

SEP 14 1977

**JULY 1977**

**SEVENTEENTH YEAR — No. 196**

# **international review of the red cross**



**INTER ARMA CARITAS**

**GENEVA  
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS  
FOUNDED IN 1863**

**PROPERTY OF U. S. ARMY  
THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL  
LIBRARY**

## INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

- Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, Lawyer, former Director-General of the Swiss National Bank, *President* (member since 1975)
- Mr. JEAN PICTET, Doctor of Laws, Chairman of the Legal Commission, Director of the Henry Dunant Institute, Associate Professor at the University of Geneva, *Vice-President* (1967)
- Mr. HARALD HUBER, Doctor of Laws, Federal Court Judge, *Vice-President* (1969)
- Mrs. DENISE BINDSCHEDLER-ROBERT, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Judge at the European Court of Human Rights (1967)
- Mr. MARCEL A. NAVILLE, Master of Arts, ICRC President from 1969 to 1973 (1967)
- Mr. JACQUES F. DE ROUGEMONT, Doctor of Medicine (1967)
- Mr. ROGER GALLOPIN, Doctor of Laws, former ICRC Director-General and former President of the Executive Council (1967)
- Mr. VICTOR H. UMBRICH, Doctor of Laws, Managing Director (1970)
- Mr. GILBERT ETIENNE, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies and at the Institut d'études du développement, Geneva (1973)
- Mr. ULRICH MIDDENDORP, Doctor of Medicine, head of surgical department of the Cantonal Hospital, Winterthur (1973)
- Mrs. MARION BOVÉE-ROTHENBACH, Master of Social Work (University of Michigan) Reader at the Ecole des Sciences sociales et politiques of the University of Lausanne (1973)
- Mr. HANS PETER TSCHUDI, Doctor of Laws, former Swiss Federal Councillor (1973)
- Mr. HENRY HUGUENIN, Bank Manager (1974)
- Mr. GOTTFRIED DE SMIT, Managing Director (1974)
- Mr. JAKOB BURCKHARDT, Doctor of Laws, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chairman of the Council of Federal Polytechnic Schools (1975)
- Mr. THOMAS FLEINER, Master of Laws, Professor at the University of Fribourg (1975)
- Mr. HERBERT LÚTHY, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of History at the University of Basle (1975)
- Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI, Doctor of Laws, Special Assistant to the President (1977)

*Honorary members:* Miss LUCIE ODIER, *Honorary Vice-President;*

Messrs. HANS BACHMANN,

GUILLAUME BORDIER,

Mrs. MARGUERITE GAUTIER-VAN BERCHEM,

Messrs. ADOLPHE GRAEDEL, ÉDOUARD DE HALLER, ERIC MARTIN,

RODOLFO OLGIATI, MAX PETITPIERRE, PAUL RUEGGER,

DIETRICH SCHINDLER, FRÉDÉRIC SIORDET, ALFREDO VANNOTTI.

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, *President*

Mr. VICTOR H. UMBRICH, *Vice-President*

Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI

Mrs. DENISE BINDSCHEDLER-ROBERT

Mr. THOMAS FLEINER

Mr. JEAN PICTET

# CONTENTS

## INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS

JULY 1977 - No. 196

### INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

### IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

<b>Diplomatic Conference — Summary of the fourth session's work . . . . .</b>	<b>337</b>
<hr/>	
Visits by ICRC President . . . . .	373
President of the Moroccan Red Crescent visits ICRC . . . . .	374
Visit of Prince Hassan of Jordan . . . . .	374
Accession to the Geneva Conventions . . . . .	377
<hr/>	
Exhibition of the Moroccan Red Crescent at Castiglione Museum . . . . .	378
Highest distinction of Dutch Red Cross awarded to director of International Tracing Service . . . . .	379
Seventh International Festival of Red Cross and Health Films, in Varna. . . . .	380
Dissemination of the Geneva Conventions . . . . .	382
<hr/>	
<b>States Parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 . . . . .</b>	<b>388</b>

**REVUE INTERNATIONALE  
DE LA CROIX-ROUGE**

**REVISTA INTERNACIONAL  
DE LA CRUZ ROJA**

**EXTRACTS FROM  
THE REVIEW**

**GERMAN**

**INTERNATIONAL  
REVIEW OF  
THE RED CROSS**

The French and Spanish editions, also issued every month, may be obtained at the same price.

Charles Zorgbibe: Die Anerkennung des Kriegszustandes - Ein Überblick II — HBC 88 — Das Funknetz des IKRK — IKRK Mitglied demissioniert.

*The International Review is published each month by the  
International Committee of the Red Cross*

17, avenue de la Paix, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland  
Postal Cheque No. 12 - 1767.

Annual subscription: Sw. Fr. 30.— (\$12.—)  
Single copy Sw. Fr. 3.— (\$1.—)

**EDITOR: Michel TESTUZ**

---

The International Committee of the Red Cross assumes responsibility only for material over its own signature.

**DIPLOMATIC CONFERENCE**  
**ON THE**  
**REAFFIRMATION AND DEVELOPMENT**  
**OF**  
**INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW APPLICABLE IN**  
**ARMED CONFLICTS**

*A summary of the work of the fourth session*

INTRODUCTION	338
I. THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEES	340
A. Protocol I . . . . .	340
B. Protocol II . . . . .	352
C. Weapons . . . . .	357
D. Drafting . . . . .	358
II. PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE CONFERENCE	359
A. Protocol I . . . . .	359
B. Protocol II . . . . .	363
C. Weapons . . . . .	370
D. Final plenary meetings . . . . .	371
(a) Adoption of Protocols—Statements . . . . .	371
(b) Resolutions . . . . .	371
(c) Signature of Final Act . . . . .	372
	337

## INTRODUCTION

The signing of the Final Act, on Friday, 10 June 1977, at the Geneva International Conference Centre, marked the end of the fourth and last session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law applicable in Armed Conflicts, which had been convened by the Swiss Federal Council four years previously.

The concrete results of the Conference take the form of two Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, drawn up in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish. The first concerns the protection of victims of international armed conflicts, and contains 102 articles and two Technical Annexes. The second Protocol, relating to the protection of victims of non-international armed conflicts, has 28 articles. Thus, excluding the annexes, there is an impressive total of 130 new provisions of international humanitarian law, adopted two days before, on 8 June 1977, by consensus at the Conference's final plenary session which rounded off the four years of effort. In addition, eight Resolutions were adopted.

The first session of the Conference took place from 20 February to 29 March 1974,<sup>1</sup> with the task of reaching a decision regarding two draft Protocols submitted by the International Committee of the Red Cross, one on international armed conflicts and the other on non-international armed conflicts. The second session lasted from 3 February to 18 April 1975,<sup>2</sup> and the third from 21 April to 11 June 1976.<sup>3</sup> Finally, the fourth session, at which the final round of debates took place, met from 17 March to 10 June 1977. The Conference had been preceded by considerable preparatory work; in this respect, it is worth mentioning the two Government Expert Conferences organized in Geneva by the ICRC from 24 May to 12 June 1971 and from 3 May to 3 June 1972.<sup>4</sup>

As to the participants, no less than 155 States were invited, 124 of which attended the first session, 120 the second, 107 the third, and 109 the last. Eleven national liberation movements and 51 intergovernmental

---

<sup>1</sup> See *International Review of the Red Cross*, No. 158, May 1974.

<sup>2</sup> See *International Review of the Red Cross*, No. 172, July 1975.

<sup>3</sup> See *International Review of the Red Cross*, No. 186, September 1976.

<sup>4</sup> See *International Review of the Red Cross*, Nos 127 and 128, October 1971 and November 1971; No. 136, July 1972.

or non-governmental organizations also sent representatives, giving a total figure of some 700 delegates.

The ICRC was involved in the deliberations in an expert capacity.

The work to be accomplished was split between four main Committees, which were sub-divided as necessary into Sub-Committees, Working Groups, Technical Committees and Drafting Committees.

Despite the difficulties, the Conference reached a successful conclusion. The ICRC President, Mr. Alexandre Hay, took pleasure in recognizing this fact in his speech to the plenary session at the end of the Conference, from which a brief extract follows:

In a world that is now so divided that it is becoming difficult for Governments to reach agreement on political and social problems, proof has been given that, where the survival of humankind is at stake, representatives of all countries and of all persuasions can meet and, in spite of many divergences, speak the same language, and at times make a gesture of friendship. Yet four years of unremitting hard work—ten years for the International Committee of the Red Cross—were required to produce these fundamental charters for the human race.

Unlike other conferences, held to discuss oil or money, this Conference was concerned with the human person, which must be defended and protected from the growing dangers threatening it.

As spokesman of the institution which, for more than a hundred years, has worked to construct the Geneva Conventions, I would like to pay tribute to the spirit of conciliation, of patience and of perseverance shown by the representatives despite the many antagonisms whose very real nature has been demonstrated even here.

The Conference President, Mr. Pierre Graber, Head of the *Federal Political Department* (Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and spokesman for the Federal Council, also voiced his satisfaction during his closing address, as can be seen from the following extract:

Undoubtedly, those who study the texts resulting from our work will point out the limitations imposed by the sovereignty of States and the difficulties of applying some of the provisions adopted.

They cannot, for all that, dispute the success of our Conference, nor deny that an attempt has been made to bridge the gulf that has yawned for decades past between humanitarian law and the evolution of armed conflicts. Still less can they ignore the spirit of concerted effort and mutual concessions, the closer human relations that have been seen in this International Conference Centre in Geneva.

For all your hard work, for your unfailing tenacity, for the constructive debates contributing so much to understanding between peoples, I offer

you, ladies and gentlemen, my heartfelt gratitude. Thank you for the magnificent way in which you responded to the confident spirit—some said the foolhardy spirit—in which my Government invited you here.

Switzerland and Geneva are glad to have been the scene of the successful exploit which we have just accomplished together.

The following pages give a summary of the work of the Committees and plenary sessions of this fourth session of the Conference.

## I. THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEES

### A. PROTOCOL I

#### **Title of the Protocol**

After a short discussion, Committee I felt it necessary to retain the expression “Additional Protocol” as it stood, in order to bring out the link between this instrument and the Conventions; it also deemed it appropriate for the title itself to contain the abbreviated form “Protocol I”, which had already been used throughout the discussions. The already sufficiently lengthy title makes no mention of the date the Protocol “came into being”, which in fact is 10 June 1977, the day the Final Act of the Conference was signed. The title was adopted by consensus.

