

air

amnesty international review



**A Quarterly Review
of news and comment
on international
human rights**

**Number 29
November 1969
One shilling**

Amnesty Notebook **Indonesia:** Professor Julius Stone and Miss Stephanie Grant returned from a mission to Indonesia disturbed by the size of the problem to be resolved and seeking international support for a programme of relief and rehabilitation of prisoners related to a timetable of release. There are officially some 116,000 political prisoners but the Indonesian Government has recently announced its intention to release 26,000 before the end of the year. A brief report appears later in this issue.

United Nations: It was announced in New York that in future, United Nations Information Centres would not be permitted to accept petitions on Human Rights for transmission to the Human Rights Commission. Petitioners would have to rely on normal postal and telegraphic communications. Amnesty International expressed concern at this decision and stated that it would itself transmit any petitions to the United Nations, without necessarily endorsing the contents. This statement by Amnesty was widely welcomed and publicised.

U.S.A.: The Board of Amnesty International U.S.A. has agreed to try again to develop Amnesty groups in the U.S.A. Until this decision, taken in October, AIUSA had been working on an individual membership basis and had recruited over 5,000 individual members.

Prize money : In Germany and U.S.A. Amnesty International has benefited from awards to Amnesty supporters for distinguished work in the field of science and literature : Professor Mitschelich of Germany received a peace prize and Professor Max Delbrück of U.S.A. was awarded the Louisa Gross Horowitz Prize of Columbia University. (Professor Delbrück has since been awarded the Nobel Prize for Medicine.)

In the United Kingdom : W. H. Auden gave a poetry reading on behalf of Amnesty International.

Latin America: An Amnesty representative will attend the Inter-American Conference on Human Rights being held in Costa Rica from 7th to 22nd November, 1969, and hopes also to visit Uruguay, Argentine, Chile, Peru and Brazil during November and December.

Spain: An Amnesty observer attended a trial in Spain and will be reporting to the International Secretariat. The trial was of 19 trade unionists charged with illegal propaganda. All nineteen were Basques who had been active in the strikes in January 1969, protesting against the declaration of the State of Emergency. All were accused of being members of the illegal P.S.O.E. (the pre-Civil War Socialist Party of Spain now exiled in France) or its trade union affiliates the U.G.T. Seventeen of the 19 had been held in prison since January, without trial.

The judge released from detention all but two of the accused who were sentenced to 2 years in prison.

International Council Meeting

Meeting in Geneva the International Council of Amnesty International approved guide-lines for the adoption of prisoners of conscience. It was agreed that any prisoner adopted should be detained under legislation inadmissible in terms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; or detained without charge, or without a trial. And he should not—as far as known to the International Secretariat—have committed or advocated an act of violence.

Amnesty could assist prisoners of conscience by making representations for their release, by providing legal representation, by making arrangements for asylum and by giving assistance to dependants.

This re-affirmation of Amnesty policy followed discussions on the possibility of altering existing practice. There were suggestions of allowing for new categories of prisoners, new terminology or new procedures. It was decided, however, not to amend the Statute by introducing either the concept of a "political prisoner" or that of a "prisoner of circumstance".

Groups

A document prepared by the International Secretariat on group work and techniques was discussed by the relevant working group whose proposals were given general endorsement by the Council. These proposals—relating to the problems of an increasing number of groups to be serviced—were referred to the International Executive Committee for action.

It was agreed that without prejudicing Amnesty's existing work by dissipating resources or altering the image of the organisation, responsibility should be extended to include arranging asylum in certain cases. Those concerned would be "prisoners of conscience" likely to be released if asylum were assured, and those in danger of extradition or deportation who ran a serious risk of becoming "prisoners of conscience". Also included would be individuals in danger of assassination or physical harm.

Another working group report considered by the Council Meeting was that on conscientious objection. The report was referred to the International Executive Committee with a request that consultation be undertaken with the relevant specialist organisations such as W.R.I., World Peace Bureau, and information given to the national sections.

There were also resolutions on conscientious objection, and a special working

party considered different aspects of the problem. Some difficulties were envisaged in the practical application of certain policy in this field and the whole subject was referred to the I.E.C. for discussion and recommendation. It was agreed that consideration should be given to the Nuremberg principles as providing relevant criteria when considering persons who had refused orders under military law.

Resolutions

The resolutions debated at the Council Meeting covered all fields of Amnesty's work.

On Indonesia and following the Amnesty Mission it was agreed that there should be an appeal for a general amnesty for all political prisoners in that country during 1969-1970.

Portugal: The Meeting called for improved treatment of political prisoners and urged a re-drafting of the regulations so that Amnesty-adopted Prisoners of Conscience could receive letters and parcels.

