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"We could always tell when international protests were taking place . . . the food rations increased and the beatings inside the prisons got less . . . letters from abroad were translated and passed around from cell to cell . . . but when the letters stopped, the dirty food and the repression started again."

From the statement of a prisoner released from Chi Hoa National Prison, Saigon, December 1972

preface
by sean macbride s.c.
chairman of the international executive committee

While Amnesty International's influence and stature is growing, so are its urgent tasks. Our investigations into the treatment of prisoners have satisfied us that many governments are now, either directing or tolerating, the use of systematic torture on prisoners in their custody. Sometimes in efforts to obtain information, other times in order to quell opposition by the use of terror. Sometimes with both these ends in view. The more sophisticated torture methods and torture equipment are even being exported by some powers to their "client states". The teaching of torture methods has become part of regular military training in some countries that boast of being civilized and even Christian. In NATO manoeuvres, or "war games" as they are euphemistically called, torture is taught and some "allied" military personnel have been injured by "practice torture". In South East Asia and in the Portuguese colonies in Africa, massive massacres of civilians have been carried out by military ground forces or by aerial bombardments. Napalm, chemicals and defoliants are used in contravention of international law and of the decisions of the United Nations. Countries are bombed and laid waste in defiance of all the rules of international law and of humanitarian principles.

In the face of this massive breakdown of public morality and of civilization itself, Amnesty International and the courageous band of NGOs that are working in the field of human rights and peace need more
help from the Churches. The full weight of their moral authority must fearlessly oppose the barbarous practices used by many governments. Likewise, trade unions and professional bodies must also rise in defence of the oppressed wherever they are, otherwise they too will be engulfed in this escalation of brutality. Amnesty International need their help and support in this work.

Members of Amnesty International, who do such selfless work, must join in our effort to awaken the Churches, the Trade Unions and world public opinion.

Your International Executive Committee has approved the text of 2 draft Resolutions for submission to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Plans are also being finalized for the signing of a Petition to the UN demanding action against the torture of prisoners. Amnesty members, groups and National Sections are asked to approach their own parliamentarians and governments to secure their support for the very modest proposals which are being put forward by Amnesty International and the other Non-Governmental Organizations.

Action at national level should also be taken to get Governments to ratify the UN Covenants for the Protections of Civil and Political Rights and the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. To their shame and disgrace some governments who spoke and voted for the UN Convention for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination have not ratified it yet. This is becoming a public scandal and Amnesty members should ask their Governments to ratify the conventions they have voted for, if they have not already done so; if they have already ratified, to ask governments that have not done so to ratify and to keep faith with their colleagues.

Without neglecting their day to day work for their own adopted prisoners, National Sections should seek to influence public opinion and government in their countries and to press for more effective international action to protect prisoners from torture. The International Conference for the Abolition of Torture to be held in Paris at UNESCO in December, which is being organized by Amnesty International, will focus international attention to this grave problem, but there must be concurrent action at national level as well.

From this year's Report, Amnesty members will realize the growing extent of our work. This has placed an increasing burden on your International Executive and Secretariat. Both have given unstinted work for the objectives of the organization, often under difficult conditions. There have been and still are serious administrative problems to be overcome; I have no doubt that with perseverance and determination these will be successfully surmounted.

If Amnesty International has developed into being one of the most important international organizations it is due to the idealism, determination and perseverance of its members. On behalf of all the prisoners for whom you work we thank you.

introduction
by martin ennals
secretary general

Amnesty International develops, grows bigger and becomes more sophisticated. Regrettably, the problems Amnesty International is pledged to resolving also seem to grow bigger, to develop, to become more sophisticated.

What started as a special campaign in 1961 is now a permanent campaign, with a permanent staff of researchers producing information about political prisoners and their treatment and servicing a membership in 62 countries, in 32 of which there is a central national organization dedicated to work for the release of prisoners of conscience and the abolition of torture and the death penalty.

The rapid development of Amnesty International in the 12 years of its existence reflects a deep and widespread feeling that human rights— and inhuman behaviour—are human responsibilities. It indicates an increasing public awareness that governments—and others who exercise power over people—constantly reject in practice the concept and declared standards of human rights, humanitarian laws and human dignity.

During its first year of life Amnesty compiled a list, with personal details, of 1,200 prisoners of conscience: persons in prison because of their political or religious beliefs, their colour or their ethnic origin.

Today not only are 1,200 Amnesty groups of members working for individually adopted prisoners, but there are also many thousands of other prisoners (the names of whom in some cases are not even known) who are the subject of Amnesty action, benefit from Amnesty relief programmes or are within the purview of Amnesty concern.

The responsibility for the organization's growth, unfortunately, lies not only with Amnesty's membership but also with the governments which make Amnesty International not only necessary but inevitable. For every act of oppression there is a potential reaction from the people of the world. It is Amnesty's task to ensure that this positive reaction by public opinion is expressed—not always aloud but in the most effective way possible to help the victims of intolerance.
1973 is a year in which Amnesty International has been trying to draw attention to the growing and systematic use of torture by those in positions of power and authority. We have sought in the public campaign to elicit a strong and positive response to the epidemic proportions of this public disease—a disease which can only be eliminated by international action. "As unthinkable as slavery" is not just a slogan coined by Amnesty International as a campaign device. It is a phrase which challenges the human race to respond in unison. Poverty and hunger are inherited. Torture is a voluntary and deliberate act performed consciously by those who are sick or afraid. Torture can be stopped—now. But it can only be stopped if those who practice it are prevented by law, by shame, by fear or by other means: just as slavery was stopped by international repugnance expressed by people and governments alike.

The campaign against torture is only one aspect of the work of the organization which is committed to a programme aimed at securing the release of individual prisoners of conscience throughout the world. The process of individual adoptions of prisoners by groups is the basis of Amnesty International’s existence and membership. In the past 12 months considerable attention has been paid to developing new Amnesty techniques. This has included individually orientated action in areas such as Vietnam, Indonesia, Paraguay and Guatemala, where little may be known about the prisoners themselves, except that they are held without trial and subjected to evil conditions without legal safeguards, often without any contact or support from external sources including their families or lawyers. In Guatemala the situation (now officially recognized by the Organization of American States) is tragic. There, Amnesty’s concern lies with names—of people feared dead but about whom neither the government nor the families are able to provide any information.

Persistent group work by Amnesty International sections is effective. It boosts the morale of the prisoner, provides help for the prisoner’s family in the immediate needs of life, reminds governments of international opinion and standards. It does not always result in the release of prisoners. New techniques must be evolved: new forms of psychological warfare on oppressors, new means of bringing together public opinion across national borders. Experimental programmes involving groups, not necessarily linked with Amnesty International, are being used. Trade union and youth organizations, professional associations and industrial concerns, all can have their influence in cases where their members or colleagues are involved. It is now Amnesty’s intention to harness not only those who are members but also those who are specially concerned with the individual prisoners.

The publication, for example, of reports on torture in Brazil, on apparently perpetual imprisonment in Indonesia, on human rights in the USSR, has drawn attention to problems of imprisonment and the failure of world governments to apply the standards proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners approved by the United Nations. International law is slow in evolution, limited in its implementation and virtually dependent on public opinion for its renovation and enforcement. It is no use blaming "them" when those responsible in fact are "us": The move or progression from nationalism to internationalism is gradual and comes after public opinion has accepted it—not before.

Amnesty International depends for its effectiveness and the effectiveness of its individual actions on informed public opinion. To be effective, therefore, Amnesty International must not only work for individuals and groups; it must campaign publicly, and be seen to campaign, for the human rights of individuals and groups. It must address its campaign not only to the converted to whom we provide ammunition in the form of information, nor merely to the governments who practice the intolerance and bestialities which are unacceptable to mankind, but also to those who do not know how they can help, or do not realize that they themselves are affected when any one of their colleagues or co-religionists or political allies is imprisoned or tortured.

After more than a decade of establishing its own existence and structure and recognition, Amnesty International must now address itself to a larger audience not only of sympathisers but also those whose interests are less specific, less universally committed, but who can and will work for the release of prisoners of conscience and the elimination of torture. Amnesty International must look outside itself. It must be visible, even where the membership is limited in terms of individuals or groups. Amnesty International must plan its Human Rights programme and propagate it.

There are far more prisoners of conscience in the world than there are Amnesty members. Our initial target is to reverse that proportion.
the movement

national sections

The growth of membership in Amnesty International has accelerated over the past year but the overall balance of support and involvement remains predominantly West European. This is a balance which will have to be rectified and various initiatives are currently under way to strengthen the base of Amnesty throughout North America and the Third World.

EUROPE

West Germany continues to provide the greatest single contribution to the work of Amnesty International in terms of both groups and financial support. The growth of this Section is continuing and a corresponding broadening of approaches both through public and governmental channels has taken place. The British, Swedish, Dutch, Danish and Norwegian Sections have maintained their consistent work for prisoners throughout the past year and participation in Amnesty in these countries continues to rise. France is developing steadily in membership
and organization. The International Secretariat is now assisting in the establishment of research contacts from many parts of the world who are accessible in France, and a part-time staff member of the Secretariat is now based in the Paris office of the Section. The Swiss Section has also expanded very rapidly over the past year.

Since the 10th anniversary Assembly Meeting in Luxembourg in 1971, the Luxembourg Section has grown steadily, as has the Austrian Section which is providing hospitality for the 1973 meeting of the International Council. The Faroe Islands, a very active Section, was among those represented at the Council meeting in Utrecht. The Belgian Section, which is growing slowly, has been hampered by a language barrier which necessitates two sub-sections. The Finnish Section is still making slow progress. Internal human rights problems continue to inhibit the growth of an Amnesty Section in Italy. This is an aspect of Amnesty’s Development which was debated at the Utrecht Council in 1972. Discussion was invited from other Sections but the response was not encouraging.

NORTH AMERICA

A Canadian Section has now been formed by the groups which previously were separate and uncoordinated. Rapid membership and financial growth is expected as a result. The USA Section has provided considerable help in relations with the United Nations Secretariat and has overcome many of the difficulties that retarded previous development. Although the number of groups has increased in the past year, both Sections have a long way to go to reach the size of the larger European Sections.

LATIN AMERICA

In Latin America the existing committees in Mexico and Peru were visited by a staff member of the International Secretariat. With the increase of work by Amnesty in Latin America the organization is becoming better known and a number of articles have appeared in responsible newspapers, particularly in connection with the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture. There is need for more information material in Spanish, and this is now being prepared and circulated. There has been close contact with a number of organizations and churches in the area and several organizations have expressed interest in affiliating to Amnesty as corporate members. Meanwhile the Mexican Section is developing its activity.

The problems of Latin America have illustrated in particular the need to find new techniques to work for prisoners. It may well be that the development of Amnesty support and membership in the continent will also take a somewhat different shape from that in Europe, North America, Africa and Asia.

AFRICA

The Nigerian Section has been represented at the last two meetings of the International Council, and the visit of the Secretary General in May 1973 enabled the committee in Lagos to introduce Amnesty to the government and to the public through a television programme and by a lecture and private meetings. In Ghana the Section is not as strong as in Nigeria but despite hostile press comment following the Secretary General’s visit, during which he expressed support for prisoners in Ghana, the secretary of the Section reports a new interest in the work of the committee and there is hope of wider membership in the future.

The Gambian Section, which is the oldest in Africa, has appointed new officers, and a radio programme on Amnesty during the Secretary General’s visit stimulated further interest. Talks with government ministers and civil servants indicated support for the strengthening of the Section.

Two meetings have been held in Monrovia with a view to establishing a Section in Liberia, and there is a possibility of a committee being formed in the Ivory Coast where a senior government minister expressed his interest in giving his support.

MIDDLE EAST

The Secretary General visited the Lebanese and Israeli Sections in May 1972, but tensions in the Middle East have not helped to provide the atmosphere for growth of local human rights organizations. In Israel, however, the Section has been restructured and is now based on a new group in Tel Aviv. There have been firm approaches regarding the formation of a new section committee in Jordan where the Amnesty International statute has now been translated into Arabic. Expressions of interest from lawyers in Syria and Kuwait have also been received. The Egyptian committee has not yet been formally established, and internal problems resulting in imprisonment and expulsion of journalists from their professional organization may have inhibited development of Amnesty activity there.

ASIA

Japan is making encouraging progress with new groups being established and Japanese participation being organized in various aspects of Amnesty’s work, in addition to the adoption of prisoners. South Korea has experienced difficulties in that some members of the committee have been imprisoned during the year and have been the subject of intervention by the International Secretariat with the South Korean government. The chairman of the South Korean Section was invited to attend the Utrecht meeting of the International Council but was unable to accept when the South Korean government failed to provide him with a passport in time for him to travel. Despite these obstacles however the work in South Korea has continued and
developed. Their report is printed in both English and Korean and Japanese Amnesty members from Kansai attended the South Korean annual meeting and reported to the International Secretariat.

National Sections are inevitably affected by the internal political situations in their own countries particularly when the international organization is unpopular with the government. After Lord Avebury's visit to Sri Lanka in 1971, the National Section expressed its disquiet at the report which was published. Nonetheless it remained in existence and now has new officers. The Bangladesh Section committee was quickly re-established after the cessation of hostilities and has been in regular contact with the Secretariat.

There are moves to start a new committee in Pakistan and a long term assignment of a staff member is planned for the end of 1973 to work in the Indian sub-continent to help the sections and committees in that region and assist in the development of Amnesty in Asia. The committee in Nepal which was formed in 1972 has now been fully established and was recently visited by a member of the research staff.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The New Zealand Section has grown over the past year and new groups have been formed. The Australian members of Amnesty are still organized into five regional Sections without a unified national body. There was a levelling off of the membership spurt which took place during the past year, but the work of the various sections for the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture has brought widespread publicity for the work of Amnesty.

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS

There are individual members of Amnesty in a large number of countries where no national Sections exist. As a result of the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture it may be that a considerable increase of individual and corporate membership could result if a determined effort is made to pursue the contacts and the interest demonstrated in Amnesty's work.

development of amnesty international

The Long Range Planning Report last year urged the development of Amnesty International in non-European areas and called for a systematic approach to the formation of National Sections. The entire question of Amnesty's growth is now recognized by the International Executive Committee as a matter to be given high priority. As a result, a number of initiatives are being planned.

A full-time member of the Secretary-General's Office has been working with the Information Office and with the Executive Secretary to formulate a strategy for development. The International Council will discuss this strategy at its meeting in September. Briefly, the strategy recommends: the improvement of services and communication within the existing membership; the expansion of categories of membership; the establishment of new publications policies; the broadening of international press work; the intensifying of fund-raising efforts; the building of a field secretary programme in the Third World.

This strategy is based on the fundamental objective of widening the impact of Amnesty International throughout the world. Amnesty must use every method possible to increase public support for its objectives, without compromising the integrity and principles for which it stands. We must therefore adapt to the political patterns and possibilities of the countries and cultures in which we wish to work. Where sections and groups are difficult to found, newer and more flexible channels of action and communication must be sought.

relations with other international organizations

UNITED NATIONS

At a meeting of the UN's ad hoc Working Group of Experts concerned with human rights in Southern Africa, held in London on July 31 and August 1, the Secretary General gave evidence regarding political prisoners and their (mis)treazinent in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique. His testimony formed an important part of the Group's Report of February 1, 1973 (U.N. Doc. E/1111).

In December 1972, in Tanzania, the Secretary General met the Deputy Representative of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to discuss African refugee problems.

• In December, Amnesty joined the International Commission of Jurists, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International League for the Rights of Man and the Federation Internationale des Droits de l'Homme in a communication to the UN Commission on Human Rights calling upon the Commission to begin a thorough study of the situation in Greece. The basis of the claim is that the Greek Government have effected a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights.

The same claim forms the basis of a submission to the UN Human Rights machinery made by Amnesty in February on the situation in Indonesia.

UNESCO has been extremely helpful in providing facilities and helping with arrangements for the International Conference on Torture to be held on the 25th Anniversary of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Amnesty International has been represented at various meetings of NGOs interested in questions of human rights held in Strasbourg. Amnesty has expressed to the Secretary General of the Council its concern that the revised version of the UN's Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners should have been adopted by resolution (73) 5 of the Committee of Ministers without previous opportunity having been given to specialist organizations to comment on the proposed revision.

The subject of Conscientious Objection has now been reinstated in the Council's work programme, but no firm steps appear to have been taken to reach agreement on this important human right.

The Amnesty International Report on the treatment of prisoners in Northern Ireland forms a part of the dossier being considered by the European Commission of Human Rights under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Our reports on torture of prisoners in Turkey have also been distributed to members of the Council.

The National Council for Civil Liberties (NCCL) of Great Britain is taking the case of an Amnesty International adoptee to the European Commission of Human Rights. Amnesty International will join NCCL as agents for the Petitioner.

A resolution calling for the abolition of capital punishment, based largely on a draft prepared by the Legal Officer, has been introduced by parliamentarians to the Consultative Assembly.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Pursuant to correspondence with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) of the Organization of American States, with which Amnesty has co-operative relations, a formal submission was made in April 1973 to the IACHR on the question of deaths and disappearances of individuals in Guatemala.

In January, a member of the International Secretariat visited the Secretariat of the IACHR in Washington. In March, Dr. Luis Reque, Executive Secretary of the IACHR, visited the International Secretariat. Relations between the IACHR and Amnesty International are close and productive.

ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

The Secretary General attended the November 1972 meeting of the Coordinating Committee of the Organization of African Unity's Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees (BPEAR). Amnesty was given observer status on the BPEAR in April 1972 and continues to liaise with that body concerning the protection and support of African refugees, especially those fleeing from the white-minority-ruled areas of Southern Africa. In addition, Amnesty has drawn the attention of the BPEAR to the problem of refugees who are faced with deportation or detention in their countries of refuge.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Sean McBride represents Amnesty International on the Bureau of the Standing Conference of International NGOs in consultative status with the United Nations. In that capacity he was elected as chairman of the Special NGO Committee on Human Rights. At the triennial conference of the Standing Conference held in Geneva in June 1972 the two resolutions which were drafted by Amnesty International on a Convention on Torture and the Treatment of Prisoners and on Respect for International Humanitarian Law were endorsed by the majority of those participating in the Conference and efforts are being made to obtain governmental sponsorship so that the resolutions can be submitted to the UN General Assembly in the autumn of 1973.