#### **Preamble**

In this preamble, the High Contracting Parties proclaim their earnest wish to see peace prevail among peoples, recalling that recourse to the threat or use of force is authorized only in the limitative terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

They go on to express their conviction that nothing in humanitarian law can be construed as legitimizing or authorizing any use of force incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, and then reaffirm that such law must be applied to all persons it is designed to protect, without any adverse distinction based on any criterion whatsoever.

Committee I deleted the clause of the preamble stipulating that, in cases not covered by the Protocol, the principles of the international law remain applicable; Article 1, adopted at the first session, in fact contains

a provision of this nature, which sought its inspiration in the now-famous so-called “Martens clause”.

The Preamble as a whole was adopted by consensus.

## **Part I — General provisions**

Committee I looked anew at Article 2—*Definitions*, the remainder of which had been adopted at the second session, and decided by consensus to delete the proposed sub-paragraph (c), which defined persons and objects protected. These expressions are defined appropriately in the different parts of the Protocol in which they are used, and it had therefore become unnecessary to provide a general definition.

## **Part II — Wounded, sick and shipwrecked**

The majority of the provisions in this Part had been adopted at the second session. Committee II in fact concluded its work on these questions at the third session.

## **Part III — Methods and means of warfare — Combatant and prisoner-of-war status**

### *SECTION I—METHODS AND MEANS OF WARFARE*

Part III of Protocol I, like Part IV relating to the civilian population, fell within the competence of Committee III, which had adopted all the articles of Section I—*Methods and means of warfare*, i.e. Articles 35 to 42 (formerly 33 to 39)<sup>1</sup> at the second and third sessions. At the fourth session, the Committee nonetheless re-examined Articles 39—*Emblems of nationality* (formerly 37) and 42—*Occupants of aircraft* (formerly 39), in the first case with a view to a change in the wording affecting the substance, and in the second case to deal with a fundamental question.

The revised text of the provision on emblems of nationality states that this article in no way affects the existing generally recognized rules of international law applicable to espionage. The revision resulted from fears expressed that the original text might cause differing interpretations on this point. But more important is the amendment concerning the

---

<sup>1</sup> In the following pages, the numbering of the articles in Protocol I is that of the final version. The former numbering, used throughout the four sessions of the Conference, is given in brackets.

occupants of aircraft (Art. 42). It will be recalled that, during the third session, the Committee had refused to grant protection to parachutists in distress when it was evident that they would land on friendly territory and would therefore avoid capture. Although the Committee was not unanimous with regard to reversing this decision, it nevertheless amended the text by prohibiting attacks on persons having parachuted from an aircraft, irrespective of who was in control of the territory on which they were landing. This simply confirms customary practice, which fully conforms to the spirit of the Red Cross and which is also mentioned in the military handbooks of several Powers.

## *SECTION II—COMBATANT AND PRISONER-OF-WAR STATUS*

As a result of the changes made by the Conference Drafting Committee, this Section now has five articles, viz. Article 43—*Armed forces* (formerly Art. 41), Art. 44—*Combatants and prisoners of war* (formerly Art. 42), Art. 45—*Protection of persons who have taken part in hostilities* (formerly Art. 42 bis), Art. 46—*Spies* (formerly Art. 40) and Art. 47—*Mercenaries* (formerly Art. 42 quater). Only Articles 44 and 47 were debated at the fourth session, since the other articles had been adopted by the Committee at the previous session.

Article 44, entitled “Combatants and prisoners of war”, is among the most important in the Protocol. At the end of the third session, the Committee had resolved not to make a decision on the basis of the report of its working group, preferring to give itself a period of reflexion, as certain aspects of the proposed draft still met with objections. Nonetheless, at the start of the fourth session, it became clear that the text was the best possible compromise if proper account were to be taken of the legal requirements and reality. The principle of the combatant’s obligation to distinguish himself from the civilian population was reaffirmed, whereas it was recognized that there are difficulties in demanding the unconditional respect of this principle for guerrilleros, since they would then lose all their effectiveness in combat. The Committee therefore decided to proceed immediately with the vote on the text which had resulted from the deliberations at the third session, without relaunching the debate. The outcome of the vote was 66 in favour of the proposed text, 2 against and 18 abstentions. It is obvious that a considerable amount of time was then devoted to explanations of votes. In part, these concerned the

reasons behind the positions taken, but there were also declarations made on the proper interpretation of certain parts of a text which includes delicate points that resulted from laborious efforts to reach a compromise, and which are still not univocal.

Article 47 concerns mercenaries. There was a two-fold problem here: on the one hand, an acceptable definition of the term "mercenary" had to be found, and on the other, it had to be decided whether a mercenary would be denied all right to protection or only the right to prisoner-of-war status. As a result of private consultations between the representative of Nigeria, who initiated this proposal, and the representatives of other countries, a new text was quickly drawn up and adopted, by consensus, at the Committee. The definition is limitative in nature, excluding military advisers, nationals and residents of the territory controlled by a party to a conflict, as well as the members of the armed forces of a party to the conflict or of a State. Private gain, which is characteristic of the mercenary (the word comes from the Latin "merces", meaning reward), must be assessed in relation to the compensation paid to regular soldiers of similar functions. With regard to the implications of being a mercenary, the text merely states that he "shall not have the right" to prisoner-of-war status. There is therefore nothing to stop the captor from granting this status if he sees fit. The fundamental guarantees in favour of all persons deprived of their liberty (Article 75) are in all cases applicable to mercenaries, as was emphasized during the debates.

This being a compromise text, once more it could not satisfy everybody: but was a better solution really feasible? Some will reply in the affirmative, feeling that the simplest answer lies in each State's agreeing to prohibit the recruitment of mercenaries.

#### **Part IV — Civilian population**

##### *SECTION I—GENERAL PROTECTION AGAINST EFFECTS OF HOSTILITIES*

All the articles in this section had already been adopted by Committee III at the first and second sessions, except the provisions relating to civil defence.

## CHAPTER VI—CIVIL DEFENCE

This problem had already taken up a considerable proportion of Committee II's time at the third session, and once again patient negotiation was necessary, as was a real desire to adopt a text acceptable to each and everyone.

The first article in this Chapter (Art. 61—*Definitions and scope*, formerly Art. 54) defines the expressions “civil defence”, “civil defence organizations”, “personnel” of civil defence organizations, and “*matériel*” of civil defence organizations, and it explains the scope of civil defence for the purposes of the Protocol. The list of tasks attributed to civil defence is both long and detailed. Fifteen headings cover everything from warning to emergency disposal of the dead, including rescue and fire-fighting. Although it is in fact exhaustive, contrary to the wishes expressed by some, the latter were satisfied by the last of its headings which mentions the “complementary activities necessary to carry out any of the tasks mentioned above. . .”.

The second article (Art. 62—*General protection*, formerly Art. 55) lays down the principle of the protection of civilian civil defence organizations and their personnel, as well as of civilians who are not members of such organizations but who carry out civil defence tasks under the control of the competent authorities. It is also recalled that buildings, *matériel* and shelters used for civil defence purposes are protected by virtue of Article 52 of the Protocol (*General protection of civilian objects*).

The third article (Art. 63—*Civil defence in occupied territories*, formerly Art. 56) lays down a principle in the matter of civil defence in such zones, namely that the Occupying Power must assist local civil defence organizations to carry out their tasks, that shelters provided for the civilian population can never be requisitioned, and that the buildings and *matériel* belonging to civil defence organizations cannot be requisitioned either, unless there are no harmful implications for the civilian population.

The fourth article (Art. 64—*Civilian civil defence organizations of neutral or other states not parties to the conflict and international coordinating organizations*, formerly Art. 57), deals with the protection of the civil defence organizations of States not parties to the conflict which come to the assistance of one of the parties to the conflict, and the duty of the High Contracting Parties who grant assistance and of the parties

to the conflict receiving it to facilitate, when appropriate, the international co-ordination of civil defence actions. Finally, it obliges the Occupying Power to accept this assistance, unless the resources at its disposal are sufficient to ensure the adequate performance of civil defence tasks in the occupied territory concerned.

The fifth article (Art. 65—*Cessation of protection*, formerly Art. 58) contains provisions for the case in which civil defence organizations cease to have the right to protection (committing acts harmful to the enemy) and stipulates how cessation should be implemented. This article also resolves the highly controversial question of the right of civilian civil defence personnel to carry arms, and sets the limits to this right.

The sixth article (Art. 66—*Identification*, formerly Art. 59) deals with the identification of civil defence organizations, and to this end it introduces a new international sign, a blue triangle on an orange background.

The last article (Art. 67—*Members of the armed forces and military units assigned to civil defence organizations*, formerly Art. 59 bis), regulates a question which is crucial for States whose civil defence depends on the army: the question of the members of the armed forces and military units assigned to civil defence organizations. Protection is also granted to such personnel and units, but subject to several conditions, particularly that they be permanently assigned and exclusively devoted to civil defence tasks, that they perform these tasks only within their own national territory, and that the personnel be clearly distinguishable from other members of the armed forces.

In addition, Committee II adopted Chapter V of Annex I to the Protocol, which gives technical information concerning the chapter examined above (see below).

## SECTION II—RELIEF IN FAVOUR OF THE CIVILIAN POPULATION

This section, now containing four articles instead of the three in the draft submitted by the ICRC, had not previously been discussed by Committee II. Since everyone was agreed on its usefulness and importance, the differences of opinion expressed—particularly regarding how relief actions should be carried out—were in fact smoothed out without too much difficulty.

This first article in this section (Art. 68—*Field of application*, formerly Art. 60) defines its field of application as follows: it applies to the civilian

population and is supplementary to the relevant provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

Article 69—*Basic needs in occupied territories* (formerly Art. 61) widens the scope of the duties of the Occupying Power towards the civilian population of the occupied territories. In addition to food and medical supplies, already mentioned in Article 55 of the Fourth Convention, the Occupying Power must also, to the fullest extent of the means available, ensure in particular the provision of clothing, bedding and means of shelter.