Rhodesia: Concern was expressed at the continued imprisonment, detention and restriction of African men and women in Rhodesia and the Meeting deplored the imprisonment without trial, or banning of prisoners to isolated areas in order to prevent further political activity. An appeal was made for the release of political prisoners and the end of their subjection to social and economic sanctions. It was decided that Amnesty International should seek world-wide publicity and assistance for political prisoners in Rhodesia.

Tunisia: Many reports had been received of the seriously degrading conditions under which "prisoners of conscience" were detained in Tunisia. The Government had refused to allow medical investigation by British Amnesty. It was agreed that the Tunisian Government should be pressed further to accept inspection of its prison conditions by a qualified investigator, and that information on torture and maltreatment of prisoners should be published.

Iraq: It was noted that more than 54 persons had been executed in Iraq during recent months on charges of espionage, that the trials had been held before a special court and without normal judicial safeguards, and that there had been reports of torture, ill treatment and harsh prison conditions. The trials had been held in secret and no facilities had been made available for observers from international organisations. A representative from Amnesty International had been refused entry. It was therefore agreed to appeal again to the Iraqi government to allow a team of Amnesty International observers to attend trials and visit prisons, also to urge all governments to use their influence to secure this end.

Other resolutions were passed to the International Executive Committee for consideration, for example those relating to the Statute of Amnesty International and the treatment of prisoners. Further matters, including resolutions on the U.N. Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of prisoners were sent to working parties for their report to the I.E.C.

Finance

On the subject of finance, Mr. Anthony Marreco reported that there was an overall budget deficit of £4,113. It was decided that it would be undesirable to increase the group rate of subscription, but national sections should recognise their responsibility to provide funds to meet the present budget. The Meeting approved the International Executive Committee proposal that a relief officer should be appointed subject to special funds being available, to work particularly with funds for prisoners and their dependants in Southern Africa.

In the discussion on the annual report it was agreed that in future reference should be made to Prisoners of the Year and that short reports from each national section should be included. Countries which had refused Amnesty missions would be listed, reports on amnesties in various countries would be given and a summary of the report would be printed in French. There would also be a list of publications. Following agreement on these points the Annual Report was adopted.

Prisoners of Conscience

The Council noted with regret that Daniel Madzimbamuto and Eleni Voulgari were still in prison and unanimously agreed to maintain them as Prisoners of the Year in 1969/70. It was also unanimously agreed to adopt Larissa Daniel, a prisoner of conscience in the U.S.S.R. as the third Prisoner of the Year for 1969/70.

All national sections were invited to make their own individual arrangements for prisoners of conscience week 1969, which would be from November 15th—22nd, except for the British Section who would be holding it on a different date. It was agreed that there should be no centralised propaganda efforts from the International Secretariat on this occasion.

There was unanimous endorsement of the Chairman's recommendation that the 50th anniversary of the International Labour Organisation should be marked by paying special attention to trade unionists in prison for upholding the rights of freedom of association and the principle of international labour organisation. It was agreed that approaches should be made to the principal international trade union organisations, three of whom were particularly welcome observers at the International Council Meeting and were present to discuss ways and means of intensifying Amnesty's activities to obtain the release of trade unionists in prison for reasons of conscience.

Invitations were received from Norway and Italy for the next meeting of the International Council and it was agreed, subject to further discussion, to hold the Council Meeting in Venice on a date to be declared in 1970.

Indonesia

Indonesia has long been known to have a prison population of appalling dimensions, almost all of whom are prisoners of conscience. Amnesty's concern with Indonesian prisoners is of long standing. Mochtar Lubis, detained by President Sukarno, on account of his independent journalism, was one of our early adopted prisoners.

An Amnesty delegate visited Indonesia in 1966, and in July 1969 a further mission was conducted by Professor Julius Stone, a patron of Amnesty and a widely-respected international lawyer. Professor Stone discussed the problem of detainees with officials and members of the Government in Djakarta. He concerned himself primarily with the Government's approach to the problems of rehabilitation which their release would entail. His report has added a great deal to our knowledge of the situation of the prisoners but has also illuminated some of the complex political and administrative problems involved in their release.

The present detainees, of whom, according to the Attorney-General, there are 116,000, are all unsentenced detainees, held under decrees passed by the Sukarno Government, and are those individuals suspected of left-wing sympathies who were arrested at the end of 1965 when the abortive anti-Sukarno coup of the 30th September sparked off an anti-communist reaction involving the death of perhaps half a million people, and the detention of some 200,000. Some of these have since been released, a few have been brought to trial (103, according to the Attorney-General) but the majority have waited in grossly ill-equipped detention camps. It is only recently that the Suharto Government has felt stable enough to turn its attention from the crippling economic and political problems it faces towards the

prisoners. Early in October the Indonesian Attorney-General told a Press conference that his Government plans to release some 26,000 prisoners during the next three months, and gradually to move some 10,000 others to resettlement areas on one of the more distant islands of the Indonesian archipelago.