The Chairman of the International Executive Committee, the Secretary General and the Legal Officer have all taken part in meetings with other international organizations during the year and close working relationships have been developed with a number of NGOs whose co-operation in exchanging information and in other ways is particularly valuable to Amnesty. During the past year Amnesty has acted jointly with several organizations over such questions as the sentencing of observers to trials and the issuing of joint statements on subjects such as civilian imprisonment in Indo-China and especially South Vietnam.
Expenditures in budget year 1972/73 (£138,586) showed the anticipated substantial increase over the previous year (£81,483). This increase resulted primarily from the move of the International Secretariat to new premises, from the recruitment of new staff, and the entailing rise of operational cost. Another important factor was the general inflationary trend. Actual expenditures exceeded the forecast by £3,736.

Total income exceeded forecast by £4,705. On the one hand our National Sections and our membership made substantial efforts to raise this income. On the other hand we had the generous support of other donors, notably the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust.

Subject to International Council approval, the deficit of £1,408 will be carried over into budget year 1973/74.

As a result of improved facilities and increased staff, the efficiency of the Research Department has greatly increased. Our investment in a full-time information office is already paying off in rapidly improving access to media, and in widening public awareness of our work. On the other hand, streamlining of administrative and especially financial procedures has not progressed as had been hoped. Therefore, strengthening of the financial and administrative systems at the International Secretariat is now being pursued as a high priority.
**Corrigendum**

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT APRIL 30, 1973** (Provisional)

**INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED APRIL 30, 1973** (Provisional)

### INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment at cost</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Aggregate depreciation</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Account Research Department Loans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner of Conscience Fund</td>
<td>13,078</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Marrecco</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to Staff</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>16,519</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to PoC for conversion of premises</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS payments and guarantees not received April 30</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds due to Al and prepayments</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Debtors</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at Bank</td>
<td>9,971</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Hand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance NS Contributions</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Recoverables from RD</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for Accruals</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Refunds</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monies held in suspense</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monies held for Special Projects</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief monies held in Current Account</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>16,158</td>
<td>16,158</td>
<td>16,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>30,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Represented by</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation Scheme Reserve</td>
<td>7,234</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for dilapidation</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for capital expenditure not now needed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Fund</strong></td>
<td>45,831</td>
<td>45,831</td>
<td>45,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 30 April 1972</td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>30,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Deficit for the year</strong></td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Fund</strong></td>
<td>40,285</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£50,057</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Sections Contributions</td>
<td>103,344</td>
<td>103,344</td>
<td>103,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Guarantee</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Guarantee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Contributions</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131,678</td>
<td>126,973</td>
<td>126,973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Less EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Compensations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>26,511</td>
<td>51,678</td>
<td>51,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Related Expenditure</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>18,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers and Temporary Help</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for Background Papers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total A</strong></td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>51,678</td>
<td>51,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationary</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephones and Telegraph</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>2,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Material</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Repairs and Service Contracts</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>5,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of Office Equipment</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total B</strong></td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>14,717</td>
<td>14,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premises</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and Rates</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Related Expenditure</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Amortization)</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>9,971</td>
<td>9,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Recurring Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total C</strong></td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>6,791</td>
<td>6,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New page 18
Amnesty International’s work on behalf of political prisoners and for the abolition of torture and the death penalty is well known. Its relief programme, however, is often overlooked. Yet during the past year Amnesty International distributed more than £85,000 in relief to adopted prisoners and their families. To put this figure into proper perspective it must be compared with the International Secretariat’s separate operational budget in 1972-73 of £134,850.

The relief programme reflects the practical side of unjust imprisonment: the prisoner is often the sole breadwinner of his family. When he is detained, others suffer as well. Even when he is released, he often encounters difficulty in finding a job. In some countries, for example, ex-political prisoners are quietly blacklisted from employment: the Kafka-esque nightmare that originally left the prisoner’s family destitute continues even when the gates of the prison are finally opened.

Letters received from prisoners attest both to the practical and psychological effects of the relief programme. People in confinement are beset by fears for the well-being of their dependants. The knowledge that his family has some financial support helps to maintain a prisoner’s morale.
Money for relief is raised by National Sections and groups working for the release and succour of individually adopted prisoners. Occasionally the International Secretariat itself receives unsolicited donations from non-Amnesty members for relief in specific countries. Distribution of relief is a very sensitive area of Amnesty's work and accurate assessment of the amounts involved is difficult, because distribution arrangements have to be tailored to the situation within each country. In many cases relief is direct: Amnesty groups send money to the families of their adopted prisoners or to the prisoner himself after he is released in order to help him re-establish himself. In some cases, groups or National Sections, because of circumstances within the prisoner's country, have undertaken to pay for the education abroad of family members. Great care is taken, however, to ensure that such relief arrangements will not get the prisoner or his family into trouble with the authorities.

For the most part special arrangements have to be made for the distribution of funds. Some of this is distributed through the International Secretariat. In other cases National Sections administer their own programmes.

How effective is Amnesty International's relief programme? Perhaps the answer lies in the following excerpts from two letters from prisoners in different parts of the world. Both were received by Amnesty groups in May 1973:

"... I wish to express my deep gratitude to the group for the financial assistance rendered my wife and kids while I was in detention. Without your valuable assistance my family could have been homeless and starving...."

"Dear Friend,

My first words are to thank you and all your friends there for all the moral support and material help you have given to my family and to me, particularly during the time I was in prison. Only someone who has spent nearly 5 years behind bars, under a severe prison regime, parted from those he loves best, can know how important it is to feel that one is not alone, that far away, in another country, there are friends who do not forget and who do all they can to soften the hard and unfair sentence to which he was condemned, and who give him heart and courage. Such support and help is an unforgettable blessing. Without it, prison would be even harder to bear. ..."

The 1972 International Council Meeting, concerned at the epidemic growth of torture by governments and their agencies, decided to launch a worldwide Campaign for the Abolition of Torture.

The Campaign was conceived as a two-pronged one: public and diplomatic. At the public level, the Campaign was designed to arouse awareness of the magnitude of this barbarous practice and to generate a world outcry against torture. On the diplomatic level, pressure would be brought to bear on governments and the United Nations to devise effective legal machinery that would provide unfailing means of enforcing Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which prohibits torture. In the words of Seán McBride, Chairman of the IEC, when he officially opened the Campaign on Human Rights Day, December 10, 1972, tortue must be made "as unthinkable as slavery".

To achieve this end, campaign plans included publication of a world survey of torture, diplomatic and political representations to governments and their regional and international groupings, promotion of the Draft Resolution on a Convention on Torture and the Treatment of Prisoners, an international petition to the President of the United Nations General Assembly, and regional conferences of National Sections on the various causes of torture and the remedies needed to abolish it. The climax of these efforts will be an International Conference for the Abolition of Torture which will be held at UNESCO House in Paris on December 10 and 11, 1973, to coincide symbolically with the 25th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

From the outset, the Campaign has received a great deal of publicity and interest everywhere and met with a favourable response
from many international figures and from the press, radio and television. Concentrated and often highly imaginative individual campaigns by National Sections considerably reinforced the global promotion efforts by the International Secretariat.

With the help of National Sections, the international appeal* to the President of the UN General Assembly, translated into more than 30 languages, was circulated throughout the world.

At the time this Annual Report went to press, well-publicized conferences on torture had been held by the American and Swiss Sections. Later in the year, major regional conferences and seminars were being held by the Benelux, Australian, New Zealand, Irish, Scandinavian, Canadian, British and German Sections.

A host of world statesmen, diplomats, politicians, and experts and some 200 leading international non-governmental organizations have been invited to the Paris Conference.

The Conference will be divided into four working parties which will: 1) identify the individuals and institutions responsible for torture; 2) establish the social, political and economic background to torture; 3) discuss the international, regional and national legal factors affecting torture practices; and 4) determine the physical and psychological effects on victims and the involvement of doctors in torture sessions. The Conference as a whole will formulate concrete proposals for legally enforceable machinery to abolish torture.

* "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

Article 5, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

"We, the undersigned, call upon the General Assembly of the United Nations to outlaw immediately the torture of prisoners throughout the world."
The construction of the Research Department was completed early in May 1973, with the appointment of a new researcher on the Middle East. The Department is divided into five area units: two full-time and one half-time researchers work on the African countries; three full-time researchers investigate the problems of political imprisonment in Asia; three in Europe; two researchers divide the countries of Latin America between them, and one researcher holds a watching brief over the Middle East. The Department is fortunate in being assisted by a number of volunteers and part-time workers. The institution of the post of Executive Assistant has taken some of the routine work off researchers, and there has been a marked improvement in the availability of secretarial help.

All these practical improvements have been made possible by the continued support of our National Sections and the generosity of the Rowntree Trust and other contributors. It should however be added that the Department and many of its staff are new and that some time will have to be allowed for it to settle down and become fully operative.
The number of cases taken up has continued to grow, and so has the number of released prisoners. During the calendar year 1972, the cases of 1,500 new prisoners were sent out to the groups, and there were 842 releases; in the first five months of 1973, 818 new case sheets were constructed, and 520 prisoners were released. Amnesty International of course does not claim all the credit for the releases. The performance of the Research Department, it can be assumed, will further improve when the Latin American Department starts using the contacts it has recently established and when the Middle East unit goes into action.

In addition to the work on individual cases, we have published several major reports dealing with political imprisonment, torture and the state of human rights in several countries. In September 1972, the report on torture in Brazil appeared; the Draft Protocol on Civilian Prisoners in Indochina was followed by the report on Political Prisoners in South Vietnam, which was published in July 1973; the Indonesia submission to the United Nations and the Indonesia Special — a joint publication with the Dutch Section — were prepared. Unfortunately, the Chronicle of Current Events, a reliable record of the state of human rights in the Soviet Union, which was published in English translation by Amnesty International, stopped appearing in Moscow. Number 27 of the Chronicle was the last one to be published.

In addition to its routine work, the Research Department has also been receiving a growing number of inquiries on political imprisonment and related questions from other organizations and individuals.

An optimistic trend is observable in several African states, where considerable numbers of political detainees or restrictees have been released over the last 12 months (Lesotho, Sudan and Ghana, for example), but Amnesty International’s task in Africa remains immense. Military regimes in Mali and Nigeria continue to hold detainees, as do civilian regimes in Rhodesia, Malawi and elsewhere. In Uganda and Burundi opponents of the government have “disappeared”, and in Sierra Leone, Morocco, and Zambia the banning of opposition political parties and groups has led to large numbers of arrests. The use of political imprisonment as a weapon of oppression in South Africa, Namibia, and the Portuguese colonies continues, as it has for the past decade, to be a major concern of Amnesty.

With the establishment in October 1972 of a research office in Paris serving Francophone Africa, it was possible to extend Amnesty’s work in that area and establish a network for information in regard to 15 French-speaking states. Missions to Ghana, Tunisia, Tanzania, Uganda, Senegal, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, Mali, Liberia and Gambia obtained data about prisoners of conscience and encouraged the development of African national sections. On a broader scale, the attendance of the Secretary General at a meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in November 1972, emphasized Amnesty’s interest in the continent-wide problem of refugees.

**ALGERIA**

In July 1972 President Boumedienne commuted to prison terms all death sentences passed on prisoners in Algeria. As part of its campaign against capital punishment, Amnesty wrote to the President applauding this step and suggesting that it might be extended into a general ban on the death sentence in Algeria.

**BOTSWANA**

Amnesty’s principal concern regarding Botswana during the past year has been the predicament of Rhodesian refugees in that country, who have been faced with repatriation. It was feared that should these persons be forcibly returned to Rhodesia they would face persecution for political offences or for having left the country illegally. Although this has been a problem of at least two years’ standing, matters reached a head in March 1973, when the Botswana authorities attempted to repatriate 42 Rhodesian refugees. Some of the Rhodesians were taken into custody by the Rhodesian authorities after having been put across the Botswana-Rhodesia border, but others escaped and have gone into hiding. Shortly after this incident Godfrey Beck, a registered refugee who left South Africa during the 1960s, was deported to his country of origin by the Botswana government and is since reported to have been detained by the South African police.

(For Angola, Guinea Bissau and Mozambique see Portugal, page 26)
International Secretariat protested to the Botswana High Commissioner in London about the repatriation of the Rhodesians and of Mr. Beck and the case was also brought to the attention of the Organization of African Unity, the United Nations, and the World Council of Churches. Mr. Beck, who is being held incommunicado, has been adopted.

BURUNDI
As a result of widespread massacres of the majority Hutu people of Burundi, Amnesty intervened in the summer of 1972 with cables of protest to President Micombero and to the Burundian Ambassador in Brussels. Due to the ferocity of these massacres, Amnesty held out little hope for the survival of a number of prisoners whom it had taken up as investigation cases following their trial for political offences in July 1971. However, it was announced in March 1973 that 9 political prisoners had been released. Some of the Amnesty cases were among this number. The Research Department is at present attempting to obtain information about the fate of the 5 remaining active cases.

CHAD
Between July 1972 and March 1973 several hundred persons from various walks of life were arrested in Chad. They included several former colleagues of President Tombalbaye, who rules Chad at the head of the only legal political party, the Chad Progressive Party. In December the Secretary General of Amnesty International wrote to President Tombalbaye asking for humane treatment for the detainees and requesting that they be either released or tried. Thirteen adoption cases from this group of detainees were taken up in the first few months of 1973, and it is hoped that others will be adopted in the next few months. A Research mission to Chad in May 1973 obtained additional data about political prisoners in the country.

CONGO-BRAZZAVILLE
In December the Secretary General wrote to President Ngoubai asking for an amnesty for the political prisoners who had been held, reportedly in poor conditions, at the detention centres at Oueso, Djambala, Brazzaville, and Fort Rousset, since March 1972. Investigation case sheets are being prepared on a number of Congolese prisoners.

GABON
Numerous Gabonese, most of them members of the intelligentsia, and including the sole Gabonese lawyer practicing in the country, Maitre Pierre-Louis Agondjo, were arrested between July and October 1972 and are being held at various prisons under charges of subversive activities. The Secretary General has written to President Bongo about these detentions. 9 cases have been sent out to groups as investigation cases, and in May 1973 a research mission was sent to Gabon with a view to obtaining more data about the prisoners.

GHANA
Amnesty International has remained in close touch with the situation in Ghana, where in May 1973 between 20 and 30 members of the Progress Party government which was overthrown by a military coup in January 1972 remained in detention. The majority of these detainees have been taken up by Amnesty groups as investigation cases. In July 1972 Jeremy Thorpe, leader of the British Liberal Party, visited Ghana on behalf of Amnesty International to speak to members of the ruling National Redemption Council about the detainees (over 250 were being held without trial at that time) and to visit some of the prisoners in their cells at Ussher Fort Prison, Accra. Recommendations based on Mr. Thorpe’s report were forwarded to the Ghanaian government in August, and in November 1972 Amnesty issued a press statement calling for the release of the detainees. The statement also condemned the trial of 9 persons under a Subversion Decree which specified trial by military tribunal without possibility of appeal and made the death sentence mandatory. When 8 persons were sentenced to death under this decree, Amnesty cabled the Ghanaian government urging commutation of the sentences. The sentences were subsequently commuted to life imprisonment.

On the anniversary of the coup, in January 1973, Amnesty once again urged the National Redemption Council to release all the detainees. Releasing the first five months of 1973 reduced the total of detainees held to a small fraction of the 1.301 originally arrested in January 1972. The Secretary General pressed government officials for the release of these few remaining prisoners when he visited Ghana in May 1973.

GUINEA
The large number of political prisoners and detainees in Guinea continues to be a source of concern. This matter was raised in November 1972 in a letter sent from the Chairman of the International Executive Committee, Seán MacBride, to President Sekou Toure via the Guinean Ambassador in Rome. No reply was received to this letter, and Amnesty is now preparing case sheets on Guinean prisoners and continuing to seek opportunities to contact the Guinean government directly on the matter.

IVORY COAST
Amnesty International has been concerned for some time with the...
fate of over 300 persons who are reported to have been detained without trial in the Gagnoa district following disturbances there in November 1970. In April 1973 Amnesty obtained the names of 80 such persons, and their situation was mentioned by the Secretary General, Martin Ennals, when he spoke to government officials on the Ivory Coast during his tour of West Africa in May 1973. Mr. Ennals obtained an assurance that the detainees would be either tried or released in the near future.

KENYA
Amnesty groups continue to press for the release of 3 members of the banned opposition party, the Kenya People’s Union (KPU), who have been detained without trial since 1969 under the Preservation of Public Security Act. Financial assistance is also being provided to their families. In addition, a businessman arrested in June 1971, when 12 men were given prison terms for plotting to overthrow the government of President Jomo Kenyatta, and since held without trial, has been taken up as an investigation case. In general, the situation regarding human rights in Kenya is relatively good, although there is some cause for disquiet in the banning of the Kenya Students’ Union in 1972 and the banning of the Jehovah’s Witnesses sect in April 1973.

LESOTHO
1972 and 1973 saw a decrease of Amnesty activity in respect to Lesotho, as restrictions were finally lifted on members of the opposition Basutoland Congress Party, most of whom had been detained in January 1970 and released by January 1972. By May 1973 most of the 20 adoption and investigation cases which had been handled by Amnesty groups during the previous year had been closed as a result of the release from restriction of the persons concerned and the general “normalization” of Lesotho politics which took place during the spring of 1973.

MALAWI
The situation in Malawi was of great concern to Amnesty during 1972 and the first half of 1973. Reliable reports state that the number of persons detained without trial, which was estimated at close to 300 in May 1972, has risen during the past 12 months to over 1,000. Most of these persons are held at the main detention camp at Dzeleka. Conditions in this camp, according to first-hand accounts, are very poor. Sanitary conditions are bad, diet is inadequate and some of the prisoners are said to be in poor mental condition after detention for as long as 9 years.