The third article (Art. 70—*Relief actions*, formerly Art. 62) deals with the question of relief actions undertaken for territories under the control of a party to a conflict, other than an occupied territory (actions for the latter having been adequately covered by the Fourth Convention). Subject to the agreement of the parties concerned, relief actions which are humanitarian and impartial in character shall be undertaken when the civilian population lacks the supplies mentioned under Art. 69 (see above).

The High Contracting Parties and the parties to a conflict, subject to their right to prescribe certain technical arrangements and controls, are bound to allow the unimpeded passage of such relief consignments in their territory, and to facilitate the international co-ordination of relief actions.

Moreover, the parties to the conflict must protect such consignments and facilitate their distribution.

Article 71—*Personnel participating in relief actions* (formerly Art. 62 bis) defines the personnel (particularly those specializing in the transportation and distribution of relief consignments) who may participate in these relief actions, subject to the approval of the party concerned, and requires that such personnel be respected and protected.

### SECTION III—TREATMENT OF PERSONS IN THE POWER OF A PARTY TO THE CONFLICT

With the exception of Article 74—*Reunion of dispersed families* (formerly Art. 64 bis) and Article 79—*Measures of protection for journalists* (formerly Art. 69 bis), no article in this section had been adopted during previous sessions.

At the fourth session, Committee III examined and adopted the remainder.

Article 72—*Field of application* (formerly Art. 63) caused no difficulties. It defines the field of application peculiar to this section of Part IV of the Protocol, referring not only to Parts I and III of the Fourth Convention, but also to “other applicable rules of international law relating to the protection of fundamental human rights during international armed conflict”. This reference to human rights in relation to the law of armed conflicts has a significance which should be mentioned in particular.

Article 73—*Refugees and stateless persons* (formerly Art. 64) grants persons who, before the beginning of the hostilities, were considered as refugees or stateless persons, a status which protects them with respect to all parties to a conflict and throughout the conflict. Nonetheless, several delegations would have liked to extend the protection guaranteed by the article to persons who became refugees or stateless persons after the beginning of hostilities, and were not just before. Faced with the difficulties raised by this proposal, the Committee preferred to maintain the text it had drafted, and not to add this proposal.

Article 74—*Reunion of dispersed families* (formerly Art. 64 bis) has already been dealt with (adopted at the third session).

Article 75—*Fundamental guarantees* (formerly Art. 65) was in itself one of the two basic points on the agenda of Committee III (the other being Art. 44—*Combatants and prisoners of war*). Indeed, it is probably one of the most important articles in Protocol I.

It defines the minimum standards of humane treatment to be applied to all persons who do not benefit from more favourable treatment under the Conventions or Protocol I. In fact, it is a veritable “safety net” in international humanitarian law, since it enables protection to be afforded to categories of persons that might have been “neglected” under the Conventions and Protocol I, such as nationals of States not parties to the Conventions, nationals of parties to a conflict if those parties grant them treatment equal to or less favourable than that granted to nationals of the opposing party, nationals of neutral States, mercenaries, etc.

The Committee debated this article for over two weeks. A question arose as to whether the protection guaranteed by this article should also be applicable to nationals of parties to a conflict. The Committee settled the question by limiting the application of this provision to persons affected by both the armed conflict and the actions of the party in whose power they were, without listing examples of categories of persons thus

protected, and consequently without mentioning the criterion of belonging to a party to the conflict.

The following paragraphs contain lists of all harmful acts, both mental and physical, against which all persons covered by this article are protected, and of the minimum legal guarantees from which these same persons should benefit before any sentence is pronounced or put into effect.

The former Article 66—*Protection of objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population* had been replaced by the present Article 54 (formerly Art. 48) bearing the same title, which was adopted at the second session. Having defined the territorial limitations on attacks against indispensable objects, which were dealt with in Article 66, the Committee therefore added this text to the end of the present Article 54, and abolished the former Article 66. In addition, a condition was included to the effect that a party to a conflict may derogate from the prohibitions against its attacking objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, within its own territory, “in the defence of its national territory against invasion” and “where required by imperative military necessity”.

Article 76—*Protection of women* (formerly Art. 67) is the first in a series of four articles protecting special categories of civilians (women and children; journalists). The article devoted to women requires that they be the object of special respect, that they be protected against any form of indecent act, and that pregnant women and mothers having dependent infants, to the maximum extent feasible, not be condemned to death and, in any case, not executed.

Article 77—*Protection of children* (formerly Art. 68) requires that children also be the object of special respect. In addition, this article lays down an important new ruling under which the parties to a conflict must take all feasible measures to ensure that children under fifteen years of age do not take part in the hostilities. Should this nonetheless happen, children who fall into the power of the adverse party should continue to be protected by this article. In any case, the death penalty cannot be executed on children and adolescents under eighteen years of age.

Article 78—*Evacuation of children* (formerly Art. 69) lays down the measures that any party to a conflict must take if it wishes to carry out the evacuation of children. In particular, it has to provide each child with an information card giving no less than 19 particulars, in order to

avoid—in collaboration with the ICRC Central Tracing Agency—the repetition of past tragedies where children who were evacuated in haste never found their parents again, and never even returned to their home localities because of inadequate information.

Article 79—*Measures of protection for journalists* (formerly Art. 69 bis) had already been adopted by Committee I at the second session. It was simply renumbered at the fourth session.

## **Part V — Execution of the Conventions and of the Protocol**

### *SECTION II—REPRESSION OF BREACHES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND OF THE PROTOCOL*

Committee I continued the examination of this section, the first two articles of which (Articles 85 and 86) (formerly Articles 74, 75 and 76) it had adopted last year.

Adopted without opposition, Article 87 (formerly 76 bis) deals with the duties of commanders in repressing breaches, and places the main emphasis on their obligation to promulgate knowledge of humanitarian law among their subordinates in order to prevent breaches.

Draft Article 77—*Superior orders*<sup>1</sup>—was adopted by 38 votes to 22, with 15 abstentions: many delegations thought it undesirable to allow to go unpunished the refusal of an order which would constitute a grave breach, since the result would be to undermine the discipline indispensable to armed forces; other delegations, on the contrary, thought that the article should exempt from any punishment the refusal to carry out any order which would constitute a breach, even a minor one, of the Conventions or of the Protocol.

Article 88—*Mutual assistance in criminal matters*—adopted without opposition, comprises two articles of the draft, 78 and 79: its aim is to establish between the High Contracting Parties, without prejudice to existing treaties, the greatest measure of mutual assistance in legal matters, including extradition if circumstances allow.

Three proposals were examined in parallel: one forbade reprisals in all circumstances (70 bis); the second permitted them in well defined cases and conditions (74 bis); the third laid the obligation on the Parties to co-operate with the United Nations Organization in the event of grave

---

<sup>1</sup> Not retained by the plenary session, as will be seen later.

breaches (article to be inserted before draft Article 70, now Article 80). Considering that the question of reprisals had been settled satisfactorily in Parts II and IV, Committee I approved only the third proposal, as Article 89—*Co-operation*—by 41 votes to 18, with 17 abstentions.

Article 90—*International Fact-Finding Commission* (formerly Article 79 bis)—provides for a commission to be established, composed of fifteen members of high moral standing and acknowledged impartiality. Its dual mission would be, on the one hand, to inquire into any facts alleged to be a grave breach as defined in the Conventions and in the Protocol or other serious violation of these instruments, and, on the other hand, to facilitate, through its good offices, the restoration of respect for humanitarian law. The Commission would act with the consent of the Parties to the conflict or, where the Parties have previously made an explicit declaration to this effect, at the request of only one of the Parties. Article 90 makes the creation of the Commission subject to the acceptance of its competence by twenty of the High Contracting Parties. The whole article was adopted by 40 votes to 18, with 17 abstentions.

This Section II of Part V closes with Article 91—*Responsibility* (to be inserted before former Article 80, now 92), which reaffirms, for the purposes of the Conventions and the Protocol, Article 3 of the Hague Convention respecting the laws and customs of war an land. This article was adopted by consensus.

## **Part VI — Final provisions**

This Part deals principally with commitment to and release from the Protocol, the entry into force of the Protocol, and possible amendments.

Articles 92, 93 and 94 (formerly 80, 81 and 82) provide for the Protocol to be open for signature, for ratification or for accession, six months after the signature of the Final Act. In fact, an official ceremony in Berne—the depositary, as for the Conventions, being the Swiss Federal Council—on 12 December 1977 will mark the beginning of the period of twelve months during which signature of the Protocol will be possible. It should be pointed out that, the Protocol being in the nature of an addendum, only the States already Parties to the Conventions may become Parties to the Protocol. By virtue of Article 95 (83 of the draft),

the Protocol will enter into force six months after the deposit of the second instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 96—*Treaty relations upon entry into force of the Protocol*—provides in particular that a party to a conflict which is not a Party to the Protocol may accept and apply its provisions, in which case the Protocol shall govern relations between the party concerned and the others previously bound by the Protocol. Moreover, the Conventions and the Protocol may be made applicable to a conflict opposing a High Contracting Party and the authority representing a people exercising its right of self-determination, provided that the said authority addresses to the depositary a unilateral declaration to such effect. The entire article was adopted by consensus.

Committee I was unable to agree on the desirability of retaining draft Article 85—*Reservations*—or on the articles which it was intended to declare not subject to reservations. Finally, a new proposed article having been rejected by 47 votes to 34, with 4 abstentions, the questions of possible reservations to the Protocol will be governed by custom.

Article 97 (formerly 86)—*Amendment*—adopted by consensus gives the depositary State the possibility, after consultation with the High Contracting Parties and the ICRC, to convene a conference to examine any proposed amendment of the Protocol.

By 50 votes to 27, with 13 abstentions, the Committee adopted an article 86 bis<sup>1</sup> setting up a Committee of States charged with examining proposals to ban or limit, for humanitarian reasons, the use of certain conventional weapons. The work of this Committee would have been guided by the ban, imposed by the Protocol, of any weapons of a nature to cause superfluous injury or to wound without discrimination. The ICRC, in addition to taking part in the work of the Committee, would have provided the necessary secretariat services.

The last articles of the Protocol (99 to 102—formerly 87 to 80) were adopted by consensus. Article 99 (formerly 87) provides that denunciation of the Protocol by a High Contracting Party shall not take effect for one year, and not then if the Party is in a situation in which the Protocol is applicable. Such denunciation shall not affect the obligations already incurred in respect of any act committed before the denunciation takes effect. Articles 100—*Notifications* (88), 101—*Registration* (89) and 102—

---

<sup>1</sup> Not retained by the plenary session, as will be seen later, under point II.A.