There had been hopes in Djakarta that the newly-announced releases might have been on an even larger scale, though the military members of the Government continue to see any measure of amnesty as a threat to the security of the State. Many Indonesians will agree that a large number of prisoners were not communists at the time of their arrest—but defend their continued detention on the grounds that they may have become communists during their imprisonment. Another apparently paradoxical reason often given for the continued detentions is that a released prisoner would be in physical danger from the local community on his return to his village, since the killings of 1965/6 were motivated by popular Islamic fervour against supposed communists which still exists and which has been encouraged by the Government in many instances during the last three years. However, it is believed that if the President gave a strong and positive lead towards rehabilitation both centrally and through the regional army commands, the possibility of local hostility would be minimised.

The Government's new policy for releases deals with the prisoners according to their three categories, which are based on the degree of their alleged "involvement" in the coup attempt; releases will depend on this categorisation. It is not necessary here to question whether the formulation of the categories, and indeed arbitrary categorisation of this sort, can be justified. What is important is that the programme of releases adopted by the Indonesian Government should, while reflecting its political fears, conform to the humanitarian standards which the Government itself accepted when it returned to the United Nations in 1967 and which can be used as a measure for its present actions in carrying out the planned releases.

At present conditions in detention camps and prisons are known to be extremely bad; a prison population of these dimensions should strain any government's resources. The Prison Department is known to be heavily in debt, and although it is no longer the case (as in 1966) that prisoners were shot by local commanders when they could not be fed, the prison rations have been cut by half this year. Many of the detainees are in remote camps, they cannot see their families or lawyers, and they have become a forgotten community. No outside observer has been granted formal access to the detention areas.

From Amnesty's point of view the newly-announced releases are a very tangible declaration of intent. But even on the official figures, 26,000 releases leaves 80,000 people under restriction. Our concern must be that the Government is encouraged to extend its policy of releasing prisoners, that prison conditions for those who remain are improved, and that the releases are effective—that they are followed by rehabilitation and not by a further period of restriction. The Indonesian Government has so far failed to demonstrate that the resettlement on Buru is not, in fact, exile.

The USA

Declaration of Concern and Appeal for Amnesty

Amnesty International appeals to the American Government to keep faith with its tradition of freedom of dissent by declaring an amnesty for all those imprisoned, awaiting trial, or in exile because of their refusal, on grounds of principle, to participate in the Vietnam war.

Few, if any, localised wars have provoked as much international debate and concern as the present war in Vietnam. Amnesty's concern here is not the rights and wrongs of the war as an international or political issue, but with the crisis of conscience which it has created for so many young Americans.

In the United States a unique combination of freedom to express dissent, side by

side with conscription for an unpopular war and the absence of recognition of the right of selective conscientious objection (i.e. moral objection to participation in a particular war) has affected the lives of not hundreds, but thousands, of young American men between the ages of 18 and 26.

The dimension of the problem has not been fully publicised or appreciated. If all those directly affected are taken into account, including those currently indicted or in prison—as civilians or inside the army—those previously indicted or imprisoned, and the large numbers in hiding or in exile as deserters, the total figure would be in the region of 10,000. (Amnesty is preparing a report which is to be published before the end of the year). Since the Civil War there has been no issue which has so divided the American people or resulted in imprisonment—in some cases sentences of as much as 10 years have been imposed—for so many *only* because of their moral objection to government policy.

These young men are constantly and openly told by many of the most respected and respectable members of their society: churchmen, writers, professors, doctors, ex-ambassadors, even generals, that the war in Vietnam is immoral or illegal, suicidal for their country and murderous for the Vietnamese. On the other hand they are forced by the Selective Service Law to join the armed services, where they run the risk of fighting in a war that outrages their deepest moral beliefs.

The men in gaol, or indicted and awaiting trial, are not draft-dodgers in the sense of wanting an easy evasion of an unpleasant task. Many of them have given up their student deferments. Most of them are of above average education and intelligence. Men with these advantages have excellent opportunities of avoiding the draft within the law and without social stigma.

The indicted draft-resisters and some of the deserters in exile form a reservoir of potential prisoners of conscience who may populate the gaols of America long after there is no Vietnam war unless some form of amnesty is granted. The great majority of exiles are anxious to return, but see no profit to themselves or their country in surrendering their liberty while the war continues.

Men in the army who object to the war on conscientious grounds have very little chance of release. Because they are not normally accused of any specifically political crimes, the numbers involved are difficult to ascertain but it is certain that hundreds, and probably thousands, of objectors to the war are deserters or imprisoned in military stockades.