Although details about individual prisoners remain difficult to obtain, Amnesty international has taken up the cases of several prisoners in Dzeleka, and has 38 active adoption or investigation cases in Malawi as a whole. These include 21 leaders of the Jehovah’s Witnesses sect, who were imprisoned in December 1972. The sect, which has been persecuted for its beliefs in Malawi for a number of years, suffered severe repression in the autumn of 1972 when the youth wing of the ruling Malawi Congress Party (MCP), the Malawi Young Pioneers, began to harass Jehovah’s Witnesses throughout the country. The ensuing campaign of intimidation cost a number of lives and drove 15,000 to 20,000 members of the sect out of the country into neighbouring Zambia. When some of these refugees returned to Malawi in December 1972 following pledges of safety by members of the Malawi government, they were told that they were now expected to co-operate fully with the MCP or face further harassment. As a first step 21 leaders of the sect were immediately imprisoned. All have been adopted.

MALI
Thirty different Amnesty groups are working on the cases of political prisoners in Mali, most of whom have been detained since the military government came to power in November 1968. These prisoners are being held without charge or trial, mostly at Kidal in the northern region of Mali. Their health is said to be suffering, and in May and September 1972 there were reports of deaths among the detainees held at the prison at Taoudeni. The question of the detainees was raised by the Secretary General with the Malian authorities during his visit in May 1973.

MAURITANIA
Between January and March 1973 20 Mauritanians, including students and teachers, were arrested, and are said to have suffered mistreatment at the hands of the police before being detained at the Prison Civile in the capital, Nouakchott. In April 1973 the Chairman of Amnesty International and the Secretary General of the International Association of Democratic Jurists addressed a letter to President Ould Daddah concerning the plight of the detainees, but no reply was received. Later in the month the detainees staged a hunger-strike in protest against their poor prison conditions, and in June all of the detainees were taken up by Amnesty as investigation cases.

MAURITIUS
A number of leaders and members of the radical Mauritan Militant Movement (MMM) were arrested early in 1972 when the movement threatened to exploit the visit of Queen Elizabeth of Britain to the island in March of that year to draw attention to its political claims. This action followed previous detentions at the end of 1971 during a wave of strikes. By May 1972 26 MMM supporters were in detention.
within and outside the territory in an effort to resolve the question of appeal failed and the men were put to death in January 1973. A more recent cause for concern was the promulgation in April 1973 of a new code of civil liberties which restricts the rights of assembly, or association, and of freedom of the press. Another major cause for concern is the banning of the Rabat branch of the left-wing opposition party, Union Nationale des Forces Populaires (UNFP), which took place in April 1973. Over 2,000 persons are said to have been arrested subsequent to the banning, which took place following an outbreak of armed attacks on police installations and other buildings in various parts of the country. Those detained include some prominent lawyers who were UNFP leaders.*

Amnesty also appealed at the end of 1972 for commutation of the death sentences passed on the 11 men found guilty of organizing an assassination attempt on King Hassan II during August 1972. This appeal failed and the men were put to death in January 1973. A more recent cause for concern was the promulgation in April 1973 of a new code of civil liberties which restricts the rights of assembly, or association, and of freedom of the press. 

NAMIBIA

In 1972 the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution asking the UN Secretary General to initiate talks with all parties interested in the political situation in Namibia, and accordingly Dr. Kurt Waldheim and later his representative, Dr. Alfred Escher, had talks with the South African government and political movements within and outside the territory in an effort to resolve the question of independence.

* In late June and early July a German judge visited Morocco on behalf of Amnesty International and attended the trial of 167 persons at Kenitra. The accused were charged with the armed attacks on police stations and other buildings which took place in March 1972.

Immediately before Dr. Waldheim went in March 1973 to South Africa, Amnesty International sent him a telegram expressing concern about the nature and extent of political imprisonment, particularly in view of the State of Emergency which still prevailed in Ovamboland. Amnesty continued to receive allegations of torture and, on Dr. Escher’s departure for South Africa, urged Dr. Waldheim to look into the allegations and to make the lifting of the State of Emergency under which these atrocities were alleged to have occurred a pre-condition to the discussion of the territory’s independence. A list of 84 of the 200 Ovambo detainees who were subsequently charged was received, but efforts to find out further details on them and on the charges, were unsuccessful. So were efforts to establish direct contacts within the territory; a mission was planned but did not take place, due to indications that Amnesty’s representative would not be able to enter the territory.

The UN Secretary General’s latest report indicates that talks between him and the South African authorities have not been very successful so far. Meanwhile, the South African government has gone ahead with a proposal it had put forward to Dr. Escher for the appointment of an Advisory Council that would advise the South African government of initiatives for independence. Between February and March 1973, disturbances broke out in Windhoek and Ovamboland where political movements opposed to South African administration campaigned against the Advisory Council. At the time of going to press 9 Ovambo leaders were reported to be in preventive detention and information is being sought with a view to producing case sheets on them. An Amnesty-adopted prisoner who had been banished to a remote rural area since 1969, Brandon Simbwaye, is rumoured to have escaped. Amnesty International distributed some relief to families of some detainees through various channels. A total of 15 prisoners are under adoption or investigation in Namibia.

NIGERIA

Amnesty International’s principal concern in Nigeria continues to be the detention without trial of 30 prisoners, including some former Biafran officers and a number of military personnel allegedly involved in the pre-war coup of January 1966. These prisoners have been held since the close of hostilities in the Biafran War in January 1970, and the International Secretariat is at present producing investigation case sheets on them. A special cause for concern was the transfer of these prisoners from military custody in Lagos to civilian prisons in remote parts of Nigeria (mainly in the north of the country). The Secretary General expressed Amnesty’s concern at the fate of these detainees to the Nigerian authorities during his visit in April 1973. Another disturbing factor is the continued infliction of the death penalty, by public execution, on persons found guilty of armed robbery. The
Amnesty continued to make representations to both the British and the Rhodesian authorities on behalf of the detainees. Throughout the year, Amnesty International drew attention to the cases of the members of the African National Congress, who were sentenced to death for participating in guerrilla attacks or bringing arms into Rhodesia. Amnesty learned that the children were placed subsequently in a remarkable degree of tolerance and readiness to think constructively.

Nevertheless, the Smith government continued to press for a British agreement to the settlement. This coincided with an escalation in guerrilla activity and a break-down in security within the country which forced the Rhodesian authorities to adopt stringent security measures to cope with the situation. New security legislation was introduced providing for stricter censorship, collective punishment of African communities who had failed to report the presence of guerrillas, and for longer sentences for persons found guilty of directly or indirectly assisting the freedom fighters.

Steps were taken against communities whose schools, health centres and shops and other public places were closed. In certain cases livestock was impounded by the police and the population was left without means of support. There were several secret trials and a number of people were sentenced to terms ranging from 10 to 25 years for assisting or failing to report the presence of guerrillas. Eight persons were sentenced to death for participating in guerrilla attacks or bringing arms into Rhodesia. Amnesty International received a few allegations of the use of torture on persons arrested for interrogation. Several former Amnesty prisoners of conscience were re-detained.

The Smith government admitted to having 183 persons in preventive detention in May 1973. These included 6 officials of the African National Council, who were adopted as prisoners of conscience. Also adopted was Peter Niesewand, the international news agency, London Guardian and BBC correspondent, who was tried secretly under the Official Secrets Act and whose case was widely publicized in Britain. The British Government took up his case with the Rhodesian authorities and on his release Amnesty International drew attention to the cases of the other 110 adopted prisoners of conscience under preventive detention and called on the British Government to give them the same personal attention as was given to the Niesewand case. Throughout the year Amnesty continued to make representations to both the British and the Rhodesian authorities on behalf of the detainees.

Didymus Mutasa, one of the founders of the multi-racial Cold Comfort Farm which was closed down by the Rhodesian government, and an Amnesty prisoner of conscience, was allowed to leave Rhodesia and come to Britain in November 1972. His release followed representation by Amnesty to the British Government and to the Rhodesian Minister of Law and Order, that he should be allowed to take up an offer for a place to study in Britain. Amnesty groups helped support families of prisoners of conscience and, in some cases, of released detainees who are still restricted, with the continued co-operation of Christian Care. There was some difficulty in maintaining contact with prisoners of conscience in early 1973 evidently due to new restrictions on correspondence imposed by prison officials.

Groups in Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, and Sweden announced plans for special campaigns. Five groups in Laholm and Halmstad, Sweden, started an extra adoption programme in order to raise funds for the school fees of the children of Rhodesian prisoners and detainees. The Netherlands Co-ordinator headed a campaign which aimed at collecting funds for relief for 26 prisoners at Gwelo and Wha Wha prisons who were issued with detention orders last year after release from Khami Prison where they had served sentences for political offences, and for the 10 long-term detainees at Gonakudzingwa. The German Co-ordination Group issued a pamphlet on the predicament of the Tangwena tribes, who have been driven from their traditional homeland by the Rhodesian authorities, and also gave material aid to the tribespeople.

Amnesty interviewed the Roman Catholic Bishop of Umtali, Bishop Donal Lamont, while he was in London earlier in 1973 about the Tangwena children who were reportedly kidnapped by Rhodesian authorities in order, allegedly, to lure the community away from its hiding place. Amnesty learned that the children were placed subsequently in the care of missionaries.

SENEGAL

In March 1973 the French Section financed the mission of Maitre Bernard Tirlocoq to Senegal, where he obtained information about various categories of prisoners, including former politicians who were jailed in 1962 and students who were detained in February 1973 after troubles at the University of Dakar. It is proposed to produce case sheets on a number of these prisoners.

SIERRA LEONE

During the past year Amnesty groups continued work on the cases of 18 prisoners under adoption or investigation in Sierra Leone. Most of these prisoners are members or supporters of banned opposition United Democratic Party (UDP), and have been detained without trial for periods of up to 30 months under the Emergency Regulations first imposed in September 1970. Political tension in Sierra Leone began to mount late in 1972 in anticipation of the elections which were scheduled to be held in the Spring of 1973. The remaining opposition party, the
Sierra Leone People's Party, came under increasing pressure from President Siaka Stevens's ruling All People's Congress (APC), which is moving towards the imposition of a one-party state in Sierra Leone. In September 1972 an incident at a by-election at Kailahun resulted in the arrest of 7 SLPP leaders and supporters. They were released in the following month but charged with conspiracy and incitement, and their trial is still continuing. As the election approached, there were further detentions of SLPP members. An SLPP leader, M. S. Mustapha, was detained in February 1973 but released in mid-April. Others still held include the editor and acting editor of the SLPP newspaper Unity.

When nominations opened at the end of April for the elections, the APC resorted to widespread intimidation in order to gain victory at the polls. There have been reports of massive new detentions, and a death toll of between 60 and 200 has been described by some sources. The election held on May 11 resulted in a victory for the APC. The International Secretariat is collecting data on the persons recently detained, with a view to adopting them as soon as possible.*

SOMALIA

During 1972-1973 Amnesty groups continued to handle several cases of former members of the Somali government imprisoned without trial after the military coup of October 1969. Early in April 1973 the Somali government informed the International Secretariat and Amnesty groups that 19 of these detainees had been released at the end of March. Amnesty International has written to the President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council congratulating the government on this amnesty, and inquiring about 6 other detainees who are due to be brought to trial on charges of corruption before the National Security Court. In addition, Amnesty groups have adopted 2 prisoners sentenced to prison terms under the National Security Law of September 1970 on such charges as “uttering insulting remarks about the President”.

SOUTH AFRICA

The focal points of Amnesty International activity were three trials which took place during 1972-73. The appeal of 13 members of the non-European Unity Movement and APDUSA, who were mentioned in the last two Annual Reports, was refused and all are presently serving their sentences on Robben Island. Pending the hearing, a number of German Amnesty groups assisted by the German Section paid for the bail of the 3 accused, thus enabling them to spend Christmas with their families. During February 1973 another two of the accused brought prison conditions on Robben Island sharply into focus when they successfully appealed to the Supreme Court for the return of their privileges which had been withdrawn after they had participated in drafting a petition to the prison commandant.

The Timol case (see last year’s Report) also drew to a close and all the accused were found guilty of conspiracy with the banned African National Congress (ANC). Two were refused leave to appeal but the other 2 are appealing against their 5-year sentences. Investigation case sheets were made out on 6 persons who were charged under the Terrorism Act in November 1972. The men concerned were arrested in July 1972 and held in solitary confinement until they were convicted in June 1973. Five were given sentences of between 12 and 15 years’ imprisonment for conspiracy with the ANC. The 6th was sentenced to 8 years’ imprisonment for possessing false travel documents. He is now adopted.

Following a decision of the International Council in Luxembourg in 1971, the Secretary General wrote to South African Prime Minister, John Vorster to express concern about the mass removal of some African communities into rural “resettlement areas” where conditions are said to be appalling. Amnesty continues to be concerned about the resettlement areas and has adopted a number of ex-political prisoners who have been restricted to these areas on completion of their prison terms.

The banning of 8 leaders of the National Union of South African Students and 8 members of the South African Students’ Organization and the Black People’s Convention in March 1973 raised an outcry in the South African press. A number of these banned persons lost their livelihoods or the chance to continue their education as a result of the bannings. One of the students, Philippe le Roux, whose application for special permission to attend university was refused, tried to escape through Botswana, but was arrested near the border, charged and sentenced to 12 months’ imprisonment. Charges were also preferred against Winnie Mandela, whose banning orders have been renewed several times, Peter Magubane, a former Rand Daily Mail photographer, and Father Cosmas Desmond, who wrote a book on the resettlement areas, “The Discarded People”. All were found guilty of breaking the provisions of their banning orders. All have been adopted by Amnesty.

The programme of assistance to families of prisoners of conscience continues. The total number of prisoners under adoption or investigation in South Africa is 110.

SUDAN

Release of detainees held since the abortive Communist coup of July 1971 continued throughout the year. In mid-1972 a source in Khartoum reported that 570 persons were still held without trial, but by the end of the year the number had fallen to 100. Most of these prisoners were held at Kober Prison in Khartoum North, but about 20 were detained at a special installation at El Shala in the western region of Sudan.

* A number of long-term detainees were released from prison in late May 1973, including some UDP supporters who had been held since October 1970.
Releases continued throughout the first 6 months of 1972, and when a
new constitution was endorsed by President Numeiry on May 8, 1973,
the Sudanese government announced that all political prisoners had
been released. Under the new constitution detention without trial is
claimed as the release of all political prisoners valid.

Although the general tendency has been towards releases, there
have been a number of arrests over the past year. In July 1972, on the
anniversary of the abortive coup attempt, several students were arrested,
but released in December. In January 1973 a retired army brigadier and
President Numeiry. At the same time a number of members of the
Moslem Brothers (Islamic Charter Front) were arrested and detained for
some weeks. But politicians on the right wing of the political spectrum,
as well as Communists, have benefited from government amnesties. At
the end of 1972, the leader of the Moslem Brothers was released from
house-arrest, having been in either prison or restriction since Numeiry
took power in May 1969. In May 1973 the release was announced of
Saddik el-Mahdi, a former Prime Minister of Sudan, and leader of the
conservative Umma (Mahdist) Party. During the past 12 months
Amnesty groups have handled over 70 adoption and investigation cases
in Sudan.

TANZANIA

Amnesty groups continued to press the Tanzanian government for
the release of 8 adopted prisoners held on the mainland of Tanzania.
These detainees include three former Zanzibar ministers who have been
held under the Preventive Detention Act since 1964, several associates
and relatives of the former cabinet minister, Oscar Kambona (who now
lives in voluntary exile), and a number of Rwandanese refugees who have
been detained since 1969 due to their failure to comply with regulations
regarding the registration of refugees. Mr. Kambona's 2 brothers, who
had been Amnesty adoptees for a number of years, were released in
February 1972 but redetained in June of that year as they were about
to leave Tanzania to rejoin their families. They were immediately taken
up as full adoption cases again, and in August they were both placed on
the Postcard for Prisoners Campaign. Regarding the Rwandanese refugees,
Amnesty International has been in touch with the United Nations High
Commissioner for Refugees, and it appears that these prisoners are
now being gradually released as they agree to sign refugee papers.

One major Amnesty concern during the past year has been the
gate of persons arrested both on mainland Tanzania and on the island of
Karume, in April 1972. Hundreds of persons were arrested following the
assassination of the island's ruler, Sheikh Abiel
had been released. The remainder, including former minister Abdul-
rahman Babu, were taken up by Amnesty International as investigation
cases. Also in August the new ruler of Zanzibar, Aboud Jumbe, an-
nounced that 63 of the persons held on Zanzibar would be brought to
trial for alleged involvement in the assassination. The Zanzibar govern-
ment has been attempting to obtain the return to the island of the 23
Zhambis detained on the mainland, so that they might be tried at the
same time as the other 63. Amnesty International has urged the Tan-
zanian government not to return these prisoners, because the absence
of a legal framework guaranteeing human rights on Zanzibar, and the
fact that some persons who have been repatriated from the mainland
under similar circumstances in the past have been executed, could place
the prisoners' lives in jeopardy should they return.

Negotiations between the Tanzanian and Zanzibari Attorneys
General took place in the spring of 1973. They concluded with the Tan-
zanian government refusing to repatriate the 23 prisoners because the
failure of the Zanzibari authorities to guarantee that they would enjoy
such rights as that of employing defence counsel at their trial. The trial
on Zanzibar eventually opened on May 7, 1973, with 63 persons appear-
ing in court and 18 on the mainland being tried in absentia. Amnesty
International has taken up the majority of the 63 as investigation cases,
it hopes to have an observer present at the trial, and has written to
President Nyerere asking him to ensure that the human rights of those
on trial are protected.

Amnesty International also pressed the Zanzibari government for the
release of 4 girls of Persian origin who had been forcibly married to
members of the ruling Revolutionary Council in 1970, and who were
being held in virtual house arrest in their "husbands"' homes. The
conditions under which these girls were held improved slightly following
the assassination of Sheikh Karume in April 1972. In March 1973 3
of the girls managed to escape and flee the island. The 4th girl,
Nasreen Mohamed Hussein, is still held and is still adopted. Relatives
of the girls were imprisoned for a short period and reportedly beaten
following the escape.

All these matters were discussed with the Tanzanian Foreign
Minister, John Malecela, when the Secretary General, Martin EnnaIs,
visited Tanzania in November 1972.