*Authentic texts* (90) deal with the information to be supplied by the depositary, the registration of the Protocol by the Secretariat of the United Nations and, finally, the authentic texts in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

### **Regulations concerning Identification (Annex I to Protocol I)**

The experts of the Technical Sub-Committee were not convened to the fourth session of the Conference, since their work had been completed in the third session, after the adoption by Committee II of the draft Regulations concerning Identification, apart from the last chapter. This final chapter, Chapter V, "Civil defence", was adopted by consensus in the fourth session. It stipulates, in Article 14, that the civil defence personnel identity card is governed by the relevant provisions of Article 1 of the Regulations. If these personnel are permitted to carry light individual weapons, an entry to that effect should be made on the identity card. Article 15 specifies that the international distinctive sign of civil defence is an equilateral blue triangle on an orange ground.

Committee II also adopted an amendment mentioning religious personnel in paragraph 2 of Article 4 (Use of the distinctive sign). A new Chapter VI was added to the Regulations; entitled "Works and installations containing dangerous forces", it deals with the use of the international special sign consisting of three bright orange circles, as adopted by Committee III, for the protection of such works and installations.

The original Chapter VI, "Periodic updating", which Committee II had replaced by Article 18 bis in Protocol I, eventually became Article 98, after examination by the Drafting Committee.

## **B. PROTOCOL II**

### **Preamble**

Group C of Committee I, set up to examine the final clauses and the preambles of the two Protocols, adopted a preamble in conformity with the ICRC draft. Accepted by consensus by the full Commission, this simple and concise text recalls the fundamental role of Article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions in cases of armed conflict not of an international character, a role that is defined in Article 1 of the Protocol. It mentions also the international instruments relating to human rights,

and it enunciates the principle of the Martens clause, that, in cases not covered by the law in force, the human person remains under the protection of the principles of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience.

### **Part I — General provisions**

The articles in this Part were adopted at the first session of the Conference.

### **Part II — Humane treatment of persons in the power of the parties to the conflict**

At the third session of the Conference, Committee I adopted an Article 10 (*Penal prosecutions*) incorporating Articles 9 (*Principles of penal law*) and 10 (*Penal prosecutions*) of the draft submitted by the ICRC. Only one point still had to be resolved: the inclusion of the *prohibition of collective penalties* in Protocol II. The ICRC draft text stipulated this prohibition in its Article 9, para. 1, as a corollary to the principle of individual penal responsibility. Working Group B, entrusted with examining penal prosecutions, had felt that this question should not be dealt with in this limited context.

The same Group B resumed examination of this point at the fourth session. Having once more deliberated on the appropriateness of keeping a principle of this kind in Protocol II, the Group defined the concept of collective penalties, which cover all kinds of sanctions (e.g. confiscation of a family's possessions) and not only legal penalties. This further-reaching prohibition found a place in Article 6—*Fundamental guarantees*, para. 2 (*b*), and was adopted by consensus at the Committee.

It should be noted that, at the plenary sessions of the Conference, a preference was expressed for the term “punishments” rather than “penalties”, in order to avoid any risk of too limited an interpretation of this prohibition.

A second point was pending at Committee I, concerning Article 10 (*a*) relating to “reprisals”. At the third session, Working Group B drew up the following text: “The provisions of [Parts II, III and V] shall not, in any circumstance or for any reason whatsoever, be violated, even in response to a violation of the provisions of the Protocol”. Committee I took note of this text, holding back its final adoption until Committee

III had reached the end of its work on Part V. In the light of the work of Committee III, Working Group B of Committee I re-examined the question this year. Although there was seen to be a clear consensus on the reference to Parts II and III in the article, the same did not apply to Part V: some would have liked to see it mentioned in full in the provision; others would have preferred to mention only Article 26—*Protection of the civilian population*. As a compromise, after Parts II and III and Article 26, Articles 26 bis, 27 and 28 were referred in square brackets to the Committee. This proposal was put to the vote, and the reference to these provisions was retained by 29 votes to 11, with 39 abstentions. The article itself was adopted as a whole by 33 votes to 15, with 28 abstentions.

The Drafting Committee was asked to determine the position of this provision in the Protocol, and to give it a title. Called “unconditional respect”, it should have been placed at the end of Part VII—*Execution of the present Protocol*.

### **Part III — Wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons**

All the provisions under this Part were adopted at previous sessions.

### **Part IV — Methods and means of combat**

Article 21, relating to the *prohibition of perfidy*, was the only one remaining on the agenda of Committee III.

After a long debate, without reaching agreement on a more elaborate article, the Committee decided on an extremely concise text limited to stating the principle of the prohibition of perfidy, which it adopted by 21 votes to 16, with 41 abstentions.

### **Part V — Civilian population**

#### **CHAPTER I—GENERAL PROTECTION AGAINST EFFECTS OF HOSTILITIES**

All the provisions in this chapter were adopted at the second and third sessions of the Conference.

#### **CHAPTER II—CIVIL DEFENCE**

The draft text submitted by the ICRC contained two articles, one stating the principle of respect for personnel, and one defining civil defence.

When Committee II was examining these provisions, a large number of delegations advocated the deletion of any mention of civil defence in Protocol II, feeling that a ruling in this sphere was not appropriate in an instrument relating to non-international armed conflicts.

With not too much enthusiasm, the Committee finally decided on a much simplified text; it was adopted by 24 votes to nil, with 32 abstentions, and reads as follows: "Unarmed civilian civil defence personnel shall be authorized, except in the case of imperative military necessity, to continue to carry out the civil defence tasks necessary to the survival of the civilian population". Even in this succinct form, the article was to be suppressed in plenary session.

### CHAPTER III—MEASURES IN FAVOUR OF CHILDREN

In its draft text, the ICRC had proposed an Article 32—*Privileged treatment*, designed to guarantee special protection to children. This provision was examined in Committee III at the fourth session. Adopted by consensus, it repeated the basic substance of Articles 68 and 69 (now 77 and 78) of Protocol I devoted respectively to the protection and evacuation of children.

Besides the general obligation of providing children with the care and assistance they need, a certain number of specific tasks are assigned to parties to a conflict, viz. they shall endeavour to furnish a lasting means of identification of the children, they shall take care that children who are orphaned or separated from their families are not abandoned and that, as far as possible, they receive an education, and that they shall, if necessary, evacuate them; finally, a basic principle is stated in this provision: the parties to a conflict shall "take all feasible measures in order that children who have not attained the age of fifteen years do not take a direct part in hostilities and, in particular, to refrain from recruiting them into their armed forces".

#### Part VI — Relief

It was this year that Committee II examined the provisions relating to relief.

Under the Part devoted to *Relief*, the ICRC draft text included three articles (33, 34 and 35) the first concerning relief actions proper, the second the recording of conflict victims and the transmission of related informa-

tion, and the third the activities of National Red Cross and other relief societies.

These articles gave rise to long debates, initially within the Working Group set up to discuss them, and later in Committee. A number of delegations expressed their fear that the rules adopted would be too constraining, particularly with regard to the acceptance of relief. Two delicate problems—the scope of the right of control granted to States accepting the transit of relief consignments, on the one hand, and the respect of the national sovereignty of the State within whose territory the relief consignments are to be transported, on the other hand—were discussed at length. Finally, a large number of delegations expressed the wish that Articles 33—*Relief actions* and 35—*National Red Cross and other relief societies* of the ICRC draft text be combined into one provision.

A single article was therefore drawn up on the basis of several amendments, and was finally adopted as a whole by consensus.

The first paragraph establishes the right of relief societies located within the territory of the High Contracting Party concerned to carry out relief activities; the four following paragraphs state: the principle of relief actions, the duty of the High Contracting Parties and the parties to the conflict concerned to facilitate the passage of relief consignments, the methods for conveyance of the consignments and, finally, the possibility for health personnel and units to take part, if necessary, in relief actions.

Article 34—*Recording and information*, which provides that each party to a conflict is responsible for organizing an information bureau to which they must communicate all relevant information on the victims of the conflict, was adopted by consensus without great difficulty. This provision, besides stipulating the actual setting up of the information bureau, defines the bureau's tasks as being the transmission of information to the bureau of the adverse party, the conduct of enquiries in response to requests for information, and the communication of information to the families concerned. However, all these activities must only be carried out if they have no potentially harmful consequences for the victim or his family.

## **Part VII — Execution of the present Protocol**

The articles in this Part were adopted at the third session.

## Part VIII — Final provisions

Working Group C of Committee I dealt with the final clauses. These articles did not give rise to long debates. The following provisions, of a similar tenor to those of Protocol I, were adopted by consensus in Committee: *Signature, Ratification, Accession, Entry into force, Amendment, Notifications, Registration and Authentic texts.*

Nonetheless, two points are worthy of special attention: firstly, the deposit of two instruments, the figure proposed by the ICRC, was felt to be sufficient, and was maintained for the entry into force of the Protocol; secondly, no proposal to include an article on reservations was put forward, and in this respect, the Protocol will be bound by customary law.

Finally, it should be noted that Committee I adopted a provision relating to *denunciation* which was not mentioned in the ICRC's draft. The ICRC, in fact, taking as a basis the special nature of Protocol II, whose field of application is limited to the territory of the State which has committed itself to applying it, had not provided for a denunciation clause. Nonetheless, a number of delegations expressed the wish that a provision of this kind be included, with a view to making the situation clear and consistent with treaty law.

### C. WEAPONS

During the fourth session, the *Ad Hoc* Committee set up a working group to consider various proposals relating to the prohibition or limitation of the use of certain conventional weapons.

The group came out strongly against the use of weapons designed to wound by means of fragments not detectable by X-ray. A broad measure of understanding was also reached with regard to mines and booby-traps, particularly the recording of mine-fields, restriction of the use of remotely emplaced mines, mines and other devices in inhabited areas and the prohibition of the use of certain explosive and non-explosive devices. A solid basis of discussion was established with regard to incendiary weapons.

Documents were also submitted in respect of other classes of weapons, including fuel-air explosives and small-calibre weapons, but they were not unanimously approved. They will probably have to be the subject of thorough technical discussion before agreement can be reached.