Amnesty International has recently had reason to write to, among others, the Italian, Norwegian, Spanish and Yugoslav governments about their policy in relation to conscientious objection. We now appeal to the American government, by declaring an amnesty, to confirm its long established stand as a champion of liberty of conscience and by introducing legislation to cover selective conscientious objection to ensure that young Americans will never again be faced with imprisonment because of their courageous decision to make a stand about what they believe, rightly or wrongly, to be an immoral policy.

London—New York

The Secretary General of Amnesty International has just returned from a trip to America by charter flight organised by the United Nations Association.

Cost per ticket was £65, return, London-New York.

If the International Secretariat were to organise a similar flight in October 1970 it would need something in the region of 150 Amnesty members to take part.

Would anyone interested please write, as soon as possible, to the Secretary General. (A decision to organise a charter flight will be made on the basis of the number of members expressing interest.)

Recent additions to the Library

Books on this list may be reviewed at a later date.

THE HIGH PRICE OF PRINCIPLES by *Richard Hall*. Hodder and Stoughton 35s.

CLASS AND COLOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA 1850-1950 by *H. J. and R. E. Simons*. Penguin 21s.

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS by *Maxime Rodinson*. Penguin 5s.

A HANDBOOK OF AFRICA. Penguin.

POLITICS IN FRANCE by *Pierre Avril*. Penguin 8s.

THE PEASANTS OF VIETNAM by *Gérard Chaliand*. Penguin 7s.

AMERICAN POWER AND THE NEW MANDARINS by *Noan Chomsky* Penguin 8s.

THE RISE OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN REICH by *Brian Bunting*. Penguin 15s.

THE BIAFRA STORY by *Frederick Forsyth*. Penguin 6s.

HOUSE OF BONDAGE by *Ernest Cole*. Allen Lane, The Penguin Press 63s.

AFTER PRISON, WHAT? by *Rev. Ashton Jones*. (Orders for this book to be mailed direct to the author at: 1547 Calle Jules Vista, Ca. 92083, U.S.A. 89c.)

UNYOUNG, UNCOLOURED, UNPOOR by *Colin Morris*. Epworth Press 6s.

APARTHEID: a documentary study of modern South Africa by *Edgar H. Brookes*. Routledge & Kegan Paul 28s.
(see review)

Book Review

"Apartheid: a documentary study of modern South Africa", by Edgar H. Brookes. 1968. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 28s.

In the introduction to his book, Professor Brookes gives the facts which, as he says, make it possible for "many good and kind men in South Africa to approve apartheid". In the text he quotes legislation which denies Africans the right to live permanently in 87% of their own country; which forces husband and wife to live apart from each other, separates mother from child; legislation which prohibits Africans, Coloured and Asians from obtaining employment commensurate with their abilities, merely because their skins are dark. This legislation is not compatible with goodness and kindness and Professor Brookes fails to explain the real causes for the development of apartheid and the reason for its maintenance.

He quotes at length from statutes, speeches in parliament, the Press and other documents relative to apartheid, and illustrates its effect. But apartheid legislation cannot be reduced to 150 pages, and his selection lays him open to criticism. His references to industrial apartheid, to the arbitrary arrest and detention of Africans, to pass laws are so brief and inadequate as to be misleading.

Professor Brookes emphasises his great care to be fair and impartial. But like so many white South Africans who write books about their country, he writes as though it is only white opinion that matters. The franchise proposals of the United Party, the Progressive Party and the Liberals are given in detail, but there is no mention of the franchise demands of the African National Congress. The Eiselen Commission report on Bantu education is quoted at length, but he ignores the Commission on mother tongue medium on which Africans for the first time were appointed. Debates in the white Republic Parliament are reproduced, but the Transkeian parliament has also expressed its views on apartheid. And of the books cited, not one is written by an African, Coloured or Asian author.

There is no reference to political prisoners—though their opposition to apartheid is the basic reason for their being incarcerated.

Travel smooth with Dawson Brothers Travel Ltd.

Let us look after all your holiday and business travel.

*You will find our service quick,
efficient, and above all smooth.*

Pay us a visit or ring 01-353 4382 and leave the rest to us.

75-79 Farringdon St., London EC4

A Gordon & Gotch company

RIGHTS AND WRONGS

SOME ESSAYS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Edited for AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL by
Christopher Hill*

"... Amnesty offers more profound evidence for its existence as an organisation devoted to the protection and restoration of human rights to those at odds with their governments on matters of conscience."—Times Educational Supplement

A PENGUIN SPECIAL Price 5/-

AIR is published by Amnesty International, Turnagain Lane, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4
(telephone: 01-236 0111/3) and printed by T. B. Russell, Rose and Crown Court, Foster Lane, E.C.2.