TUNISIA

Amnesty International gave continued attention throughout the year
to the cases of intellectuals and students arrested at the time of strikes
and demonstrations at Tunisian universities and secondary schools early
in 1972. Seventeen of these prisoners were tried in mid-September
1972 in Tunis, and Lennart Aspegren of the Swedish Section attended
the trial as an Amnesty observer. The charges were not pressed and most
of the prisoners were released into provisional liberty by the end of the year. A number of ex-prisoners in provisional liberty are being supported by adoption groups.

A second political trial took place in March 1973 and was attended by an observer sent by the Belgian Section. This trial resulted in a number of prison sentences, some on former Amnesty adoptees. All the persons sentenced have now been adopted. In February 1973 Ahmed Ben Salah, an ex-minister who had been in prison since March 1970, escaped from his cell and fled the country. Mr. Ben Salah had been adopted by Amnesty and had been the subject of a post-card campaign in November 1972. His brother, Dr. Mohammed Ben Salah, was arrested immediately after his escape and is said to have been tortured.*

UGANDA

The situation regarding human rights in Uganda declined drastically during the year. President Amin's expulsion of non-citizen Asians at three months' notice received publicity throughout the world, but Amnesty International has been mainly concerned with the fate of Ugandans who have "disappeared" after having been arrested by troops or security forces. Amnesty has the names of nearly 200 such individuals who have vanished since the Amin government came to power. Some of these names were obtained by the Secretary General when he visited Uganda in November 1972. They include such prominent figures as the Chief Justice of Uganda, Benedicto Kiwanuka, and Vice-Chancellor Kalimuzo of Makerere University.

In January 1973 the Ugandan government issued a statement purporting to explain the disappearance of 85 persons, but Amnesty has conducted research on this list and is not satisfied with the explanations given. It seems highly likely that many of those who have "disappeared" have been killed. In September 1972 a group of British newsmen who were temporarily interned in a Ugandan prison reported that summary executions were taking place. In November 1972 Amnesty called for a judicial enquiry into events in January 1972 at Mutukula Prison Farm, where hundreds of prisoners were reportedly massacred, and protested to President Amin about a new decree which gave wide powers of arrest without warrant to troops and prison service members. Amnesty has also approached the Ugandan Attorney General and the Ugandan representative at the United Nations on the question of detentions and "disappearances", but no response has been received from Kampala.

In January Amnesty cabled the Ugandan government to plead for the lives of several persons sentenced to death by public execution for "guerrilla" activities. Further research is now being conducted into the matter of "disappearances" with a view to further action.

* Amnesty International sent an observer to his trial in June 1973. Although permitted to attend the trial, the observer, Dr. Wolfgang Aigner, Chairman of Austrian Section, was later questioned by police and expelled from Tunisia.

ZAMBIA

Some of the detained members of the banned United Progressive Party (UPP) were adopted during the year. Releases of UPP detainees took place regularly during the late summer and autumn of 1972, but in October of that year a number of former UPP supporters who had been detained and released were readopted after attempting to form a new political party. In December Zambia officially became a one-party state, and early in January, the ex-UPP leader Simon Kapwepwe and 34 of his supporters were released from detention. It was announced at the time that only 15 detainees remained in prison but in March 1973, 48 persons from the Western Province, a one-time stronghold of the banned African National Congress, were detained without trial. Amnesty is investigating these cases with a view to adoption. It remains concerned about other aspects of the human rights situation in Zambia, specifically by the fact that several ex-UPP detainees have been proven to have been tortured when they were first detained in 1971 and 1972, and by the continued use of detention without trial against large numbers of persons, including over 40 Rhodesian refugees who have been held since the spring of 1971.

the americas

After several years of working in only a few countries—mainly Brazil, Paraguay, Mexico and Cuba—Amnesty International expanded the Latin American Department in 1972-73. Although the expansion only took place towards the end of the year, there are now two full-time researchers, as well as a part-timer and volunteers, and work has begun in several new countries. Our work in most of these countries is in a very early stage, and we have had to spend much of our time extending our sources of information and explaining the aims and methods of Amnesty International to the governments concerned.

During the visit of one researcher to 17 Latin American countries between August 1972 and January 1973, personal contacts were established all over the continent. Many hundreds of letters have been written introducing Amnesty to international and Latin American organizations and institutions. Apart from Costa Rica, only Colombia has so far ratified the American Convention on Human Rights, signed in Costa Rica in November 1969. The issue of ratification of this convention
where those prisoners whom the Government qualifies as extremely severe in prison conditions. These are particularly severe in Rawson prison were killed by the guards. A telegram also was sent on the occasion of a shooting incident at the naval base Trelew, where 16 political prisoners were sent to President Lanusse on several occasions, asking for investigation into allegations of torture on specific prisoners and into the conditions of torture during the interrogation period. Telegrams were sent to President Lanusse on several occasions, asking for investigation into allegations of torture on specific prisoners and into the conditions of torture during the interrogation period. Telegrams were sent on the occasion of a hunger-strike at Christmas time by prisoners and their relatives in protest against prison conditions. These are particularly severe in Rawson prison where those prisoners whom the Government qualifies as extremely dangerous are held.

In his reply to the telegram the Minister of Justice claimed that prison conditions are fully adequate and that there were no political prisoners.

Amnesty International replied by drawing his attention to a few aspects of the prison conditions, in particular the isolation and the complicated bureaucracy the prisoners' families have to go through to visit them. The letter also called for the release of all those who are charged or convicted only for offences under the law 17401 (the anti-communist law) and those detained at the disposal of the Executive power during the continual states of siege and whose release in many cases has been ordered by the court. Amnesty also raised the issue of individual responsibility as laid down in the Nuremberg principles and asked for investigation of those allegedly guilty of using torture.

Those accused of political offences are tried before a recently created special tribunal. The report of the Nuremberg principles and asked for investigation of those allegedly guilty of using torture.

Amnesty member visiting Argentina was asked to observe a trial in December 1972, but this trial was postponed at the last moment.

The death penalty that had been abolished in December 1972 without ever having been put into practice was reintroduced in May 1973 following the assassination of a military officer by left-wing guerrillas. In a letter that was released to the press Amnesty International expressed concern at the re-introduction of the death penalty and at the reported transfer of political prisoners to military control. This was seen as a move by the military to prevent the President-elect, Dr. Hector Campora, from fulfilling his election promises of a generous amnesty on taking office.

At its first session since 1966, the Argentinian Congress unanimously approved the bill of general amnesty presented by President Campora when taking office on May 25, 1973. The law quashed all convictions for crimes committed for reasons connected with political, social, labour or student activities. It also abolished the special "anti-subversive" courts set up by the military regime. Most of the prisoners affected by the amnesty, prisoners of conscience as well as urban guerrillas, were released before the Congress' approval under an executive pardon issued by Dr. Campora a few hours after he took office. Amnesty International sent a cable welcoming the amnesty and the resultant release of some 1,200 prisoners.

ARGENTINA

Amnesty International's main concern has been the many allegations of torture of prisoners during the interrogation period. Telegrams were sent to President Lanusse on several occasions, asking for investigation into allegations of torture on specific prisoners and into the shooting incident at the naval base Trelew, where 16 political prisoners were killed by the guards. A telegram also was sent on the occasion of a hunger-strike at Christmas time by prisoners and their relatives in protest against prison conditions. These are particularly severe in Rawson prison where those prisoners whom the Government qualifies as extremely dangerous are held.

BOLIVIA

Although there were several amnesties in the latter part of 1972 and beginning of 1973, there are signs that over 300 prisoners remain, while others have died as a result of torture in prison. Amnesty International began its work in Bolivia by addressing telegrams to the Government about persons reported to have "disappeared." Before taking action on individual cases, Amnesty also wrote letters to the Bolivian Government giving a general introduction to its aims, and supporting petitions...
made by the Bolivian Church and others for a Christmas amnesty which it was rumoured that the Bolivian Government would grant. In late December the Government announced that the general amnesty would not take place, because of an alleged plot against President Banzer. The Government also declared a state of siege after demonstrations in the major Bolivian towns following the devaluation of the peso in October 1972. The state of siege was still in effect in May 1973.

In February 1973 Amnesty International received a statement from the government claiming that no non-violent political prisoners remained in detention. Amnesty responded by sending lists of all the names of Bolivian prisoners it had received asking that the charges against all those still detained should be made public and that they should be brought to trial. No political prisoners have been tried in Bolivia since August 1971. Amnesty began a special investigation project for Bolivian prisoners, and also took up the first adoption cases. There were more arrests and political assassinations as a result of tensions at the beginning of this year, and Amnesty has recently begun working on many new cases.

BRAZIL

On September 7, 1972, the 150th anniversary of Brazilian independence was celebrated. Amnesty International decided to publish a report on allegations of torture in Brazil on that occasion. It appeared in English, French and Portuguese editions. Together with a separate confidential appendix listing the names of torturers, the report was submitted to the Brazilian government, the United Nations and other international organizations.

Release of the report, along with appropriate press material, evoked a great deal of publicity, and extensive follow-up ensued. In Brazil, the report eventually led to a new press decree being issued in late September, in which the Brazilian authorities forbade the publication of Amnesty International's statements concerning Brazil. Amnesty International expressed its regret at this further instance of press censorship in a press release issued on September 22.

An assessment paper was prepared following publication of the torture report, in order to evaluate the overall impact of the publication. The assessment concluded that the report had been well received overall and had been widely circulated in Brazil. Subsequent correspondence and case material arriving from entirely new areas in Brazil appear to be a direct result of greater knowledge of Amnesty International in that country. The report has been reprinted several times and appears to have become a standard reference work regarding torture in Brazil. It is expected to play a significant role in Amnesty's current campaign against torture.

A number of other initiatives were taken both before and since the report was issued.

Hunger strikes by political prisoners, including three Amnesty adoptees—the Dominican priests, Brothers Brito, Christo and Lesbaupin—asking for amelioration of prison conditions, took place in May and June. Information provided by Amnesty International on the strike, including a press release issued on July 12 and Amnesty-inspired letters to various newspapers, drew world attention to the human rights situation in Brazil.

An urgent action campaign was initiated in which coordination groups were asked to organize letter-writing campaigns on behalf of persons whom, it is feared, are being tortured, but about whom too little is known to ascertain whether or not they could be considered prisoners of conscience. Large-scale campaigns have also been mounted around several adopted cases, including that of Joao Francisco de Souza, a subsequently-released lay helper of Dom Helder Camera, Professor Livio Rossi, imprisoned apparently because of his friendship with politically active people, and Father Tilden Jose Santiago, a worker priest.

Adoption and investigation work continues as before with approximately 80 adopted and 49 cases under investigation. Contact has been established and maintained with exile organizations in Chile; this has greatly facilitated the receipt of information concerning releases and the arrangement of aid to ex-prisoners. The coordination groups have been active and helpful in establishing still other lines of contact and assistance.

Most recently, Amnesty International has become concerned at the numbers of persons who have been reported "run down by motor vehicles" or "shot while trying to escape" and on April 26, 1973, a news release was issued drawing attention to the disturbing frequency with which such events had occurred, and noting that a memorandum referring to 25 such incidents in recent months had been sent to President Medici of Brazil.

COLOMBIA

Amnesty began to adopt prisoners in Colombia at the end of 1972. Over 100 people were arrested from July 1972 onwards. They were accused of having "links" with the National Liberation Army (ELN) and forming the urban network of the movement. The ambiguous charges against the prisoners and the international fame of many of them (including the film-maker Carlos Alvarez), elicited an international protest. The alleged violations of Colombian justice and the continued postponement of the court martial (which finally commenced in April 1973) increased the protests. The first day of the trial of 182 suspects was held in camera with the exclusion of the defence lawyers. Several international legal experts condemned this as a travesty of judicial procedures. In May 1973 the Military Attorney Delegate in Colombia stated that, in his opinion, the court martial should be declared null and void, because of the "irregularities" in the conduct of the trial. The trial, involving
that they all be given the right to impartial trial and proper defence.

GUATEMALA

The most serious human rights problem continues to be the high incidence of disappearances of Guatemalan citizens—without trace—or later found dead with signs of torture on their bodies. In the Guatemalan press there are regular reports on these disappearances and discoveries of bodies: the last clandestine cemetery containing 12 bodies was found in February 1973.

Although in numerous cases there are strong indications that the police and armed forces have been directly involved in the "arrest", the person is not subsequently brought before a competent judicial body. The authorities deny any knowledge of the disappearances, which appear to be the work of semi-official death squads.

When 8 trade unionists and members of the Guatemalan Communist Party were abducted last autumn—by members of the political police according to eye-witnesses—Amnesty International wrote to the Minister of Interior inquiring about their fate. As the Minister's reply was not satisfactory, another letter was sent protesting against "the continued and uncontrolled violations of the most fundamental human rights: to life, to protection from arbitrary arrest; to a fair trial and to a proper defence." This letter was released to the press, but received no other reply from the Minister than a repeated denial that the eight had been detained by Government forces. These problems have been the subject of a formal submission to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Amnesty groups are, as a special project, investigating some 65 cases of disappearances where the police or military elements are reported to have taken part in the arrest. One earlier investigation case has been released and 2 more are currently allocated to groups.

HAITI

Arbitrary detentions have been the rule in Haiti for many years, and large numbers of political prisoners have been held without trial in inhuman conditions. At the end of 1972, during a period which seemed to promise a certain liberalization, the Government announced that some 130 prisoners had been amnestied. When it was discovered that many of those amnestied were already living abroad, and that at least one was almost immediately rearrested, Amnesty International protested in a letter to the President about this deception of public opinion.

This was the second expulsion of Salvadoran citizens that has taken place during the past year. In his letter, the Secretary General also asked for investigation into the circumstances of the death of a trade unionist while in detention and into the allegation of maltreatment of those expelled. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees was approached for a clarification of possible refugee status for those deported.
The letter and the news release also asked the President to publish a list of all political prisoners giving the reasons for their detention, and to take immediate steps either to bring the detainees to trial or free them. Amnesty also spoke of the suffering of the prisoners' families in not knowing where their relatives are held or even if they have died in detention. Publicity given to this letter resulted in information reaching Amnesty which enabled us to take up the cases of several prisoners.

**MEXICO**

There have been new cases taken up in Mexico and new allegations of torture have recently been received. The 6 prisoners taken up by Amnesty were arrested in 1967 after a small explosive device was placed outside the Bolivian Embassy in protest against the death of Che Guevara. Consequently, the accused people were given extremely harsh sentences of up to 20 years (modified after an appeal several years later). The final hearing of these prisoners has now come up before the Supreme Court, and Amnesty groups are currently organizing a petition for the release of prisoners, in view of the fact that the several hundred people arrested on far more serious charges in the aftermath of the student movement of 1968 had all been released by 1972 in the amnesty proclaimed by President Echevarria. There have been several political assassinations carried out by right-wing terrorist groups in Mexico in the last year, while left-wing sympathisers have been known to be arrested merely for having family or friendship links with the violent left-wing opposition.

**PARAGUAY**

Thirty-nine political prisoners in Paraguay were released during the past year. Of these 7 were adopted by Amnesty. The 3 long-term prisoners, Professors Antonio Maidana, Alfredo Alcorta and Julio Rojas, who were mentioned in last year's report, are still detained however. It is their 15th year in a cell which they never leave, although the judge granted them freedom on expiry of their sentences, in 1961. In May 1972, Amnesty International submitted Professor Maidana's case to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, which in April 1973 resolved to ask the Paraguayan Government to release him. The Government's reaction is not yet known. Amnesty groups have continued their work on behalf of adopted prisoners; apart from regular appeals they have given publicity to the prisoners and the hardships they and their families suffer. Amnesty International sent a telegram to President Bordaberry, Amnesty International expressed its regret at this step.

Amnesty has now adopted several political prisoners detained in May 1972. Thirty-nine political prisoners in April '73 were released by amnesty proclaimed by President Echevarria. There have been several political assassinations carried out by right-wing terrorist groups in Mexico in the last year, while left-wing sympathisers have been known to be arrested merely for having family or friendship links with the violent left-wing opposition.

**PERU**

Since the general amnesties of political prisoners in 1970 and 1971, Amnesty International had until recently taken up no new cases in Peru. Political arrests, however, have continued and reached their highest pitch in May 1973, after unions in several towns declared a general strike against government policy. Students, intellectuals, trade-unionists and others were rounded up in large numbers and subjected to brutal interrogation. Other political prisoners have been detained for well over a year without being brought to trial, and the International Secretariat has received reports that the judiciary can no longer be considered independent under the military regime. The Government continues to increase its control over the press and trade union movements and to purge the extreme left-wing political parties. Amnesty has again begun to take up individual cases in Peru, and there are signs that there may be an increasing call for Amnesty intervention. Amnesty has now adopted several political prisoners detained in May 1973.

**URUGUAY**

Despite its tradition of stability and parliamentary rule, Uruguay has for several years experienced political unrest, with the Tupamaros movement as the expression of the left-wing violent struggle. The Medidas Prontas de Seguridad (the Uruguayan form of State of Emergency) were in force until the situation sharpened. A state of Internal War was declared in April 1972, and full powers were given to the Executive to combat subversion. In a telegram to President Bordaberry, Amnesty International expressed its regret at this step.

Amnesty has now adopted several political prisoners detained in May 1972. Thirty-nine political prisoners in April '73 were released by amnesty proclaimed by President Echevarria. There have been several political assassinations carried out by right-wing terrorist groups in Mexico in the last year, while left-wing sympathisers have been known to be arrested merely for having family or friendship links with the violent left-wing opposition.
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The judicial system in Uruguay remained independent in spite of the rapidly deteriorating political situation and the increasing erosion of civil liberties and individual guarantees. However, since April 1972, everybody arrested and accused of a political offence has been tried by military courts in camera. The creation of various new laws such as the law of State Security (July 1972) does not augur well for Human Rights in Uruguay.

UNITED STATES
The policy of looking behind alleged criminal cases to determine, with a view to adoption, the existence of miscarriages of justice instigated for political purposes, has been extended. Accordingly, it was decided to adopt Martin Sostre, the owner of a radical "Afro-Asian" bookstore. He had been convicted of the illegal sale of narcotics. The principal police officer involved was subsequently suspended from the police force and the main witness against Sostre signed an affidavit confessing to participation in a frame-up.