As to the follow-up to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, it was finally agreed that no instrument prohibiting or limiting the use of certain conventional weapons should be proposed in plenary since many delegations took the view that the Conference was not the proper forum for adopting such instruments. An article instituting a standing committee to study weapons in the light of the relevant provisions of Protocol I was proposed and briefly discussed before being referred to Committee I.

It was also tacitly agreed that the considerable amount of work done by the *Ad Hoc* Committee and by the Conferences of Government Experts in 1974 and 1976 should not be ignored and that one or more resolutions specifying the follow-up action to be taken on their work should be adopted in plenary (see below, plenary meetings).

#### D. DRAFTING

The work of drafting the texts began during the third session, but when this ended there was still much to be done on the articles adopted by the Committees. For this reason the Secretariat of the Diplomatic Conference, with the help of ICRC experts, carried out preparatory work during September 1976. Then, in January 1977, a special working group, composed of members of the Drafting Committee, experts in the various working languages designated by the Conference Secretary-General, and of ICRC experts, examined the texts and produced proposals to be presented to the Drafting Committee. The latter met on 18 March 1977 and held 28 meetings between that date and 5 April, examining the articles adopted by the Committees and establishing their final wording.

Later, during the fourth session of the Conference, the Drafting Committee held ten meetings in which it reviewed the articles adopted in committee during that session; it resolved several problems of terminology and language for all the texts. The position of various articles and the arrangement of the chapters were also subjected to thorough revision.

The Drafting Committee carried on its deliberations in four working languages: French, English, Spanish and Russian. An Arabic text was drafted by a group of delegates from the Arab states, who formed a team to produce the Arabic version, which was then adopted by the Drafting Committee.

On the subject of the Chinese text, the Swiss delegation stated that this would be established later in co-operation with the Government of the People's Republic of China, before being submitted to the States parties to the Conference.

The Drafting Committee did its best to standardize the terminology used, the different Committees of the Conference having worked apart from each other and used different words to describe the same matters. Efforts were also made to produce an equivalence among the various languages. The task was not made easy by the fact that frequently the texts adopted by the Committees were the result of compromises made simultaneously in all the working languages. Many such texts being the product of long negotiations before they had been agreed were extremely difficult to modify, and to some of them the Drafting Committee abandoned any attempt to make changes.

Only in a few exceptional cases did the Drafting Committee refer texts back to the Committee themselves for explanations of their meaning, and the problems were in each case settled to the satisfaction of all the delegations, usually by consensus.

## **II. PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE CONFERENCE**

### **A. PROTOCOL I**

#### **Title of the Protocol**

Except for a few slight linguistic changes made by the Drafting Committee, the title of the Protocol was adopted by consensus in the form given to it by Committee I.

#### **Preamble**

The text adopted by Committee I was adopted without amendment by consensus.

#### **Part I — General provisions**

By 87 votes to one, with 11 abstentions, Article 1 was adopted in the form approved by Committee I at the first session, with only two amend-

ments made by the Drafting Committee: the title now reads *General principles and scope of application* and the paragraphs have been placed in another order.

Article 2 (*Definitions*) was adopted by consensus after the Drafting Committee had added the definition of the expression “rules of international law applicable in armed conflict”, which formerly appeared in Part III.

Articles 3-7 were adopted by consensus in the form approved by Committee I at the second session, although a few drafting improvements were incorporated.

## **Part II — Wounded, sick and shipwrecked**

No substantial changes were made to the articles of Part II as approved by Committee II. They were all adopted by consensus in plenary.

## **Part III — Methods and means of warfare — Combatant and prisoner-of-war status**

### *SECTION I—METHODS AND MEANS OF WARFARE*

The articles of this section were adopted by consensus, with the exception of Article 42—*Occupants of aircraft* (formerly Article 39)—which was put to the vote and adopted by 71 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.

### *SECTION II—COMBATANT AND PRISONER-OF-WAR STATUS*

Four of the five articles of this section were adopted by consensus, the exception being Article 44—*Combatants and prisoners of war* (formerly Article 42)—which was put to the vote and adopted by 73 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions. It is fair to say that had the Conference been unable to find, if not an area of agreement, then at least an agreement to disagree which opened the way to a compromise on this crucial point, the general outcome of the work would have suffered accordingly.

## **Part IV — Civilian population**

### *SECTION I—GENERAL PROTECTION AGAINST EFFECTS OF HOSTILITIES*

Although most of the provisions of this section were adopted by consensus, with a few slight amendments, the same was not true of all of

them. For instance, Article 51—*Protection of the civilian population* (formerly Article 46)—was put to the vote at the request of one delegation and adopted by 77 votes to one, with 16 abstentions. The same delegation also called for a vote on Articles 52, 57 and 58, and the results were as follows: Article 52—*General protection of civilian objects* (formerly Article 47)—79 votes for, none against, and 47 abstentions; Article 57—*Precautions in attack* (formerly Article 50)—90 votes for, none against, and 4 abstentions; Article 58—*Precautions against the effects of attacks* (formerly Article 51)—80 votes for, none against, and 8 abstentions.

#### **SECTION II—RELIEF IN FAVOUR OF THE CIVILIAN POPULATION**

The four articles of this section were adopted without amendment by consensus.

#### **SECTION III—TREATMENT OF PERSONS IN THE POWER OF A PARTY TO THE CONFLICT**

The eight articles of this section were also adopted by consensus subject to a few minor amendments of form.

### **Part V — Execution of the Conventions and of the Protocol**

#### **SECTION I—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

The plenary meeting made no changes to Articles 80, 81, 82 and 84 (formerly Articles 70, 70 *bis*, 71 and 73), which Committee I had adopted at the second session.

On the other hand, paragraph 3 of Article 83—*Dissemination* (formerly Article 72)—which required the High Contracting Parties to report at intervals of four years on what they were doing to disseminate knowledge of humanitarian law, was deleted by 45 votes to 30, with 14 abstentions.

#### **SECTION II—REPRESSION OF BREACHES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND OF THE PROTOCOL**

Articles 85, 86, 87, 88, 89 and 91 were adopted without amendment and by consensus, as drafted by Committee I at the third and fourth sessions.

Article 90—*International Fact-Finding Commission*—was adopted by 49 votes to 21, with 15 abstentions, after undergoing some amendment: in particular, it was specified that only those High Contracting Parties which declare that they recognize *ipso facto* the competence of the Commission will elect its members.

Draft Article 77 on superior orders was deleted after receiving only 38 votes to 25, with 25 abstentions; opposition, both from those who regarded the draft as too ambitious and from those who considered that it did not go far enough, prevented it from securing the required two-thirds majority.

## **Part VI — Final provisions**

Part VI, adopted by Committee I, was supplemented by an article produced by Committee II: this was Article 98 (formerly 18 bis) on the revision of Annex I to the Protocol (Regulations concerning identification). The technical nature of this Annex made it appear desirable for it to be revised more easily and more frequently than the Protocol itself.

By contrast, the plenary session, following Committee I, rejected by 42 votes to 36, with 17 abstentions, a new proposed article on reservations. It decided not to retain draft Article 86 bis for the creation of a committee on conventional weapons (59 votes for, 32 against and 10 abstentions). Many delegations preferred the creation of such a committee to be discussed during a conference on the subject of conventional weapons. In this regard, attention should be drawn to operative paragraphs 3 to 6 of Resolution 22 (IV), adopted one week later by the Conference.

## **Regulations concerning Identification (Annex I to Protocol I)**

In its plenary session on 1 June 1977, the Conference adopted by consensus the whole of the Regulations concerning identification.

The resolutions concerning signalling systems were adopted in the plenary session of 7 June 1977:

— Resolution 17, addressed to the International Civil Aviation Organization;

- Resolution 18, addressed to the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization;
- Resolution 19, addressed to the International Telecommunication Union.

## B. PROCOTOL II

### (a) Introduction

A simplified Protocol II, containing 28 provisions, was adopted by consensus in plenary meeting of the Conference. The draft presented by the Committees had 49 provisions—what had happened? In the fourth session, the last of the Conference, there appeared a marked tendency to simplify the text, especially among delegations from the Third World. This tendency was nothing new, the Canadian delegation having put forward an amendment on these lines at the second session.

When the plenary meetings were due to start, it became obvious that the draft as established by the Committees would not be acceptable to all as it stood. The Pakistan delegation, having previously consulted numerous other delegations, took the initiative of drawing up a simplified Protocol intended to meet certain wishes, especially that the rules included should be simple, capable of being applied and respected by all those concerned and of providing complete guarantees of respect for national sovereignty and for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of the State on whose territory a conflict was taking place.

The Pakistan draft by was a simplified version of the texts adopted in committee, with no major changes in wording. The plenary meeting of the Conference, when presented with this draft, regarded it as an amendment to the draft produced by the Committees which had been taken as a working basis for the discussion. Protocol II in its final form is largely the proposal made by Pakistan, however, with some additional provisions. The result was achieved by a last-minute consensus described by the majority of delegates as a “realistic compromise”, attained by numerous consultations which led to agreement between inter-regional groups.

### (b) Analysis of the text adopted

*Note:* It was decided not to use the expression “parties to the conflict” each time that it was mentioned in the text, so as to avoid any appearance of recognition of rebel movements.

## PART I—SCOPE OF THE PROTOCOL

Part I retains three of the five provisions of the Committees' draft. The first Article—*Material field of application*—which forms the cornerstone of the instrument, was submitted to a roll-call vote and was adopted by 58 votes to 5, with 29 abstentions. The vote on this article, the subject of long debate in the first session, reflects the various tendencies with regard to the entire Protocol. The significance of the votes and abstentions varied: some delegations voted against or abstained because they considered the threshold of application was still too low, others did the same for the opposite reason, that they considered the conditions of application too restrictive and applicable only to conflicts of extreme intensity.

The scope of application has therefore been defined very precisely and has been limited, as decided by the Committee, to armed conflicts “which take place in the territory of a High Contracting Party between its armed forces and dissident armed forces or other organized armed groups which, under responsible command, exercise such control over a part of its territory as to enable them to carry out sustained and concerted military operations and to implement this Protocol”.

Articles 2—*Personal field of application*—and 3—*Non-intervention*—were adopted by consensus, without amendment. On the other hand, the provisions relating to the *legal status* and the *equality of rights and duties* of parties to a conflict were omitted on a motion by Pakistan.