With the assistance of a thorough report prepared by the German USA-Coordination Group, it was determined that Dr. James Grant had been falsely convicted in North Carolina of burning riding stables and assisting fugitives from justice. He has been adopted.

An observer was sent to the Los Angeles trial of Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo who were responsible for publication of the secret Department of Defence study on the origins of the Vietnam War. Because of previously undisclosed wire-tapping of telephone conversations of Ellsberg by the White House agents responsible for the now famous Watergate burglary, a mistrial was declared. No re-trial is expected.

The bulk of Amnesty prisoners in the United States are conscientious objectors, indictments against whom continue to be handed down. These COs are alleged Selective Service System violators whose service was due prior to the termination of draft calls. It is not known whether this policy, together with that of refusing amnesty to draft resisters, will be mellowed by the changed atmosphere induced by "Watergate".

asia

The dominant feature of Amnesty's work in South, East and South-East Asia is the vast scale of political imprisonment when compared with other regions. In 3 countries alone, Vietnam, Bangladesh and Indonesia, the total number of prisoners easily exceeds 200,000, most of whom are not only unsentenced, but have undergone no form of legal proceedings. It follows that techniques other than that of individual adoption have had to be devised to deal with a problem of this magnitude. On Vietnam, a Protocol designed to provide protection for civilian prisoners was drafted and a major report published. On Indonesia, a submission was made to the United Nations, followed by a published report. "Collaborators" in Bangladesh were the subject of meetings with Ministers in London and although a joint mission with the International Commission of Jurists to Bangladesh and Pakistan had to be cancelled in May 1973, a research mission took place in June. For the first time in Amnesty International's history, research was also begun on the People's Republic of China, with the initial aim of establishing the dimensions of political imprisonment.

At another level, group adoptions have been a main feature of Amnesty's concern in Nepal, Pakistan, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and The Philippines. One mission has taken place, to observe a trial in South Korea.

CHINA
Work has now begun on China and the Research Department is considering ways and means of obtaining information for a general report on political imprisonment. Meanwhile, Amnesty International's remaining handful of individual adoption cases in China, mainly foreigners detained during the Cultural Revolution, have all been released.

TAIWAN
Amnesty International has continued to investigate more than 100 cases of political imprisonment on the island of Taiwan, but with very little response from the Taipei Government in spite of an Amnesty mission there by the Chairman of the American Section in July 1972. Taiwan's increasing diplomatic isolation has made Amnesty's contacts
and national organizations, including the United Nations. It received
to the conflicts in Indo-China, and to other interested governments,
drew up a Draft Protocol concerned with the release and rehabilitation
VIETNAM
in the event of a cease-fire of civilians detained throughout Indo-China as a result of the war. The Protocol was presented to all the parties
death to life imprisonment, and Mr. Sanguinetti’s detailed report was
submitted to the authorities in Seoul.
the student, Soh Sung, appeared—like the conduct of his first trial—
South Korean student found guilty of espionage. The evidence against
of violating the broadly-interpreted National Security and Anti-
Communist laws. Specifically, in December 1972, Amnesty joined with
these last cases may benefit from the continuing discussions
between North and South Korean Red Cross Societies. These humanitarian contacts have been accomplished more recently by political diplomats
matched by far-reaching domestic changes especially in the South. Shortly after declaring in July 1972 that Seoul and Pyongyang would
begin talking about eventual reunification, President Park Chung Hee of South Korea declared martial law. This was followed by the introduction
of a new constitution in November that made Park effective President for life and gave him sweeping domestic powers.
During (and after) the period of martial law a number of leading intellectuals and opposition politicians were put under arrest or house arrest, including 4 prominent members of Amnesty’s South Korean Section. These 4 were released following vigorous protests from
the International Secretariat at what was an unprecedented step against Amnesty officials; but a 5th was later brought to court for "spreading a
groundless rumour". His trial was pending at the time of writing.
Amnesty has also adopted or been investigating the cases of a
number of people found guilty of "spreading groundless rumours" or of violating the broadly-interpreted National Security and Anti-
Communist laws. Specifically, in December 1972, Amnesty joined with
the International Commission of Jurists in sending the Hong Kong lawyer A. J. J. Sanguinetti as observer to the Appeal Court trial of a
South Korean student found guilty of espionage. The evidence against
the student, Soh Sung, appeared—like the conduct of his first trial—to
have been highly unsatisfactory, and torture allegations have been
made. His sentence was later commuted by the Appeal Court from
death to life imprisonment, and Mr. Sanguinetti’s detailed report was
submitted to the authorities in Seoul.
VIETNAM
In November 1972, the Chairman of the IEC, Sean MacBride,
drew up a Draft Protocol concerned with the release and rehabilitation
in the event of a cease-fire of civilians detained throughout Indo-China
as a result of the war. The Protocol was presented to all the parties
to the conflicts in Indo-China, and to other interested governments,
and national organizations, including the United Nations. It received
wide press coverage and evinced a number of very favourable responses.
The Protocol provided for a Judicial Review Board to decide precisely which civilians would be eligible for release; for the appointment
of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to supervise
their rehabilitation and the appointment of a Supervisory Authority to
ensure that the terms of the Protocol would be carried out.
Following the publication of the Protocol, Sean MacBride wrote to
American President Richard Nixon and North Vietnamese Prime Minister
Pham Van Dong urging safeguards for civilian prisoners throughout
Indo-China. At that time Washington and Hanoi were engaged in
negotiations which eventually resulted in the signing of a Vietnam
Peace Agreement in Paris in January 1973. In a statement marking
the Agreement, Amnesty reiterated its concern about civilians detained
as a result of the war and pointed out that the Agreement failed to
provide for their immediate release. Instead it simply spoke of the
two South Vietnamese parties (Saigon and the National Liberation Front) “doing their utmost” to resolve the civilian prisoner problem by the end of April.
When an international Conference on Vietnam the Peace
Agreement was held in Paris at the end of February 1973, Amnesty put
forward a Memorandum urging that South Vietnam’s civilian detainees be
placed under the care of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees pending their earliest release. Much to Amnesty’s concern, however, the Conference’s consideration of the civilian prisoner problem
was cursory in the extreme.
When the April deadline arrived, no civilian prisoners in South Vietnam had been exchanged between the 2 parties (though a few
were to change hands shortly after), while only a small proportion of
the prisoners held by Saigon had been unilaterally released. To
document its claim that more than 100,000 civilians remained in
detention in South Vietnam, most of them held by Saigon, Amnesty
published on July 1, 1973 a report called Political Prisoners in South
Vietnam. The report also dealt with torture, prison conditions and the
reclassification of political prisoners as common criminals.
The Secretariat followed up the November Protocol by circulating
articles and information on Vietnam to a large number of journalists,
groups and organizations. In particular, in May 1973, a British television
team co-operated closely with Amnesty International to produce a
documentary on torture and political imprisonment in South Vietnam,
for which it visited Saigon.
At the same time, the number of prisoners adopted or investigated
by Amnesty more than trebled, and a special Emergency Action Scheme
was introduced both to provide aid to investigate the large number
of political prisoners in Amnesty’s files about whom very little was
known. The majority of them were held by Saigon, but a few allegedly
detained by the National Liberation Front (NLF) were also investigated.

KOREA
Amnesty International continued its investigations into potential
civilian prisoners of conscience in both parts of the peninsula, though the
impenetrability of North Korea has severely limited its resources. Work
there is confined to one or two foreigners as well as some victims of a
skyjacking in 1969 whose position remains unclear.
These last cases may benefit from the continuing discussions
between North and South Korean Red Cross Societies. These humanitarian contacts have been accomplished more recently by political diplomats
matched by far-reaching domestic changes especially in the South. Shortly after declaring in July 1972 that Seoul and Pyongyang would
begin talking about eventual reunification, President Park Chung Hee of South Korea declared martial law. This was followed by the introduction
of a new constitution in November that made Park effective President for life and gave him sweeping domestic powers.
During (and after) the period of martial law a number of leading intellectuals and opposition politicians were put under arrest or house arrest, including 4 prominent members of Amnesty’s South Korean Section. These 4 were released following vigorous protests from
the International Secretariat at what was an unprecedented step against Amnesty officials; but a 5th was later brought to court for "spreading a
groundless rumour". His trial was pending at the time of writing.
Amnesty has also adopted or been investigating the cases of a
number of people found guilty of "spreading groundless rumours" or of violating the broadly-interpreted National Security and Anti-
Communist laws. Specifically, in December 1972, Amnesty joined with
the International Commission of Jurists in sending the Hong Kong lawyer A. J. J. Sanguinetti as observer to the Appeal Court trial of a
South Korean student found guilty of espionage. The evidence against
the student, Soh Sung, appeared—like the conduct of his first trial—to
have been highly unsatisfactory, and torture allegations have been
made. His sentence was later commuted by the Appeal Court from
death to life imprisonment, and Mr. Sanguinetti’s detailed report was
submitted to the authorities in Seoul.
In November 1972, Amnesty arranged to sponsor a French mission to South Vietnam, but its members were unable to get visas. Further missions are under consideration.

Amnesty International continued to work for the handful of prisoners it has adopted in North Vietnam. They include two of the so-called "Nhan Van" group of writers and intellectuals imprisoned in 1960 after calling for greater liberalization, as well as several members of a pop group imprisoned in 1971. In spite of several enquiries by visitors to North Vietnam, including a British Labour Party delegation, little progress has been made.

CAMBODIA

Amnesty International protested to the Phnom Penh Government about the mass arrests that followed the declaration of a State of National Emergency in March 1973. It pressed inquiries about several individual detainees, including members of the Royal Family.

INDONESIA

During the year, Amnesty International has taken 2 major initiatives on Indonesia. In February, a communication was submitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations for the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Treatment of Minorities asking the Commission on Human Rights "to intercede with the Government . . . of Indonesia to ensure the immediate trial or release of all untried prisoners." Evidence was presented to show that the Government's policy "revealed a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms." The Communication will be considered later this year.

In March, a documented and illustrated report called Indonesia Special was published jointly by the International Secretariat and the Dutch Section. In January, Seán MacBride wrote to President Suharto appealing to the Indonesian Government to announce a general amnesty for all untried prisoners (including those on Buru Island), whose total number was set at more than 55,000. The letter also asked, inter alia, for the commutation of death sentences, the establishment of a target date by which legal proceedings should have been initiated in those cases where the Government intended to charge prisoners with major criminal offences and the "publication of an immediate and comprehensive list of all prisoners in detention whether or not officially registered as detainees." The report and the proposals were published simultaneously by all National Sections; a press conference was held in the Hague and later Seán MacBride presented both documents to the Dutch Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission.

In April 1973, the International Secretariat sent letters to the Heads of Governments of all States who are members of the Inter-Government Group on Indonesia, the body concerned with co-ordinating the aid programmes for Indonesia, drawing their attention to the political prisoner situation.

Since August, the now customary debate on numbers in detention has continued, informed this year by Government statistics which are never mutually compatible and often wildly disparate. Official figures for categories "A" and "B" have ranged from 39,000 (October 1972) to 13,000 (March 1973) despite the fact that no releases for these groups were reported; equally, numbers for category "A" alone (those awaiting trial) were put at 10,000 on February 28 (by the Foreign Minister) and at 2,000 on March 14 (by the President). Also in March, the President announced that "85,000" "C" group prisoners had been freed in the preceding year—a release figure unconfirmed by any other sources, and 4 times larger than the number for "C" group admitted in previous official statements. Amnesty International has taken 55,000 as the minimum figure for all those held in the 5 known categories—A, B, C, X and F, but this is almost certainly an under-estimate, in view of the large numbers of prisoners, theoretically free, who are known to remain in camps or custody, or who perform compulsory labour under military direction. Arrests continued during the year and rose sharply in the weeks before the President's re-election in March.

Trials have continued at a slow but persistent rate. Several death sentences were reported, but no executions. On each occasion, Amnesty has appealed for clemency. There have been more reports of torture during interrogation.

The Government's attitude towards Amnesty International has been marked by ambivalence. In July 1972, a mission by Professor Telford Taylor of Columbia University, New York, and James Harrison, Chairman of the USA Section, had to be cancelled when the latter's visa application was refused. But in February 1973, the Indonesian Foreign Minister told his Dutch colleague that his Government was "open" for contacts with Amnesty.

Conditions within the prisons have continued to be the cause of grave concern. In December, the International Secretariat passed to the Indonesian Government a report on the medical situation which had been prepared by the Netherlands Committee of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), but which had been refused by the former (on the grounds that it was not requested). The report states that overcrowding and malnutrition are widespread in the country's prisons, and that the health of those in detention is not good. Official statistics show that 70,000 prisoners were recorded in 1971, but that a figure of 130,000 would be more accurate. In spite of the fact that no death sentences have been imposed, the number of prisoners in detention has continued, informed this year by Government statistics which are never mutually compatible and often wildly disparate. Official figures for categories "A" and "B" have ranged from 39,000 (October 1972) to 13,000 (March 1973) despite the fact that no releases for these groups were reported; equally, numbers for category "A" alone (those awaiting trial) were put at 10,000 on February 28 (by the Foreign Minister) and at 2,000 on March 14 (by the President). Also in March, the President announced that "85,000" "C" group prisoners had been freed in the preceding year—a release figure unconfirmed by any other sources, and 4 times larger than the number for "C" group admitted in previous official statements. Amnesty International has taken 55,000 as the minimum figure for all those held in the 5 known categories—A, B, C, X and F, but this is almost certainly an under-estimate, in view of the large numbers of prisoners, theoretically free, who are known to remain in camps or custody, or who perform compulsory labour under military direction. Arrests continued during the year and rose sharply in the weeks before the President's re-election in March.

Trials have continued at a slow but persistent rate. Several death sentences were reported, but no executions. On each occasion, Amnesty has appealed for clemency. There have been more reports of torture during interrogation.

The Government's attitude towards Amnesty International has been marked by ambivalence. In July 1972, a mission by Professor Telford Taylor of Columbia University, New York, and James Harrison, Chairman of the USA Section, had to be cancelled when the latter's visa application was refused. But in February 1973, the Indonesian Foreign Minister told his Dutch colleague that his Government was "open" for contacts with Amnesty.

Conditions within the prisons have continued to be the cause of grave concern. In December, the International Secretariat passed to the Indonesian Government a report on the medical situation which had been prepared by the Netherlands Committee of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), but which had been refused by the former (on the grounds that it was not requested). The report states that overcrowding and malnutrition are widespread in the country's prisons, and that the health of those in detention is not good. Official statistics show that 70,000 prisoners were recorded in 1971, but that a figure of 130,000 would be more accurate. In spite of the fact that no death sentences have been imposed, the number of prisoners in detention has continued, informed this year by Government statistics which are never mutually compatible and often wildly disparate. Official figures for categories "A" and "B" have ranged from 39,000 (October 1972) to 13,000 (March 1973) despite the fact that no releases for these groups were reported; equally, numbers for category "A" alone (those awaiting trial) were put at 10,000 on February 28 (by the Foreign Minister) and at 2,000 on March 14 (by the President). Also in March, the President announced that "85,000" "C" group prisoners had been freed in the preceding year—a release figure unconfirmed by any other sources, and 4 times larger than the number for "C" group admitted in previous official statements. Amnesty International has taken 55,000 as the minimum figure for all those held in the 5 known categories—A, B, C, X and F, but this is almost certainly an under-estimate, in view of the large numbers of prisoners, theoretically free, who are known to remain in camps or custody, or who perform compulsory labour under military direction. Arrests continued during the year and rose sharply in the weeks before the President's re-election in March.
MALAYSIA
Although arrests continue in Sarawak, an area of guerrilla activity, the Malaysian Government has considerably reduced the number under political detention in West Malaysia. In August 1972, Tun (Dr.) Ismail, the Deputy Prime Minister, told Parliament that 1,657 people were then detained under the Internal Security Act (of whom 1,324 were held in Sarawak); during the preceding 12 months, 1,152 releases had been made. However, most released prisoners were placed under restricted residence orders because—in Tun Ismail’s own words—“they still have a contagious disease, we will release them when they are fully cured”. Late in 1972, the Malaysian Ministry of Internal Affairs suggested that inquiries from groups should be channelled through the International Secretariat. A full list of adopted prisoners was then sent to Kuala Lumpur with a request for information. Nineteen cases are adopted, including 5 stateless detainees held indefinitely under Banishment Ordinances. The International Secretariat has suggested to the Malaysian Government that Amnesty’s National Sections might help to find suitable countries of asylum. Although 7 adopted prisoners were released during the year, Amnesty International was disappointed that the cases of 14 others had been reviewed and their Detention Orders extended, in some cases for a further 2 years.

PHILIPPINES
On September 23 martial law was imposed throughout the Philippines, avowedly with the aim of protecting the State against rebellion by “lawless elements of the communist and other armed aggregations” which was said already to have “assumed the magnitude of an actual state of war” (Proclamation 1081). In succeeding weeks over 8,200 people were arrested, of whom, by the end of December, 2,123 had been released (official figures). Arrests continued in the first months of 1973. Those detained, many of whom remain in prison, came from an extraordinary wide political spectrum, and included the leader of the Liberal Party, Benigno Aquino, the publisher of the Manila Times, Joaquin Roces, radio and television journalists, congressmen, academics, students and churchmen as well as those suspected of direct involvement in guerrilla activities or corrupt practices.

The Philippines is the only south-east Asian country to have signed—though not yet ratified—the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. On October 4, the Secretary General wrote to President Marcos asking for his assurance that, even during martial law, those human rights seen by the Covenant as fundamental would be protected: the right to life, proscription of torture, freedom of association. Attention was also drawn to the UN Standard Minimum Rules relating to untried prisoners, and this part of the letter was later quoted verbatim in court by defence lawyers during a mandamus action brought on behalf of 2 adopted prisoners, Senator Benigno Aquino and Senator Diokno, both systematically denied legal access.

Since September, 41 cases have been taken up by Amnesty groups, of whom 14 are now free, some as a result of a Presidential amnesty in February 1973. Most releases have been conditional and prohibit the recipient from leaving a specified area or from publishing and broadcasting. Replies to group inquiries from both civilian and military officials have been unusually prompt and courteous.

SINGAPORE
The number of prisoners remains at something under 100, all detained as “communists” under the Internal Security Act, and some in prison since 1963. Two people were sentenced on charges arising out of the 1972 elections. In May, the International Secretariat wrote to the Minister of Home Affairs asking for information about a list of 14 adopted prisoners. It also asked that groups be allowed to correspond with their prisoners. The Singapore Government has again been wholly unresponsive to approaches from Amnesty.

During the last year, releases substantially exceeded arrests. Although release normally depends on a prisoner’s willingness to make a public statement of political loyalty, there was a notable exception to this general rule in April 1973, when 2 long-term detainees, Wee Toon Lip and Michael Fernandez (both Amnesty adoptees) were released on “restriction orders” after refusing to sign statements limiting their future political associations. But in January, 2 of the remaining Nanyang Siang Pau detainees were freed only after issuing a statement placing editorial responsibility for the articles which had led to their arrest—and which were said to have “glamourized” communism—on the paper’s Managing Editor, Lee Eu Seng. Two days later, he was arrested. Like his brother, Lee Mau Seng, in detention since 1971, he is adopted by Amnesty.

THAILAND
In Thailand, where Amnesty International so far has 2 adopted prisoners, the Prime Minister disclosed for the first time in March 1973 that his Government is holding more than 100 political prisoners in detention.
Eighteen months after the ending of the Bangladesh war, some 180,000 civilian and military prisoners are still being detained in Bangladesh, Pakistan and India. Of these, Amnesty International is immediately concerned with about half the total number.

**BANGLADESH**

In July 1972, a prominent Singapore lawyer visited Bangladesh briefly to investigate for Amnesty the situation of large numbers of alleged "collaborators". Although assured that the accused would be given fair trials, he reported that the scope of the Collaborators Order under which they are being held was very wide, covering at the same time cases of grave criminal offences and atrocities, as well as simple co-operation with the then government during the months after March 1971. In October the Home Minister announced that the number of arrests had risen to 42,000 and more arrests were still to follow. Habeas corpus was suspended for cases of collaboration and minimum sentences of between 3 and 5 years were imposed for anyone convicted under the Order—to the concern of a number of Bangladesh lawyers. Although the new Constitution, introduced in December, contained excellent provisions on human rights, they do not necessarily apply to alleged collaborators, including imprisoned Biharis.

Amnesty has discussed the legal situation of the collaborators on several occasions with the Government, and expressed concern about the large numbers under arrest. When Martin Ennals met Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the Prime Minister of Bangladesh in London last August, he pressed for a general amnesty of prisoners on the basis of the recommendations made in the Amnesty delegate's report. Amnesty also asked the Law Ministry to encourage leading lawyers to accept the defence in collaboration cases.

From the large numbers in custody, only some 1,000 have so far been tried; a small number of death sentences have been passed, although no reports of their execution have so far reached Amnesty. The vast majority of alleged collaborators are thus still held without trial. The Research Department has now started taking up a small number of cases for investigation. At the end of May, the Secretariat's researcher on the area went on a research mission which included Bangladesh, to collect information.

**PAKISTAN**

Although Martial Law was lifted in Pakistan early last year, soon after the civil Government came to power in December 1971, the State of Emergency evoked one month earlier still exists. Under the Defence of Pakistan Rules, which provide for 8-month periods of preventive detention, a number of politicians, well-known journalists and students have been arrested for shorter periods, and then re-arrested immediately after their release. Of the 16 cases Amnesty took up, 11 were subsequently released. One of the prisoners is now serving a 5 year sentence under Martial Law for making an "objectionable" speech.

The Simla meeting between President Bhutto and Mrs. Gandhi in the summer seemed finally to open prospects for a normalization of Indo-Pakistan relations. However, it did not lead to the release of the large numbers of military and civilian personnel detained or otherwise restricted in both the countries, as a result of the war, and in January 1973, Martin Ennals wrote to both Heads of Government. In Pakistan some 1,000 Bengalis are detained under the Defence of Pakistan Rules for their attempts to cross the border, and 39,000 military personnel are held in camps, even though they did not take any part in the 1971 war. The Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a detailed reply outlining the position of the Bengalis, and since then the International Secretariat has been in contact with the Government to explore the possibilities for an exchange of prisoners. Sixty cases from among the detained Bengalis were taken up for investigation, and extensive correspondence with the Attorney General followed. A number now seem to be released.

**INDIA**

In his January letter to the Prime Minister of India about the 16,000 civilian detainees, the Secretary General wrote: "Amnesty knows of no legal grounds on which the detention of these civilians can be justified. Their continued detention is against the Fourth Geneva Convention relating to the Protection of Civilians to which India, as the detaining power, is bound." Two of the cases of Pakistani civilians originally taken up were released, and a small number of new cases were taken up, including those of 3 Pakistani journalists, like other civilians detained in Indian Prisoner of War Camps.

About 17,000 people are held under preventive detention in West Bengal, detained on allegations of Naxalite activities. The arrests were first made under the Maintenance of Internal Security Ordinance which was passed early in 1971 to deal with the situation of Naxalite violence then existing in the State. But they have continued even though the situation has improved considerably. Early in 1973, Amnesty International approached the Indian Government to release those against whom no criminal charges could be brought.

**NEPAL**

At the beginning of 1972, King Birendra announced plans for moderate reform and moves towards a more liberal policy. But when students and the (outlawed) opposition raised their demands for political change in the summer, a number were detained. Seven parliamentarians and former prime ministers were arrested under the old Security Act, among them K. F. Bhattarai, who was adopted by
Amnesty International in 1968 and had spent years in prison previously for his vigorous advocacy of the 1960 system of parliamentary democracy. All these were adopted by Amnesty, as well as some 50 cases of students. Group work, however, has experienced difficulties and has not so far met with any official response.

SRI LANKA

No precise figure is known for those still detained under the 1971 Emergency Regulations in Sri Lanka. In December, the total was put officially at 5,000 of whom 2,500 would be released “by the end of the year.” But unofficial estimates suggest that the real figure is nearer 8,000, and informed sources in Colombo have expressed their disappointment at the slow working of the Government’s much-publicized rehabilitation schemes. Some further arrests took place early in 1973 and in May, the International Secretariat wrote to Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister, asking for information about the total numbers and location of those still detained, and about the Government’s plans for their trial or release.

The detainees fall into 3 distinct groups. By far the largest consists of those arrested in 1971 in connection with the Janatha Vimukti Peramuna (JVP) insurgency. Most are Singalese and almost all are under 25 years old. A handful of non-JVP Marxists, arrested in 1971 as leaders of left-wing splinter groups, remain in prison in the north of the island. More recently, a number of Tamils have been arrested, some as a result of violent disturbances around Jaffa and others in connection with moves for greater Tamil autonomy.

The trial of 41 people opened in Colombo before a specially-appointed Criminal Justice Commission in July. All are charged with active involvement in the 1971 insurgency. Following the introduction of the Criminal Justice Commissions Act in April 1972, the law was amended to make confessions admissible before a Commission “to whomsoever and in whatsoever circumstances made.” Allegations, which have not so far been investigated, have since reached Amnesty of increased police brutality during the period immediately after arrest. This is said to have the aim of securing a confession which might be used in later criminal proceedings.

In Western Europe, Amnesty International continued to concern itself with Greece, Spain and Portugal; while the number of adopted or investigated detainees in Northern Ireland has gone down to 6, Turkey and the operation of martial law in many of her provinces has greatly added to our work. In the countries of western Europe, especially in Turkey and Greece, political opposition sometimes takes the form of violence. Eastern Europe, on the other hand, continues to provide large numbers of cases of men and women imprisoned for the defence of classical political freedoms in a stable situation, involving no violence triggered off by political motives.

BULGARIA

The case being investigated in Bulgaria, a young student sentenced for 3 years for participating in an illegal group was due for release in November although there has been no confirmation. There have been reports of the arrests of one or two writers, but there is not enough information available yet for adoptions to be made.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A series of 9 political trials were held in Prague and Brno in July and August 1972. Forty-six people were sentenced, of whom 15 received suspended sentences. They were charged with “subversion” under Paragraph 98 of the Penal Code. This referred to their activities during the elections in November 1971 when leaflets were distributed reminding the citizens of their constitutional rights. The highest sentence was that of 64 years meted out to two prominent former Party officials, Dr. Milan Hrubí and Dr. Jaroslav Sabata. John Mendelson, a British Member of Parliament, agreed to attend the trials as an observer for Amnesty International, but he was refused a visa.

On February 25, 1973, the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the establishment of Czechoslovakia as a Socialist state, Seán MacBride appealed to President Svoboda and the General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Dr. Gustav Husák, for clemency. Following the announcement of an amnesty which did not extend to political prisoners, the Secretary General appealed in March to the Ministers of Defence and Justice on behalf of 5 seriously-ill prisoners.
EAST AND WEST GERMANY

Following the treaty signed with the Federal Republic of Germany in November 1972, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) has now been officially recognized by over 80 countries. At the same time directives were issued warning GDR citizens of the dangers of contact with Western ideology. A comprehensive amnesty was declared on the occasion of the 23rd anniversary of the founding of the state which ran from November 1, 1972 to January 25, 1973 and resulted in the release of 31,000 prisoners, 2,000 of these to the West. The releases included the majority of Amnesty’s adopted prisoners. However there is continuing information about arrests, mainly of people trying to leave the country illegally. In May the Grundvertrag (the basic treaty, on the relations between the two German states) was ratified by the West German Parliament and it is hoped that this will result in an increase in the family reunion programme. A Researcher visited Berlin in May to enquire into the post-amnesty situation.

A case of a conscientious objector has been taken up in the Federal Republic of Germany and other similar cases are being brought to our attention.

GREECE

In June 1972 Amnesty joined in the communication submitted to the United Nations by Professor Frank Newman, on behalf of individuals and non-governmental organizations, alleging gross violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Greece. No ruling has yet been made on the case.

The former Lord Chancellor of Britain, Lord Gardiner, went to Athens early in October 1972 as an observer for Amnesty International at the appeal of the Society for the Study of Greek Problems, which had been dissolved on the grounds that it had departed from the objects set out in its constitution and that its activities had been contrary to public order and dangerous to public security. The senior officers of the Society, including John Pesmażegiou, a former Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece and an internationally known economist, and Anastasios Peponis, former Director-General of the Greek National Broadcasting Institute, were exiled to remote villages in Northern Greece, without having been charged with any offence. They were allowed to return from exile in December 1972, but in March and April 1973 were re-arrested and at the time of writing are still detained without charge.

In October 1972 Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) published an appeal for international action signed by 54 Greek political prisoners. The appeal was concerned with the continued practice of torture of political prisoners in Greece, and especially with the torture of Wing-Commander Anastasios Minis and Stathis Panagoulis. In January 1973 Maitre Christian Grobet attended the trial of Stathis Panagoulis and 12 others as an observer for Amnesty International and ICJ. In his report he stated that “many general principles of law are disregarded in Greece, and respect for the rights of citizens is extremely limited”.

An Amnesty International press statement in March 1973 was concerned with the plight of 6 lawyers detained by police in Athens and held incommunicado for many weeks. Amnesty had reason to believe that the lawyers were being tortured.

Also in March 1973, a report was prepared for Amnesty on Human Rights in Greece. Relief work for political prisoners and their families continues. At the present time Amnesty groups are working on behalf of 85 prisoners in Greece.

ITALY

Telegrams were sent in late November 1972 to 8 political leaders in the Italian Senate prior to debate on a law regulating conscientious objection. They expressed Amnesty’s satisfaction that a solution to the problem was being considered but drew the Senators’ attention to the recommendations of the Council of Europe Resolution of 1967. The law passed unamended both by the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies in December, provides for an alternative service 8 months longer than the period of call-up (15 months) and under the direction of the Ministry of Defence.

According to official figures from the Ministry of Defence, 108 objectors had been released from military prison by February 1973, but only 22 of them under the terms of the new law (the others had simply completed their sentences).

After 3 years’ imprisonment without trial, the anarchist Pietro Valpreda was granted provisional liberty in December 1972 as a result of a penal code reform allowing magistrates to use their discretion in releasing prisoners charged with serious offences pending trial. Amnesty has followed this case carefully for several years, and is looking into the possibilities of sending an observer to the trial when it is eventually held.

HUNGARY

There have been no new adoptions during the past year. Four Roman Catholic priests were released in the New Year on the expiry of their sentences: István Tobódy, after serving 12 years in prison, and István Regőzov, István Kátona and Elemir Rozca. The improved relations between the Hungarian Church and the Vatican give hope that no new arrests are to be expected. In March there were reports of 41 arrests in Budapest following demonstrations in celebration of the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848 but no further details are known.

NETHERLANDS

A conscientious objector was adopted in May 1972 in the Netherlands; he was released after 8 months in February 1973.
In December Amnesty appealed to the authorities in Poland against the death sentence passed on a young worker for having caused an explosion in a public building in Opole. The sentence was commuted by the State Council to 25 years' imprisonment. There are no prisoners of conscience adopted in Poland at the present time.

All political dissidents in Portugal are still being arrested and tried, also subjected to preventive detention for the permitted 90 plus 90 days without trial. Allegations of torture during interrogation by the secret police—the DGS—continue. Although the law allowing continued detention, under Security Measures, after a sentence has been served was repealed in November 1972 (and as a result 13 Amnesty adoptees were released), this repeal does not apply to Portugal's Overseas Provinces; so men like Dr. Domingos Arouca, a Mozambican lawyer, stay on in prison after completing their sentences.

A new decree, published in October 1972 and defining the powers of the DGS, confirms the latter's exceptional authority, granting it powers that in a non-political, preliminary examination (i.e. instruction) are normally reserved for the judiciary. Furthermore, it gives the DGS the power to abrogate the right of a defendant to a defence lawyer at interrogation, if this is deemed inconvenient for the investigation or justified by the nature of the crime.

In the Portuguese Overseas Territories, where there are few trials, political dissidents are mostly detained by administrative sanctions. Here too, the powers of the DGS have been greatly increased by new legislation (July 1972) which allows them to order preventive detention for up to 3 years, renewable for a further 3 years. It would appear from the wording of the decree that this police power is not subject to any form of judicial appeal or control. Many political suspects (about 1,800 it is estimated) were thus detained in Lourenco Marques, Mozambique in June 1972. Among them, 37 leaders and members of the Presbyterian Church of Mozambique, personally known to Amnesty International, were not released until December 1972. This was after world wide protests (in which Amnesty played a part) to the Portuguese authorities, once it became known that 2 of the detainees had died—one said to have committed suicide.

Constitutional changes have produced new legislative assemblies in all the Overseas Territories. Some of these assemblies, a number of whose members were elected by limited suffrage, now have a black majority. But it should be borne in mind that the relationship of these newly established legislative assemblies to the Lisbon appointed Governors General is now equivalent only to the relationship between the National Assembly and the central government. And in Lisbon, 2 leaders of the liberal wing of the ANP (Acao Nacional Popular), who had been persuaded by Dr. Caetano to stand for election in 1969, resigned in 1973, maintaining that their stand in the National Assembly was totally pointless.

In Portugal itself, there were known to be about 110 held in the special prisons for political offenders on March 31, 1973. And it is estimated that between 200 and 300 people a year are detained and then released. Although neither charged nor sentenced all these people have police files, which creates great difficulties for many of them over getting jobs or into universities.

In November 1972, the International Commission of the Red Cross visited some 1,800 political prisoners in 11 prisons in Mozambique. Some sources give much higher figures for political prisoners, and there must be at least an equal number of detainees in both Portuguese Guinea and Angola.

The appointment last October of a part-time researcher to work exclusively on Portugal, particularly on the Portuguese Overseas Territories, should facilitate much more work on these areas in future. Two missions have been undertaken since this appointment: one to a trial of a political prisoner in Lisbon, the other into Mozambique.

An amnesty was declared in Rumania on December 27, 1972 on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Republic. It excluded, however, all those sentenced for crimes against the state security and for trying to cross the border illegally. There have been reports of further arrests of Pentecostal ministers and with the information available, it may be possible to adopt one or two of these.

One of the major targets of this year's work on Spain has been conditions in prison. Descriptions of poor sanitary facilities, inadequate or non-existent medical attention, harsh disciplinary measures, and other problems continued to reach the International Secretariat from most of the institutions where political prisoners, particularly Basques, are held. A detailed inquiry was sent at the end of June 1972 to the Minister of Justice, who replied that he had ordered an investigation into the points Amnesty International had raised, the results of which would be forwarded to Amnesty. When nothing more was heard by January 1973, Amnesty informed the Spanish Government that—in view of the fact that the prison complaints persisted—a report based on the material available to the International Secretariat would be produced and published in the coming months. That report is now in the final stages of its preparation.

Other matters taken up directly with the Spanish Government by the International Secretariat include the September 1972 court martial of 2 Catalans for whom the prosecution was demanding sentences of
205 and 180 years' imprisonment. They were accused of having committed a series of bombings in Barcelona, but the defence brought forward evidence that one of the prisoners had been severely tortured by police to obtain his confession. Although efforts to arrange for an observer to attend the court martial were frustrated by the short notice at which the date was announced, Amnesty sent a telegram at the time of the trial pressing for an investigation of the torture allegations.

Several months later, in January 1973, 3 young men were tried by court martial accused of participating in an attack on the French Consulate in Zaragoza, which resulted in the death of the consul. The attack was a reprisal for restrictions by French authorities on Basque political refugees living in France. The military prosecutor demanded death sentences for all three, and Amnesty, in a letter to the highest military official involved in the proceedings, called attention to the UN Economic and Social Council's resolution of 1971 concerning the abolition of capital punishment. The three prisoners were later sentenced to prison terms of 30 years.

With Spanish adoption cases now numbering well over 400, individual group action is becoming an increasingly important part of Amnesty's work. Apart from offering economic assistance and moral support to prisoners and families, groups have been able to help in a variety of other—sometimes decisive—ways: appealing to the appropriate authorities when a prisoner is due to be given conditional liberty (release for the last quarter of the sentence, often refused to those held for political reasons); providing financial support after release to prisoners unable to find work because of illness or "blacklisting"; organizing international letter campaigns on behalf of long-term or exemplary cases, such as Antonio Sánchez Medina, a Jehovah's Witness who has spent more than 12 years in prison for refusing to do military service; contributing to the costs of sending observers to trials.