It should be pointed out that, as the first article indicates, “This Protocol . . . develops and supplements Article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 without modifying its existing conditions of application”. The rule concerning the legal status of parties to a conflict was already included in common Article 3 and was merely reaffirmed. As to the principle of equality of parties to a conflict, this has always been implicitly recognized within the strict context of the rules of humanitarian law.

## PART II—HUMANE TREATMENT

This vital Part aims to grant basic guarantees of treatment for all persons affected by a conflict, that is, all those not taking part, or no longer taking part, in the hostilities, whatever their circumstances (the wounded, the sick, persons deprived of liberty).

The provision concerning *Fundamental guarantees* (Article 4) has been supplemented as compared with the original text prepared by the Committees: it now includes the essential principles which had been embodied in articles deleted for the purposes of simplifying the Protocol. For example, the principle of *quarter*, which had been dealt with in a separate article, was added to the first paragraph of Article 4, which states: "It is prohibited to order that there shall be no survivors".

The list of acts prohibited at any time and in any place now includes mutilation and rape. These two additions were made to fill the gap left by omission of the provision relating to the treatment of women and children, which was partially covered by the provisions of Article 4, and by the deletion of an article defining certain methods for the protection of persons deprived of their liberty, which originally appeared in the Part on "Sick and wounded".

Finally, paragraph 3 of Article 4 restates, in simplified form, the article of the original draft providing that children should receive privileged treatment. The ban on "collective penalties", changed to "collective punishments" in a concern for accuracy, was retained, despite the Pakistan proposal which advocated its deletion. Article 5—*Persons whose liberty has been restricted* makes use of the original text, omitting only two short paragraphs on working conditions for the persons in question, and recommending that visits to them should be facilitated.

## **Article 6 — Penal prosecutions**

A number of delegations thought that it was impossible to retain the rule providing that, in the case of prosecution solely for having taken part in an armed conflict, the court should take into consideration the fact that the accused respected the provisions of the Protocol, and that in any such case any death penalty pronounced should not be carried out until the end of the hostilities. The same delegations thought it pointless to include mention of the right to seek pardon or commutation of the sentence, since this right, they claimed, existed already in the great majority of national legislations.

Although this view was not unanimously accepted, the rules referred to were deleted by consensus in order not to spoil the compromise, so laboriously established, on the Protocol as whole.

Apart from this deletion, which is regrettable, Article 6 corresponds to the text as originally drafted by the Committees. The article relating to “reprisals”, entitled *Unconditional respect*, was, by consensus, deleted. A large number of delegations thought that such a concept had no place in the context of a non-international armed conflict. In any case, all persons protected by Article 4—*Fundamental guarantees*—are covered against any measures of retortion, by the insertion in the article of the provision banning collective punishments.

### *PART III—WOUNDED, SICK AND SHIPWRECKED*

The Part concerning the protection of wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons pertains, from its origin, pre-eminently to the law of Geneva, universally recognized.

The initial draft by the ICRC contained rules worded rather briefly, since, although directly drawn from the corresponding Part of Protocol I, consideration was given to the special conditions of hostilities in a non-international armed conflict. When examined by the Committees, these provisions became considerably denser, and came to include almost the whole of the parallel texts of Protocol I. The final draft form is almost a return to the starting point: the guiding principles were retained, while detailed methods of application were dropped. The basic rule of this Part, namely, the principle that wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons should be respected and protected, was nevertheless retained under its original title, as adopted in the Committees. The same is true for the provision relating to *Protection of medical duties*. The separate rule for protection of the physical and mental health of persons deprived of their liberty was inserted in Article 5 (paragraph 2 (e)), which lays down the minimal guarantees to be granted to such persons. Articles dealing with *Search* (Article 8), the *Protection of medical and religious personnel* (Article 9), the *Protection of medical units and transports* (Article 11) and the *Distinctive emblem* (Article 12) were retained in a very simplified form, proposed in the Pakistan amendment and adopted by consensus.

It should also be pointed out that the delegations deleted, by consensus, the article relating to *Definitions*, judged to be too detailed for the context of Protocol II.

The role of the *Civilian population and relief organizations* no longer appears in this Part, the concept having been merged into a single rule on relief which will be examined at a later stage in this summary.

## PART IV—CIVILIAN POPULATION

The former Part on *Methods and means of combat* in the original Committees' draft, was eliminated. The ICRC in this connection had proposed various rules of conduct by the combatants upon the application of which they could rely and which would thus have made it possible to provide protection for the civilian population not taking part in the hostilities. Although some delegations at the outset were not enthusiastic about the inclusion of these provisions in Protocol II, this Part had been further enlarged in Committee by an article on *Protection of cultural objects*. The Pakistan proposal provided for the deletion of the entire Part, except for the article on *Quarter*, the principle of which was covered by the article on *Fundamental guarantees*. While the articles on *Prohibition of perfidy* and *Recognized signs* were eliminated by consensus, this was not the case with *Prohibition of unnecessary injury* and *Safeguard of an enemy hors de combat* which were voted on and failed to pass by, respectively, 25 to 19 with 33 abstentions, and 22 to 15, with 42 abstentions. The proposal by Pakistan was thus adopted, except for the provision on *Protection of cultural objects*, which was retained after a lively discussion and which is now included in the Part *Civilian population*, as we shall see below.

The Part *Civilian population* is no longer divided into chapters. The original draft had three chapters: I *General protection against effects of hostilities*, II *Civil defence* and III *Measures in favour of children*.

The chapter on *Civil defence*, already reduced by the Committees to a very brief article, was eliminated by consensus, as a majority of the delegations considered that rules for civil defence did not belong in Protocol II. The most important of the measures in favour of children were incorporated into Article 4 (paragraph 3 (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e)—*Fundamental guarantees*).

Rules for general protection against the effects of hostilities were substantially modified. On the initiative of Pakistan, a single general article on protection of the civilian population replaced the basic rules which established the distinctions between civilian population and combatants and between civilian objects and military objectives, defined civilian population, and forbade indiscriminate attacks. This single article repeated the last three paragraphs of the original text of the article entitled *Protection of the civilian population*.

These amputations were not all made by consensus.

A roll-call vote was requested on maintenance of the basic rules. This failed to pass by a narrow margin, with 36 votes in favour, 19 against and 36 abstentions.

A vote was also requested on retaining the principle of forbidding indiscriminate attacks; 30 delegations voted in favour, 25 against and 34 abstained.

These votes revealed differences of opinion on questions of major importance, especially if we take into account the fact that the abstentions often reflected the desire to respect the compromise agreed upon by the regional groups in advance of the plenary meetings. This “gentlemen’s agreement” was frequently referred to during the discussion.

The principle of general protection of civilian objects was not maintained.

Such protection was limited to three categories of civilian objects:

- (a) *objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population;*
- (b) *works and installations containing dangerous forces;*
- (c) *cultural objects and places of worship.*

(a) *Objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population.*

The Pakistani amendment proposed the deletion of this provision, a very important one since it postulated the principle of forbidding the use against civilians of famine as a method of combat. Tribute must be paid at this point to the delegation of the Holy See which, by its energetic intervention, succeeded in preserving this provision by consensus.

(b) *Works and installations containing dangerous forces.*

The principle of protecting these was maintained, in a simplified article.

(c) *Cultural objects and places of worship.*

A large number of delegations were opposed to the deletion of this provision, called for by Pakistan, in a long and involved discussion during which several amendments of the original text were presented. The

controversy concerned not only the desirability of having such an article included in Protocol II but also its wording, especially its reference to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property, on which there was a total divergence of views.

The article was nevertheless adopted, by 35 to 15 with 32 abstentions.

Prohibition of forced movement of civilians was adopted by consensus, in the form of the Committees' original text.

There remains the question of relief. This was the subject of a separate Part in the initial draft. This Part, which, after examination by the Committees, contained two provisions relating to relief and the recording of information about victims of conflicts, was not maintained as a Part *per se*. *Recording and information* was eliminated by consensus. A single and concise article on relief was finally adopted and inserted at the end of the Part *Civilian Population*. This article, entitled *Relief societies and relief actions*, has the effect of replacing both the provision relating to relief societies, which had been in Part II, and the article on relief.

It reads as follows:

1. Relief societies located in the territory of the High Contracting Party, such as Red Cross (Red Crescent, Red Lion and Sun) organizations, may offer their services for the performance of their traditional functions in relation to the victims of the armed conflict. The civilian population may, even on its own initiative, offer to collect and care for the wounded, sick and shipwrecked.
2. If the civilian population is suffering undue hardship owing to a lack of the supplies essential for its survival, such as foodstuffs and medical supplies, relief actions for the civilian population which are of an exclusively humanitarian and impartial nature and which are conducted without any adverse distinction shall be undertaken subject to the consent of the High Contracting Party concerned.

This drastic formula is regrettable and it is hoped that it will never give rise to restrictive interpretations which would limit relief actions for the benefit of innocent victims, bearing particularly in mind that famine remains forbidden as a method of combat.

#### *PART V—FINAL PROVISIONS*

Before taking up the final clauses, attention should be drawn to the elimination from the Protocol of Part VII of the ICRC draft, *Execution of the present Protocol*, containing various provisions designed to assure

the putting into effect of the instrument. The *Measures for execution*, *Special agreements* and *Co-operation in the observance of the Protocol* were deleted by consensus. The principles contained in those articles are nevertheless implied. For example, the provision which required each party to take the necessary measures to ensure observance of the Protocol constituted only an elaboration of one of the conditions for its application, now stated in Article 1 which specifies that organized armed groups must exercise such control as to enable them to implement the Protocol. Moreover, it will still obviously be possible for parties to conflicts, even in the absence of any written rule to this effect, to conclude, if they wish, agreements designed to put into effect all or part of the Conventions or of Protocol I. The possibilities for the ICRC to offer its services to parties to a conflict also remain unchanged, like the other provisions of Article 3 common to the Conventions, which are supplemented and developed in Protocol II, as expressly indicated in paragraph 1 of Article 1.

Only a brief reference to dissemination has been retained from this Part of the draft. It now constitutes Article 19—*Dissemination*, the first article under Part V, *Final provisions*.

The final provisions themselves require little comment. They were adopted by consensus at the plenary meeting without debate. We may recall, as previously stated, that the deposit of two instruments of ratification or accession suffice for the entry into force of the Protocol, six months thereafter. The final provisions contain no clause on reservations.