SWITZERLAND

Conscientious objectors in Switzerland are still being tried and sentenced to imprisonment (they numbered 325 in 1972) under the recent draft laws. Amnesty International has now adopted one of them as a test case: a Quaker about whom it has received detailed information.

TURKEY

Following the discussions which took place in January 1972 between a leading British barrister, Muir Hunter, QC, on behalf of Amnesty International, and the Turkish Minister of Justice, in November 1972, an Amnesty mission went to Turkey to inquire into allegations of torture of political prisoners and detainees. The delegates were Mr. Hunter, Mrs. Muir Hunter and Sir Osmond Williams, the Vice-Chairman of the British Section, the latter both Justices of the Peace. In spite of previous assurances by the Turkish authorities they were only allowed to see one prisoner, but in the opinion of the mission she was a completely truthful witness and in their report they stated that "it must therefore follow that not merely is her own statement true, but she must also be taken to corroborate the statements of other persons" who had alleged torture. The report of the mission was submitted to the Council of Europe for its consideration and subsequently published.

Since this mission Amnesty International has continued to receive signed statements from prisoners and ex-prisoners in Turkey alleging that they have been tortured. Material and advice were made available to a British television team for its film "Torture in Turkey". The Secretary General appeared in the film and stated Amnesty's conviction that torture of political prisoners had taken place in Turkey and was continuing.

In February 1973 Dr. Peter Noll, Professor of Penal Law at Zurich University, attended a trial in Ankara as an observer for Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists. He also had many conversations with eminent Jurists and politicians and well informed journalists. One of his conclusions was that: "The damage done to the law by the state of martial law is more serious than the dangers it is contending against."

Amnesty groups are working for 39 prisoners in Turkey, and further cases are being prepared for adoption. Groups have also been asked to appeal for a general amnesty for political prisoners in Turkey.

UNITED KINGDOM

Amnesty has adopted 1 prisoner in England, Michael Tobin, tried in April 1972, sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment under the 1934 Incitement to Disaffection Act, and held in Chelmsford maximum security prison. A libertarian-humanist and prolific writer, Tobin was accused of having in his possession 2 documents, A letter from a soldier of the IRA to the soldiers of the Royal Green Jackets and A letter from a Ballymurphy Mother, "with intent to commit or to aid, abet, council or procure the commission of an offence"—the disaffection of British soldiers stationed in Northern Ireland. The man who admitted writing, publishing and distributing the letters in Northern Ireland, however, was tried several months earlier and found not guilty on all charges, while Tobin received the maximum sentence under the Act and in October 1972 was refused leave to appeal on either conviction or sentence.

All but 6 of the detainees taken up by Amnesty in Northern Ireland after the introduction of the Special Powers Act have now been released, and the groups working for these prisoners maintain contact with their families, sending economic support where necessary. At the time of writing, however, 460 men are still being held without trial in Long Kesh detention camp (officially known as Maze Prison). According to the Detention of Terrorists (Northern Ireland)
Order, 1972, introduced late last year, a person suspected of terrorist activities may be gaoled for a maximum of 28 days under an interim custody order of the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. He must then be released or referred to a commissioner (appointed by the Secretary of State), who, after hearing evidence against the suspect, may issue a detention order.

A welcome development was the House of Commons vote to approve a special clause added to the Emergency Provisions Bill, abolishing the death penalty in Northern Ireland.

USSR

The past year has seen an intensified campaign against the dissident movement in the USSR. On June 21, 1972, Pyotr Ionovich Yakir, son of a general executed by Stalin, who has already spent 14 years in labour camps and exile, was arrested by the KGB and has been undergoing intensive interrogation since then. Yakir, one of the founding members of the Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights in the USSR, has allegedly “confessed” and repented the errors of his previous actions. Nearly 100 people have been interrogated in connection with his case, which is aimed at the suppression of the Chronicle of Current Events. The Chronicle is now four months overdue and it is unlikely that it will appear again in its present form because of the threats of further arrests.

Cases are already being prepared against many well-known dissidents including Yakir’s daughter, Irina, Irina Belgorodskaya, Viktor Krasin and Yuri Shikhanovich, all of them active defenders of human rights. The Human Rights Committee has been seriously undermined by the persecution of its members. Academician Sakharov, founding member of the Committee, has been summoned for questioning by the KGB, which suggests he may no longer be protected from police persecution by his international reputation. Several other dissidents have arrived in the West under pressure from the authorities. Among them is Valery Chalidze, the physicist and founding member of the Human Rights Committee, who went to the United States to lecture in November and a separate study on this issue is in preparation.

In the Ukraine the many people arrested in January 1972 in an attempt to stamp out the Ukrainian Herald, the Ukrainian equivalent to the Chronicle, have now all been tried. The sentences have been exceptionally harsh: Yury Shukhevich received a total of 15 years’ imprisonment, camp and exile; in March Vyacheslav Chornovil, the journalist and author of the Chornovil Papers, and Ivan Svitlychny, the literary critic, were both given sentences of 7 years’ imprisonment followed by 5 years’ exile.

The biennial lists from the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives giving information on imprisoned dissident Baptists have shown an increase in the persecution of this breakaway Christian sect—over half of the 350 prisoners adopted by Amnesty are dissident Baptists. In the Burmese Republic in South-east Siberia the authorities have taken action against the Buddhists, because they equate the increasing interest in Buddhism with growing nationalism. The well-known distinguished Buddhist scholar Bidya Dandaron was sentenced in January to 5 years’ imprisonment and 4 of his associates were sent to mental hospitals for compulsory treatment.

YUGOSLAVIA

The unstable political situation has continued throughout the year. Further resignations and dismissals have taken place in the party apparatus and President Tito issued in October a letter to all party committees calling for a purge in their ranks of liberal elements. Eleven intellectuals, former members of the Croatian cultural organization Matika Hrvatska, were sentenced in a series of trials in the autumn to terms of imprisonment ranging from 1 to 6 years. About 20 Croatian

Shkolnik’s sentence was reduced to 7 years at his appeal in June.
students have been sentenced to up to 4 years' imprisonment on account of their activity during the student strike in Zagreb in November 1971. Amnesty sent an observer, Mrs. Gay Martin, to the trial of 4 student leaders in August, but she was unable to gain access to the courtroom. A second mission, from Norway, was planned in October to attend the trials of the 11 intellectuals; however, as no assurance was given by the Yugoslav authorities that an Amnesty observer would be admitted to the courtroom, the mission had to be cancelled.

manifest." In a press statement which accompanied the report Amnesty expressed "grave concern at the high number of executions of political offenders which have taken place in Iran this year."

Amnesty groups have adopted or are investigating a total of 82 cases of political prisoners in Iran.

IRAQ
Amnesty continues to work for two long-term Jewish detainees, Akram Baher and Shua Soffer, who have been in detention since 1969. Fears have been repeatedly expressed that they are no longer alive, and inquiries to the Iraqi authorities continue to yield no response. Similar fears have been received concerning the fate of a group of Jews who were reported arrested last November and have not been seen since. The Secretariat has written letters of inquiry and concern to the Iraqi government but has received no reply. Amnesty continues to work for our other adoptees, who belong to left-wing parties and to the Shia Moslem sect, in spite of lack of response from the Iraqi authorities. Amnesty received reports and photographs of a Kurd, Majid Ahmed Hamid, who died as a result of the most brutal torture and mutilation at Kasr al Nihaya prison in Baghdad.

EGYPT
Amnesty's sole adopted prisoner of conscience in Egypt, Sayyed Loutfi, a journalist who was arrested in 1958, remains in detention. The Secretary General had a long interview with him in prison in December 1972, after which the Secretariat again made special representations to President Sadat for his release. Representations were made in March 1973 to the London Embassy on behalf of the students and others who have been detained without trial since the disturbances in the universities in December 1972. A list of over 100 names was given to the Embassy with a request for information on their release or trial.

IRAN
In August 1972 Amnesty International published a report on trial procedures for political prisoners in Iran. The report, which was based on Iranian legal documentation and reports from lawyers who had attended trials in Iran over a period of several years, concluded that "The denial of individual rights to political prisoners between arrest and imprisonment or execution is obvious. Also apparent is the breach of various international undertakings, many of which may be binding in international law on Iran. The repudiation by its domestic practice of the principles of human rights publicly espoused by Iran is unfortunately

JORDAN
On 2 occasions cables were sent to King Hussein requesting clemency in commuting the death sentences on a number of Palestinian guerrillas, which he did in both cases. In recent months the King has granted several amnesties and large numbers of political prisoners have been released: all those under sentence of death have either been released or had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment. Amnesty has received allegations of torture in prisons, and reports of the arrest of 2 trade unionists and a member of the communist party. All these reports are being investigated for further information.
LIBYA
Amnesty still has only 1 adopted prisoner in Libya, Giulio Hassan, a Jew who was arrested in 1969, and still remains inexplicably in detention, without charge or trial.

OMAN
Amnesty continues to work for a few investigation cases in Oman, and although brief standard replies from the authorities are received occasionally, these are not wholly satisfactory and the detainees continue to be held without trial. The Secretariat recently received the names of some 30 detainees, some of whom have alleged ill-treatment. A list was sent to the Omani authorities with a request for information about arrangements for their trial and legal defence. A short reply was received from the Secretary for Defence to the effect that all prisoners receive adequate food and medical help, but refusing to give any details about their situation "for reasons of national security".

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YEMEN
Further reports of the execution of prisoners have reached Amnesty throughout the year and the Secretariat has written several times expressing concern to the Government. Having received no reply Amnesty issued a press statement asking the Government to set up an inquiry into these incidents and to take steps to ensure the security of all prisoners in their hands. Amnesty continues to work for several detainees and appeals regularly for their release or trial.

SAUDI ARABIA
Amnesty is still investigating the cases of 25 detainees in Saudi Arabia, although groups continue to receive no response from the authorities. A large amnesty was announced at the end of Ramadan in November 1972 for some 150 people. The Secretariat believes that some investigation cases may have been included in this amnesty though it is proving difficult to check.

SYRIA
The leading members of the former Government in Syria are still detained without trial. Reports on their situation have been sharply contradictory. The Government told Amnesty that they are held under a form of house arrest within the prison precincts in Damascus, with privileged treatment in terms of visits and food; however, other sources suggest that they have been transferred to Palmyra, a prison in the desert, where they are exposed to extreme climates and kept in complete isolation. The Secretariat has received reports that a number of Jews were arrested around October and November for attempting to leave the country, which is illegal for Jews, but it is believed that some have since been released. Further information is being sought about those who remain in detention.
Amnesty is still working for Nissim Katri and Joseph Swed who have been detained without charge or trial since July 1971.
Osman Sabri, the Kurdish national poet and politician, who had been an adopted prisoner since March 1972, was released in April of this year.
guidelines relating to conscientious objection

ENDORSED BY THE 1972 INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL—

1. Consultative Assembly Resolution 337 (1967) of the Council of Europe
Persons liable to conscription for military service who, for reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from religious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical, or similar motives, refuse to perform armed service, shall enjoy a personal right to be released from the obligation to perform such service.

2. Draft Universal Charter on Conscientious Objection of the International Peace Bureau
This charter affirms for all people the right to the legal recognition of conscientious objection to military service and training on the grounds of conscience or profound conviction arising from religious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical, or similar motives, and calls upon all governments to accord to all citizens the right to refuse military service of any kind, in peacetime and in war, including provision for those who, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, feel the obligation to refuse any type of alternative service.

3. Committee on Society, Development and Peace, SODEPAX
The rights of conscientious objectors:
The consultation considers that the exercise of conscientious judgement is inherent in the dignity of human beings and that accordingly, each person should be assured the right, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, to refuse military service, or any other direct or indirect participation in wars or armed conflicts. The right of conscientious objection also extends to those who are unwilling to serve in a particular war because they consider it unjust or because they refuse to participate in a war or conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used. This Conference also considers that members of armed forces have the right, and even the duty, to refuse to obey military orders which may involve the commission of criminal offences, or of war crimes, or of crimes against humanity.

4. World Conference on Religion and Peace, Kyoto, Japan, October 18-21, 1970
The rights of conscientious objectors:
We consider that the exercise of conscientious judgement is inherent in the dignity of human beings and that, accordingly, each person should be assured the right, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, to refuse military service or any other direct or indirect participation in wars or armed conflicts. The right of conscientious objection also extends to those who are unwilling to serve in a particular war because they consider it unjust or because they refuse to participate in a war or conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used. This Conference also considers that members of armed forces have the right, and even the duty, to refuse to obey military orders which may involve the commission of criminal offences, or of war crimes, or of crimes against humanity.

Where a man or woman is detained/prisoned because he claims that on grounds of conscience he objects to military service he is to be regarded by Amnesty International as a Prisoner of Conscience if his detention/prison is the consequence of one or more of the following:
a. the failure of the legal code of his/her country to make provision for the recognition of conscientious objection and for a man/woman to register his/her objection at a specific point in time
b. refusal of the man/woman to register—as a matter of principle
   —although the opportunity for so doing exists
c. recognition of conscientious objection being so restricted that only some and not all of the following are acceptable: ethical, humanitarian, political, religious or similar grounds.
   d. restriction of the valid claim to exemption only for the period before induction (call-up). It should be possible to make such a claim at any point during military service. No one should be imprisoned or detained after making an application for exemption (after being called up) and before his/her application has been decided upon
   e. restriction of the valid claim only to comprehensive objection and the exclusion of selective objection. The possibility should be recognized of a valid objection either to some wars (or to some operations within wars) or to all war as such
   f. if denied the right to non-combatant service
   g. if denied the right to alternative civilian service

Whilst recognizing that owing to staff and financial limitations, Amnesty International is able only to adopt, at a given time, a proportion of prisoners of conscience, the Council notes with concern the decision taken by the International Council in Oslo 1970, to exclude automatically from consideration for adoption whole groups of conscientious objectors. In particular, it notes the following categories are excluded:

a. the "unconditionalists"—thus Amnesty International in the two World Wars would not have recognized many lifelong and dedicated pacifists who were imprisoned for this reason

b. those who are prepared to accept a conditional exemption but who have a conscientious objection to the alternative offered, e.g. those who were given Civil Defence but who regarded this service as being part of the War machine

c. those who whilst not liable for military service are required as civilians to register for, and to be directed into activities contrary to their conscience, e.g. working in an armaments factory, fire-watching, etc.

The International Council, believing that where the use or advocacy of violence is not involved, it is contrary to the principles of Amnesty International to make such blanket judgements and to exclude prisoners of conscience, resolves to consider its definition of conscientious objection and to widen it so as to include those categories that are at present omitted.

milestones

1961 — Amnesty International, under its original name of Appeal for Amnesty 1961, founded. The generally accepted official date is 28 May, when an article by Peter Benenson called "The Forgotten Prisoners" and announcing the appeal, was published in "The Observer" newspaper in London.

Office and library staffed by volunteers opened in Mitre Court, London. Establishment of "Threes' Network" whereby each Amnesty group adopts three prisoners from contrasting geographical and political areas.

Prisoner of Conscience Fund established.

First international meeting held in Luxembourg, attended by representatives from Belgium, Britain, France, Germany and Ireland.

1962 — Name changed to Amnesty International.


Total of 70 groups in 7 countries—Australia, Britain, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United States. Income and
Expenditure: £7,889, 5 shillings, 6 pence.

Second annual international meeting held in Bruges, Belgium.

1963 — International Secretariat and Research Bureau established in London.

Second Annual Report (1962-63): Two year totals of 770 prisoners adopted, 140 released. 260 groups in 12 countries—Australia, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, USA. Members in 35 countries. Income and expenditure £8,608.18.1.

Third annual meeting in Koenigswinter, Germany, elects five-man International Executive Committee “to supervise the functions of the Secretariat”. IEC elects as its first chairman Sean MacBride SC, former Irish Foreign Minister, who has been chairman ever since.

1964 — Poll of membership after Nelson Mandela case in South Africa leads, by overwhelming majority, to reaffirmation of non-violence condition of adoption of prisoners by Amnesty.

Annual Report 1963-64: Three-year totals of 1,367 prisoners adopted, 323 released, 360 groups in 14 countries—Australia, Britain, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, USA. Budget set at £10,000 but only £4,000 received.


1965 — Amnesty sponsors resolution at the UN to suspend and finally abolish capital punishment for peace-time political offences.

Move to Crane Court, London.

Annual Report 1964-65: 1,200 prisoners under adoption. 4-year total of 800 released. 400 groups in 18 countries—Australia, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark (including section in Faroe Islands), Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, West Pakistan, USA. Budget: £7,000.

Prison reports published on Portugal, South Africa and Rumania. Article in Reader’s Digest results in surge of international interest in Amnesty. Postcards for Prisoners Campaign started.

International Assembly in Scheveningen, Holland, establishes Central Emergency Fund to finance emergency missions in cases where the death sentence is likely. (Name changed on her death in 1967 to Karin O'Donovan Emergency Fund in memory of Honorary Secretary of Irish Section who had done much to create fund originally.)

1966 — Three Amnesty relief workers expelled from Rhodesia.

Prison reports published on Paraguay, Rhodesia and East Germany.

Annual Report 1965-66: 1,500 prisoners under adoption. 1,000 released since Amnesty founded. 410 groups in 18 countries (all as previous year minus West Pakistan, plus India). Budget: £7,000.

Report by Swedish Section observer on allegations of brutality by British interrogators in Aden causes furor and focuses Amnesty attention on problem of torture.

International Assembly in Copenhagen decides National Sections should give problem of torture special attention and that UN and other international organizations should be asked to include its elimination in their programme for UN Human Rights Year 1968.

As a result of resistance in United States to military service in Vietnam, Prisoner of Conscience status given to those who refuse to participate in particular wars, in addition to those who refuse to fight in all wars.

Amnesty International Executive Committee establishes to adjudicate uncertainties about whether or not to adopt cases.

Amnesty publishes major report by its own investigators on torture in Greece.