Protocol II will certainly seem very brief to some people. One might also regret that this instrument should have such a high threshold for its applicability. It nevertheless constitutes a major advance in international humanitarian law in armed conflicts, for all the basic guarantees for protection of the human person have been strengthened and supplemented.

It is still impossible to foresee the future of this new Protocol. We can nonetheless hail its adoption, which crowns the efforts of the international community as a whole, and we can recognize that, as the President of the ICRC had expressed the hope at the opening of the first session of the Conference, the universality of the Law of Geneva has been preserved.

### C. WEAPONS

As expected, no concrete proposal for restriction or prohibition was made in plenary meeting.

On the subject of action to be taken to follow up the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, although the draft article providing for a permanent committee to study weapons was finally rejected (see above), a consensus was reached on a Conference resolution recommending, *inter alia*, that a Conference of Governments should be convened not later than 1979 with a view to reaching agreements prohibiting or restricting the use of specific conventional weapons and specifying arrangements for the revision of such agreements and the consideration of new proposals. It also recommended that a consultative meeting of all interested Governments be convened during September/October 1977 to examine the problems presented by the organization of such a conference, prior to consideration of the question by the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly.

As we can see, specific meetings have been provided for and time limits set. We therefore have good reason to hope that the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee will not have been done in vain.

#### D. FINAL PLENARY MEETINGS

##### (a) Adoption of Protocols — Statements

A large number of delegations, on the occasion of the adoption of the two Protocols, wished to express their attitudes toward the two instruments. Most of the speakers emphasized the progress which had been achieved, despite the numerous differences of opinion apparent at the beginning and throughout the work, through the spirit of conciliation and the determination to succeed which made it possible to surmount so many obstacles. Only general good will made it possible to adopt the Protocols by consensus, despite the reservations expressed by some participants.

##### (b) Resolutions

After completing the adoption of the two Protocols, article by article, the Conference adopted several resolutions.

Three of these, concerning the identification of medical transports and related to the Regulations concerning Identification (Annex I to Protocol I, see above), were adopted by consensus. These were resolutions 17, 18 and 19 (IV).

Resolution 20 (IV), adopted by 53 to 0 with 33 abstentions, urges States which have not yet done so to become parties to the Hague Convention of 14 May 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property, and to its Protocol. The purpose of that Convention is closely related to Article 53 of Protocol I and Article 16 of Protocol II, both entitled *Protection of cultural objects and places of worship*.

Resolution 21 (IV) stressing the need for effective dissemination of knowledge of international humanitarian law was passed by 63 to 2 with 21 abstentions. It reminds the High Contracting Parties of their obligation under the Conventions and of the support which the ICRC, the National Red Cross, Red Crescent and Red Lion and Sun Societies and appropriate institutions may give in accomplishing this task.

The follow-up of work on conventional weapons is dealt with in Resolution 22 (IV), which was adopted by consensus (see above).

Lastly, in Resolution 24 (IV), adopted by acclamation, the Conference expressed its gratitude to Switzerland and to the ICRC for their contributions to the success of the work.

#### **(c) Signature of final Act**

At the last meeting, opened with speeches by Mr. Hay, President of the ICRC, Mr. Graber, President of the Conference, and Mr. Sultan, Head of the Delegation of the Arab Republic of Egypt, the representatives of 98 States and of three national liberation movements signed in turn the Final Act of the Conference. The President then declared the Conference closed. Four more States signed the Final Act during the next few days, bringing the number of signatory States to 102.

The signing of the Final Act serves only the purpose of authenticating the texts adopted, as the Protocols will not be open to signature and accession until 12 December, on the occasion of an official ceremony at Berne.

---

# INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

---

## Visits by ICRC President

Mr. Alexandre Hay, President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, visited Damascus from 21 to 24 June and was received by Mr. Hafez el Assad, President of the Syrian Arab Republic. He also had talks with Mr. Abdel Halim Khaddam, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, General Mustapha Tlass, Minister of Defence, Dr. Madani al-Khyami, Minister of Health, and Mr. Abdalla Al-Ahmar, Deputy Secretary-General of the Baath Party.

These talks enabled Mr. Hay to explain to the Syrian leaders the humanitarian concerns of the ICRC with regard to the situation in the Middle East. He was accompanied by Mr. J.-P. Hocké, ICRC Director of Operations, and Mr. D. Delapraz, ICRC delegate in Damascus.

\*

On 25 June, at Teheran, Mr. Hay was received by H.I.M. the Emperor of Iran, to whom he handed reports prepared by ICRC delegates following their visits to a score of places of detention in Iran.

\*

The President of the ICRC addressed the Swiss Institute of International Studies, of the University of Zurich, on 28 June 1977. The title of his lecture was *Humanitarian work in an inhuman world*.

## **President of the Moroccan Red Crescent visits ICRC**

H.R.H. the Princess Lalla Malika, President of the Moroccan Red Crescent, visited international Red Cross institutions in Geneva from 15 to 18 June.

The Princess spent the day of the 16th at the League of Red Cross Societies, where she was welcomed by Mr. H. Beer, Secretary General, and his principal officials. Subsequently, she had talks with the heads of Relief Operations, Information, technical services and regional services.

On 17 June, the President of the Moroccan Red Crescent was received at the International Committee of the Red Cross by President Alexandre Hay and Vice-President Jean Pictet, together with the heads of various ICRC Departments. Following a discussion of matters of common interest to the Moroccan Red Crescent and the ICRC, the Princess visited the Central Tracing Agency in the company of its Deputy Director, Mr. N. Vecsey, and watched a multivision presentation of the activities of the ICRC. The Princess then attended a working luncheon, with the ICRC President, the delegate general, and the regional delegate particularly concerned with North African affairs.

During her visit to Geneva, the President of the Moroccan Red Crescent was accompanied by Mr. A. Bouachrine, first Vice-President of the National Society, Mrs. Fatima Hassar, its Deputy Secretary-General, Dr. Nashnash, Secretary-General of the Tangier provincial committee, and other prominent persons.

## **Visit of Prince Hassan of Jordan**

On the occasion of his visit to Geneva to take part in the International Labour Conference, HRH Prince Hassan of Jordan paid a courtesy visit to the ICRC, on 10 June.



H.R.H. Lalla Malika, president of the Moroccan Red Crescent, visiting the ICRC Central Tracing Agency. Mr. N. Vecsey, deputy director of the Agency, explains details of its work.

Photos : G. Leblanc/ICRC

H.R.H. Prince Hassan of Jordan signs the ICRC's Golden Book in the presence of President Alexandre Hay. At right, Mr. Michel Convers, ICRC delegate general for the Middle East.





Distribution of milk, a gift from the ICRC, by the Bolivian Red Cross at a school in La Paz. Señora Bertha Duán de Montes, vice-president of the National Society (standing at centre) watches the distribution.

The reading room of the library of the Red Crescent Society of Afghanistan.



He was received by Mr. Alexandre Hay, President of the ICRC, accompanied by the senior members of his staff. The Prince and the President discussed the humanitarian problems arising out of the situation in the Middle East.

### *ACCESSION TO THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS*

In declarations dated 10 February 1977, received by the Swiss Government on 25 May 1977, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen acceded to the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of victims of war.

The accessions were accompanied by the following statement:

*The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that the accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to these Conventions does not in any manner imply recognition of Israel.*

In conformity with the provisions of the Conventions, the accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen will take effect six months after the date of receipt of the declarations by the Swiss Government, namely on 25 November 1977.

---

# IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

---

## EXHIBITION OF THE MOROCCAN RED CRESCENT AT CASTIGLIONE MUSEUM

The Red Cross Museum at Castiglione is at present the scene of an exhibition of the Moroccan Red Crescent. Among the features of the exhibition are displays depicting the main activities of this National Society, those of its Central Committee and the more individualized ones of its local committees. Visitors to the museum can also see Moroccan craftsmen at work, together with the colourful and picturesque finished works of art which the craftsmen themselves present to the public. The exhibition was organized to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Moroccan Red Crescent.

The inaugural ceremony was held on 19 June, attended by Mr. Emilio Ondeï, Chairman of the Museum's Management Board; Mr. Ezio Mutti, the Director; Mr. Pierre Gaillard, ICRC Adviser and Vice-President of the Museum, who represented our organization; and Mr. L. Akerhielm, representing the Henry-Dunant Institute and the League of Red Cross Societies. The first vice-president of the Moroccan Red Crescent, Mr. A. Bouachrine, gave the opening address, and expressed the apologies of H.R.H. Princess Lalla Malika, President of the National Society, who had been unable to travel to Italy for the occasion. Mr. Pierre Gaillard presented the compliments of the ICRC and its hopes for the success of the exhibition, pointing out that this display by a Red Crescent Society, held in a Red Cross Museum, is a striking example of the unity of our universal movement.

The exhibition of the Moroccan Red Crescent will stay open to the general public until mid-September.

---

## HIGHEST DISTINCTION OF DUTCH RED CROSS AWARDED TO DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL TRACING SERVICE

On the occasion of the 1977 World Red Cross Day—celebrated on 8 May—the Dutch Red Cross honoured the International Tracing Service (ITS) at Arolsen by awarding the Gold Cross of Merit to the Director, Mr. Albert de Cocatrix.

During the ceremony at the Dutch Red Cross central headquarters in The Hague, Jonkheer G. Kraijenhoff, Chairman of the Central Committee, paid tribute to the humanitarian work still being performed by the ITS more than thirty years after the end of the Second World War, and spoke of the excellent and highly fruitful working relationship that the Dutch Red Cross has had with the Service throughout that period.

All the documentation on people affected, in one way or another, by the Second World War is centralized at Arolsen. The files are still growing, due to the continued research carried out by the ITS, and the impressive archives section now contains information on some fourteen million people who had been civilian workers or underwent forced labour, deportation, evacuation, transfer, detention in concentration camps or prisons, etc. Even today, the ITS receives daily requests for information and investigation, many of which come from the Netherlands. It was in grateful recognition of the humanitarian work of the ITS that the Dutch Red Cross awarded its Gold Cross of Merit, the highest distinction it can give, to the ITS and its Director.