First Prisoner of Conscience Week.

Annual Report 1967-68: No prisoner figures given. 516 groups in 18 countries. Budget: £20,000.

Martin Ennals appointed Secretary General.

International Assembly in Stockholm adopts new Statute reorganizing and strengthening movement.

1967 — Post of Director-General established. Eric Baker of British Section named interim D-G until permanent appointment made.

Annual Report 1966-67: Nearly 2,000 prisoners in 63 countries under adoption. No figures for releases. 550 groups in 18 countries (as previous year). Budget not mentioned.

No annual meeting held.

1968 — Borderline Committee established to adjudicate uncertainties about whether or not to adopt cases.

Amnesty publishes major report by its own investigators on torture in Greece.

First Prisoner of Conscience Week.

Annual Report 1967-68: No prisoner figures given. 516 groups in 18 countries. Budget: £20,000.

Martin Ennals appointed Secretary General.

International Assembly in Stockholm adopts new Statute reorganizing and strengthening movement.

1969 — Greece withdraws from Council of Europe after two-year Amnesty campaign investigating and publicizing torture in country.

UNESCO gives Amnesty consultative status.

Annual Report 1968-69: 4,000 prisoners adopted since Amnesty founded. 2,000 released. 640 groups in 20 countries (as for 1964-65 plus Japan and Pakistan), 15,000 individual members. Budget: £23,000.

International Council met in Geneva.


1972 — Amnesty given consultative status by the Organization of American States. Independent Amnesty Commission of Enquiry publishes report on allegations of torture in Northern Ireland and submits it to British Government. Amnesty recommendations reflected in Lord Gardiner's Parker Commission minority report, which is accepted by British government. Amnesty granted observer status by the Organization of African Unity Co-ordinating Committee on Refugees. Annual Report 1971-72: 1,271 new cases adopted or investigated in calendar year 1971, 727 prisoners released, 1,100 groups in 30 countries (as for 1970-71 plus South Korea, East Pakistan Section changed to Bangladesh Section, Ceylon to Sri Lanka) Budget: £102,654. Amnesty publishes major Report on Allegations of Torture in Brazil. Brazilian government bans any mention in press of Amnesty statements. International Council meeting near Utrecht, Holland, decides on campaign to eliminate systematic torture of prisoners. It also decides that government assertions that prisoner has used or advocated violence should not be binding on Amnesty. International Secretariat moves to larger premises in Theobald's Road, London. First staff representative elected to IEC. Amnesty publishes Draft Protocol providing for release, rehabilitation and resettlement of all non-criminal civilians detained in Indochina as result of war. Amnesty launches worldwide Campaign for the Abolition of Torture. Five members of Korea Section committee arrested, four later released. Amnesty mission refused permission to see all but one of 32 prisoners allegedly tortured in Turkey in spite of previous undertaking by Turkish government. Amnesty says Soviet government has launched biggest drive in years to stamp out all forms of internal dissent.

1973 — Fighting breaks out in Turkish parliament when Prime Minister Ferit Melen accuses Amnesty of telling lies about torture in country. Amnesty asks International Conference on Vietnam and Indochina to place all civilian prisoners in South Vietnam under UN protection. Dutch Section in cooperation with Secretariat publishes "Indonesia Special" report on more than 55,000 people detained without trial for seven years. Sean MacBride meets officials of Soviet Foreign Ministry in Moscow to explore possibility of opening dialogue between Amnesty and Soviet government. Amnesty begins circulating International Appeal to Outlaw Torture. Publication of English translation of what, because of official crackdown, may be last issue (Number 27) of Chronicle of Current Events. Sixth Korean Section official arrested and given 10 days' detention for "spreading a groundless rumour". Publication of "Political Prisoners in South Vietnam", major report on plight of 100,000 civilian prisoners.
Most often, however, the information—precise though it is about individuals and groups of prisoners—is at best only a rough pointer at the overall numbers detained. No accurate national figures can be given. Nor do the numbers of prisoners of conscience adopted by Amnesty International in a country reflect the total picture. Limited resources may make it physically impossible to adopt more than a percentage of the prisoners. Furthermore, these percentages vary widely according to individual circumstances. Thus a large total of adoptees in one country does not necessarily mean that it has more political prisoners than a country in which a smaller number are adopted.

Amnesty’s finite resources also make it difficult to investigate thoroughly every area of the world where the practice of political imprisonment is suspected. And there are many areas from which statistics of any kind are almost impossible to obtain. China is one example, Albania another.

news releases 1972-73

1972
Ghana (Jeremy Thorpe’s visit), July 7.
Brazil—Appeal from the Archbishop of Sao Paulo on behalf of 36 dying prisoners, July 12.
Writers and journalists in prison (limited release), August 1.
Czechoslovakia (Refusal to grant visa to trial observer), August 3.
Telephoned statement on Sean MacBride visiting North Vietnam in a private capacity, August 7.
Iran: Trial procedures for political prisoners (release of report), August 14.
Report on Allegations of Torture in Brazil, September 5.
Announcement of launch of Campaign for the Abolition of Torture—from the Utrecht International Council Meeting, September 10.
Uganda (Detention of Chief Justice Kiwanuka), September 27.
Brazil (New press code), September 22.
Amnesty International replies to the Brazilian Government’s military communiqué, September 27.
Amnesty moves to new headquarters, October 4.
Amnesty voices concern over widespread arrests in Philippines, October 9.
Amnesty International welcomes East German release of prisoners, October 12.
Amnesty International launches Campaign for the Abolition of Torture, December 11.

Amnesty International official to stand trial in South Korea, January 14.

Amnesty and ICJ send observer to Panagoulis trial, January 17.

Amnesty welcomes commutation of death sentence on Polis, January 23.

Amnesty asks Indonesia to commute death sentences, January 25.

Amnesty urges President Amin to halt executions, January 25.

Amnesty says Vietnamese peace settlement skates over problem of civilian prisoners, January 26.

Amnesty seeks probe into deaths of prisoners in South Yemen, February 13.


1973

Amnesty urges Vietnam Conference to put civilian prisoners under UN, February 22.

Amnesty urges Vietnam to halt its "cynicism and deception" over political prisoners, March 1.

Amnesty sends observer to "Pentagon Papers" trial, March 8.

Amnesty urges Indonesia to free 55,000 untried civilians, March 14.

Amnesty International denounces the detention sin juicio de presos politicos Colombianos, March 20.

Six Greek lawyers suffering "unbearable" torture, Amnesty says, March 28.

Amnesty alarmed at wave of arrests in Cambodia, April 13.

Amnesty seeks probe into deaths of 25 Brazilians in police custody, April 26.

Amnesty calls release of Vietnamese civilians "dangerously misleading", April 28.

Amnesty protests transfer of Argentine prisoners to military control, May 7.

Amnesty appeals for clemency for Czechoslovak prisoners, May 8.

Amnesty condemns Turkish move to block showing of torture film, May 15.

Amnesty confirms re-appointment of "tiger cage" Colonel to command of Con Son Island Prison, May 16.

Amnesty says Greek Mutiny officers are being tortured, June 7.

Amnesty urges probe into "brutal treatment" of Spanish prisoners, June 14.

Amnesty says political prisoners tortured in Uruguay, June 25.

Major Amnesty Report documents plight of 100,000 South Vietnamese prisoners, July 1.

Amnesty asks to see jailed Spanish priests in Mozambique, July 17.

Amnesty supports freedom call for American war resisters, July 22.

amnesty international publications

In the year covered by this Annual Report, members of the Research Department wrote or commissioned more major reports than in any other year of Amnesty International's existence.

Most attention was focused on three reports, all professionally printed and put on public sale: Report on Allegations of Torture in Brazil, Indonesia Special, and Political Prisoners in South Vietnam. They were received with acclaim by the world press and have contributed to making the plight of the prisoners, as well as the work of Amnesty International, better known. The complete list of reports in 1972-73:


Background Paper on Turkey—June 1972.
Also published under the Amnesty International Publications (AIP) imprint in 1972-73 was the revised Handbook for Groups.
AIP continued publishing the English translation of the Soviet underground civil rights document A Chronicle of Current Events through most of 1972-73. But it has now stopped appearing in Moscow and the general feeling is that issue Number 27, which AIP issued in March this year, may be the last.

amnesty international missions 1972-73

Bangladesh
Ghana
Ghana, Mali, Senegal, Nigeria, Ivory Coast
Italy
Greece
Turkey
Tanzania, Uganda, Organization of African Unity
Morocco
Senegal
Ghana, Nigeria, Mali, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Gambia
Mozambique
Spain
June 1972
July 1972
July, August and September 1972
September 1972
October 1972
November 1972
November—December 1972
December 1972
February—March 1973
April—May 1973
May 1973
May 1973

David Marshall
Jeremy Thorpe
International Secretariat staff
Nicholas Parsons
Lord Gardiner
Muir Hunter
Martin Ennals
International Secretariat staff
Maitre B. Tirlocq
Martin Ennals
Barend van Niekerk
Helga Schwind

Argentina
Bangladesh
Bolivia
Bolivia
Bolivia
Bolivia
Czechoslovakia
German Democratic Republic
Ghana
Haiti
Jordan
Jordan
Jordan
Jordan
Mauritius
North Vietnam
Philippines
May 25, 1973
May 1973
August 1, 1972
August 21, 1972
September 4, 1972
December 24, 1972
February 1973
November 1, 1972
January 25, 1973
July 3, 1973
December 22, 1972
May 5, 1973
November—December 1972
May 1973
December 22, 1972
May 1973
December 22, 1972
May 5, 1973
February 1973

General amnesty when new President took office
Act of clemency
96 political prisoners released
38 political prisoners released in homage to the first anniversary of the nationalist revolution
62 political prisoners released in partial pardon
64 political prisoners released in Christmas amnesty
25th anniversary of the establishment of Czechoslovakia as Socialist state
23rd anniversary of founding of state
All 23 political prisoners released
132 prisoners released
(N.B. It was later proved that many of them had been released and/or exiled earlier)
200 released
274 released on the occasion of the Arab renaissance and King Hussein’s accession anniversary
38 pardoned
150 released on the occasion of King Hussein’s marriage
8 pardoned
23 political detainees released
Partial amnesty for sick and repentant prisoners
Amnesty for some martial law detainees
Portuguese Colonies
(Angola, Mozambique, Guinea)
Rumania
Saudi Arabia
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Vietnam
South Vietnam
Sudan
USSR

Unconditional amnesty for 1,500 former African guerrillas
No details
To mark Eid, the feast at end of Ramadan
65 political detainees released after electoral victory of All People's Congress
18 political detainees released
5,680 civilians released at Tet (lunar new year)
1,193 civilians released on Farmers' Day
About 50 political detainees released on signing of first permanent Constitution of country since independence
50th anniversary of founding of state

some amnesty statistics
As of May 31, 1973 there were:
1,203 Amnesty International groups in 32 countries, an increase of 148 groups and 1 country over 1971-72.
More than 32,000 individual members of Amnesty International in 62 countries.
2,740 prisoners under adoption or investigation, an increase of 470 since 1971-72.
During the calendar year 1972:
1,680 new prisoners were taken up and 842 prisoners released, respective increases of 25% and 15% over 1971.
During the first 5 months of 1973:
818 new prisoners were taken up, 520 released.
During 1972-73 Amnesty International:
Dispensed more than £80,000 in relief to prisoners and their families,
Sent missions and observers to 19 countries,
Published 12 reports and background papers,
Issued 54 press statements,
Launched a worldwide Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (see page 28).

international executive committee 1972-73

Seán MacBride SC
Chairman
Ireland
Eric Baker
Vice-Chairman
Britain
Lothar Belic
Treasurer
Switzerland
Dirk Börner
Co-opted
Germany
Anne Burley
Staff representative
New Zealand
Herman van Geuns
Netherlands
Thomas Hammarberg
Sweden
Kari Poppe
Norway
Marie-José Protails
France
Gerd Ruge
Co-opted (until February 1973)
Germany

international secretariat

Martin Ennals
Secretary General
Britain
Zbynek Zeman
Head of Research
Britain
Martin Enthoven
Executive Secretary
Britain
James Gaylord
Administrative Manager
USA
Stephanie Grant
Deputy Head of Research
Britain
Mark Grantham
Information
USA
Yele Roberts
Legal
Nigeria
Nigel Rodley
Library
Britain
Odile Garros
France

A total of 16 nationalities are represented in the staff of the International Secretariat. There are 41 full-time staff members, 6 part-time staff and 20 volunteers. Included in these figures are the Head of Research, 13 full-time researchers, 4 volunteer researchers, 5 full-time executive assistants to researchers, 10 full-time secretaries to researchers, and 1 copy typist.
national sections and committees

AUSTRALIA
New South Wales
Amnesty New South Wales Branch,
7 Isabel Avenue,
Vaucluse 2030,
New South Wales.

South Australia
Amnesty International,
South Australia Section,
P.O. Box 779,
G.P.O. Adelaide,
South Australia 5001.

Queensland
Amnesty Queensland Branch,
P.O. Box 162,
Moonee Ponds,
Queensland 4010.

Tasmania
Mrs. Bertha Rolls,
194 Waterworks Road,
Hobart 7000,
Tasmania.

Victoria
Mrs. Peter McPhail,
23 Sherwood Street,
Richmond 3121,
Victoria.

Western Australia
Mrs. Hannah Duneke,
39 Clifton Crescent,
Mount Lawley,
Western Australia 6050.

AUSTRIA
Mrs. Irmpert Hutter,
Amnesty Austrian Section,
A-1170 Wien,
Braungasse 46 A.

BANGLADESH
Syed Muhammad Husain, SC,
Orr Dignam & Co.,
185 Motijhil Commercial Area,
Dacca 2.

BELGIUM
French Speaking:
Miss Anne-Marie rodeyns,
104 Av. de l'Université,
1050 Brussels.

Flemish Speaking:
Miss Marjke Wesseling,
Grunderwvlakte 1,
1050 Brussels.

BRITAIN
Amnesty British Section,
55 Theobald's Road,
London, WC1X 85P.

CANADA
(National Director of Section)
Professor Robert B. Inch,
1739 Lorne Avenue,
Brandon,
Manitoba R7A 0W2.

Group 1:
Mrs. Judith Bishop,
P.O. Box 213,
Postal Station “E”,
Hamilton,
Ontario.

Group 2:
Mr. Peter Warren,
346 Hickson Avenue,
St. Lambert,
Quebec.

Group 3:
Amnesty International,
Toronto Group,
P.O. Box 887,
Station “P”
Toronto,
Ontario M4Y 2N7.

Group 4:
Dr. Laing Ferguson,
P.O. Box 892,
Sackville,
New Brunswick.

IRELAND
Mrs. Bridgid Wilkinson,
c/o 3B Darby Road,
Rathmines,
Dublin 6.

ISRAEL
Amnesty International,
Israel National Section,
P.O. Box 3260,
Tel-Aviv.

ITALY
Enquiries should be addressed to the
International Secretariat.

JAPAN
Amnesty Japanese Section,
c/o Inomata Law Office,
No. 903 Room,
Nagatamachi Hoso Building,
21-2-2, Akasaka,
Minato-ku,
Tokyo.

BRITAIN
Amnesty British Section,
55 Theobald's Road,
London, WC1X 85P.

DENMARK
Amnesty Danish Section,
Gyldenløvesgade 12, l,
DK-1100 Copenhagen K.

FAROE ISLANDS
Mrs. Maud Heinesen,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

FINLAND
Mr. Tom Granberg,
Luoteisväylä 28 A,
Helsinki 20.

FRANCE
Amnesty International,
Section Française,
20 rue de la Michodière,
75002 Paris.

FRANCE
Amnesty International,
Section Française,
20 rue de la Michodière,
75002 Paris.

GROUP 2:
Mr. Peter Warren,
346 Hickson Avenue,
St. Lambert,
Quebec.

GROUP 3:
Amnesty International,
Toronto Group,
P.O. Box 887,
Station “P”
Toronto,
Ontario M4Y 2N7.

GROUP 4:
Dr. Laing Ferguson,
P.O. Box 892,
Sackville,
New Brunswick.

GAMBIA
Mrs. Joanna Kamhona,
c/o The Land Office,
Local Government,
Bambar.

GERMANY
Amnesty German Section,
2 Hamburg 92,
Beesbrostraee 6.

GHANA
Dr. I. S. Epson,
Ilen Chambers,
P.O. Box 6034,
Accra.

INDIA
Amnesty Indian Section,
A-23 Kailash Colony,
New Delhi - 48.

IRAN
Mrs. Amin Atigh,
c/o The Land Office,
Local Government,
Bambar.

ISRAEL
Amnesty International,
Israel National Section,
P.O. Box 3260,
Tel-Aviv.

ITALY
Enquiries should be addressed to the
International Secretariat.

JAPAN
Amnesty Japanese Section,
c/o Inomata Law Office,
No. 903 Room,
Nagatamachi Hoso Building,
21-2-2, Akasaka,
Minato-ku,
Tokyo.

KOREA
Amnesty Korean Committee,
P.O. Box 2934 Seoul.

LEBANON
Maitre Joseph Recallich,
Rue Clémenceau,
Imm. Minkara,
Beyrouth.

LUXEMBOURG
Amnesty International Luxembourg
a.s.b.l.,
Case Postale 1014,
Luxembourg.

MEXICO
Professor Hector Cuadra,
Rue Clémenceau,
Imm. Minkara,
Beyrouth.

NORWAY
Amnesty Norwegian Section,
Case Postale 1014,
Luxembourg.

NETHERLANDS
Amnesty Dutch Section,
Beesbrostraee 6.

SOUTH AFRICA
Amnesty South Africa Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

SWITZERLAND
Amnesty Swiss Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

SWITZERLAND
Amnesty Swiss Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

THAILAND
Amnesty Thai Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

TURKEY
Amnesty Turkish Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

UKRAINE
Amnesty Ukrainian Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

USSR
Amnesty Ukrainian Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

VENEZUELA
Amnesty Venezuelan Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

VIETNAM
Amnesty Vietnamese Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

WESTERN AFRICA
Amnesty Guinean Section,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

WORLD
Amnesty International,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

AMSTERDAM
Amnesty International,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.

AMSTERDAM
Amnesty International,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.