Accepting the award, Mr. A. de Cocatrix, the ITS Director, expressed his sincere gratitude and emphasized how moved he was by this gesture, particularly as it was the first time that the ITS, which has been responsible to the ICRC since 1955, had been honoured in such a way.

### SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF RED CROSS AND HEALTH FILMS, IN VARNA

The seventh International Festival of Red Cross and Health Films took place in Varna, Bulgaria, from 16 to 27 June 1977. Held under the auspices of the World Health Organizations (WHO), it was organized by the Bulgarian Red Cross in conjunction with the League of Red Cross Societies. The festival was officially opened by Dr. Kiril Ignatov, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Red Cross. Mr. Marcel Carraud, President of the French Red Cross, spoke on behalf of the League.

The ICRC was represented by Dr. J. de Rougemont, a member of the Committee, Mr. A. Modoux, head of the ICRC's Press and Information Division, and Mr. P. Grand d'Hauteville, regional delegate for Europe.

The Varna festival, organized for the first time in 1965, has become a highly popular worldwide cinema event. It is intended not only to provide for a competition between films on the Red Cross and on health, with awards for the best, but also to stimulate film production in the Red Cross world. The cinema is indeed an ideal means in our time to promote Red Cross and constitutes a very effective instrument for teaching and training.

The screening committee accepted 138 film for showing, from 41-countries and five international organizations. Among the prize-winning entries in the « Red Cross films » category were « Bitter Lessons », presented by the USSR, which won the Grand Prix of the President of the Bulgarian Red Cross, and « Faces », presented by the French Red Cross, which received the Grand Prix of the League of Red Cross Societies. Among the films devoted to the popularizing of science, « The Red Cross Drum » (Czechoslovakia), received a gold medal. Three short films, co-produced by the World Health Organization, the International Labour Office and the League of Red Cross Societies, won a silver medal.

## IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

Two other films presenting the activities of international organizations and of National Societies were given awards: « Humanity at Work », from Canada (gold medal) and « Our Symbol, the Squirrel », from Poland (silver medal).

The prize offered by the Committee for the Diffusion of Arts and Letters through the Cinema went to Mr. Marc Gazay, National Director of Information and Public Relations of the French Red Cross and former head of the Office of Information of the League of Red Cross Societies.

---

## *DISSEMINATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS*

At virtually any point on the globe there are Red Cross Societies, ICRC delegations and other persons of good will, working independently and free of any official ties to spread knowledge of the Geneva Conventions and the principles of the Red Cross, aware of the fact that they are thus helping to establish an atmosphere of better understanding among men.

As Professor Hans Haug, President of the Swiss Red Cross, wrote in his message for World Red Cross Day 1977,

*... Every day, and almost everywhere in the world, the Red Cross is doing inestimable humanitarian work in its struggle against the ills of mankind in all their forms and regardless of their cause. The Red Cross tries to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human person. Its principles of "humanity" and "impartiality" demand that it reject any form of discrimination in performing its activities. No one in need should be given preferential treatment or be neglected on the grounds of his nationality, race, religion, social origin or political opinion. This work which, in its protection and assistance activities, is guided by unconditional humanitarian thought and which does not recognize the barriers erected between individuals and peoples, may be considered a work of peace. It helps to draw men together, to reconcile them and to deepen their mutual understanding, it improves their living conditions and thereby strengthens the spirit and faith so indispensable for peace.*

This is the Red Cross spirit which those working to disseminate the Geneva Conventions are trying to spread. In its February 1977 issue, *International Review* gave some examples of the work being undertaken in connection with this long-term activity; further instances are given here below.

### **Jordan**

Last April, the head of the ICRC delegation in Amman gave the Director of the Education Department of the Jordanian Army 600 copies of the booklet "Summary of the Geneva Conventions" and 600 copies of the "Soldier's Manual" at a ceremony held at Armed Forces H.Q. and attended by several senior officers and journalists. Those booklets, in Arabic, have been published by the ICRC and will be distributed among the units of the Jordanian Armed Forces to instruct the troops in the Conventions.

### **Afghanistan**

The Afghan Red Crescent has opened a library and reading room where Red Cross publications, including basic works, general books and periodicals will be made available. The walls are bedecked with posters issued by the ICRC and the League, providing a constant reminder to visitors, the members of the Afghan Red Crescent and the general public of the ideals of the Red Cross and the principles of our movement.<sup>1</sup>

### **Tunisia**

The Tunisian Red Crescent organized a National Week from 2 to 8 May on the theme "Peace through people", as proposed by the League. The press, radio and television gave the various events organized by the Red Crescent a broad coverage. In the provinces, the occasion was marked by the annual distribution of first aid and blood donor certificates.

In his public declarations, and especially during a press conference held at the Red Crescent Headquarters in Tunis on 7 May, Dr. Fourati, President of the Tunisian Red Crescent, appealed for more first aid workers, whose number is considered to be too low in proportion to the population, and he also asked that the public adopt a more understanding attitude towards blood donating. Even so, to date the Red Crescent has trained 5000 first aid workers, 300 assistant instructors and 100 senior instructors.

The Tunisian Red Crescent had invited the ICRC to send a representative to lecture on the Geneva Conventions in military academies, nursing schools and regional Red Crescent Committees. The ICRC delegated Mr. Pierre Gaillard who was well received wherever he went and who found, from the many questions put to him, that there was a lively interest in the Conventions and ICRC activities. At the end of each meeting, the ICRC film, "In the beginning, Solferino", was shown.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plate.

## IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

The lectures on the Conventions were delivered successively in Tunis—at the Regional Committee, the Red Crescent Nursing School and the National Health School; at the Military Academy in Fondouk Jedid; at the National Security Force School in Carthage; at the Regional Red Crescent Committee in Sfax, and at the National NCOs' School in Bizerta. The lectures on the Geneva Conventions were thus delivered to large and varied audiences, which included members of the Red Crescent who were naturally well acquainted with the subject, and also trainee nurses, officers and NCOs of the three forces, police officers, police cadets and NCOs to whom the subject was less familiar. Wherever he went, the lecturer was asked for documentation and publications on the subjects of his lectures—the Geneva Conventions and the activities of the ICRC.

Throughout the National Week, the Tunisian Red Crescent put in a considerable amount of work and its efforts were crowned with success for which it is to be congratulated.

*M.T.*

## INTRODUCTORY COURSE ON THE LAW OF NATIONS IN TIME OF WAR

### Geneva

The twenty-fourth introductory course on the law of nations in time of war, which has been organized by the Swiss Army since 1965, was held in Geneva from 26 to 29 April 1977. It was attended by 93 Swiss officers of different grades and a senior officer of the Moroccan Army.

The April 1968 issue of *International Review of the Red Cross* contained an outline of the basic elements of this course which have not been modified since; they cover the Geneva Conventions, the 1907 Hague Regulations, the 1954 Hague Convention for the protection of cultural property, and the law of neutrality, which form the backbone of the course. For four days there were theoretical lectures, practical exercises, films and talks on these various subjects. The course, conducted by fourteen lecturers and group leaders, included several staff members of the ICRC, university lecturers and senior civil servants. The interest which this idea, first introduced in 1965, aroused in participants in the course seemed to be as strong as ever.

*J. de P.*

## THE TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW AT THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL SCHOOL

### United States

The Judge Advocate General School is a part of Virginia University in Charlottesville. It provides courses in military law for lawyers and other members of the armed forces as well as for civilian government lawyers. The courses are divided into several streams—administrative and civil law, penal law, international law and the law of war.

The courses on international humanitarian law, which form part of the syllabus, are aimed at preparing military lawyers to give legal advice to soldiers and their officers, and to examine military plans and operations in order to ensure that they comply with the law of war. The students are also trained to be able to give or run courses on the law of war for other soldiers and officers of the US Armed Forces. The school comprises several grades, each of which contains a course in international humanitarian law.

All officers embarking on a career as judge advocate have to take the basic course which is attended by some 250 to 300 officers every year.

The advanced course is restricted to judge advocates who have completed about five years of active military service. It prepares career military lawyers for the profession of general staff judge advocate.

There is a special course for officers who wish to become instructors in the law of war. This lasts one week and is open to officers who are already judge advocates or who have specialized in other subjects and have had some experience as commanders. It is given four times a year.

Finally, there is a special guidance course for senior officers—colonels or lieutenant-colonels who hold high commands in the armed forces. This course essentially involves discussions—in the form of seminars—on the responsibilities of commanding officers who have to ensure that international humanitarian law is taught to their subordinates and that its rules are included in the practical applications devised during field exercises.

The instruction is given by highly qualified staff who also have practical military experience. This ensures that the instruction given is of the very highest level while not being exclusively academic, and that it includes practical examples and actual case studies. Modern technical media such as films and audio-visual aids are used in the course.

*Jiri Toman.*

### **Portugal**

Last year, the school textbook "The Red Cross and my Country" and the "Teacher's Manual" in Portuguese were distributed by the Portuguese Red Cross to all students completing their training as primary school teachers. In so doing, it arranged for a lecturer to visit each of the teacher training colleges for primary school teachers throughout the country to give an introductory course on the Red Cross, its national and international organization, its activities and its principles, and on the Geneva Conventions. The above-mentioned publications were distributed to the participants at the end of the course. The lectures were organized by the Portuguese Red Cross, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, at 27 schools specializing in the training of primary school teachers. The lectures were very well received by the 4,000 or more students who followed the course and received the ICRC publications.

*M. T.*

## **EXHIBITIONS**

### **Switzerland**

Of recent months, an exhibition, organized by the Swiss National Museum of Zurich, has been on show in a number of Swiss towns on the subject "Switzerland's good offices." In the section devoted to "Humanitarian action" the ICRC describes the work it does under the following headings: the history of the Red Cross, the role of the ICRC, the Geneva Conventions and the Central Tracing Agency. In addition, there are two showcases containing documents relating to the Geneva Conventions and the Agency. This exhibition will also be taken to Linz in Austria, next autumn.

A Geneva bank has made its show-windows available to the ICRC for an exhibition of showcards and photographs. The ICRC is exhibiting in them documents illustrating the landmarks in its history and activities. Two of the windows are devoted to the activities of the Geneva Red Cross branch.

*R. B.*

## Spain

The Spanish Red Cross has devoted much of the April issue of its review, "Cruz Roja Española" to the ICRC and its activities.

After introducing the ICRC and explaining how it is composed and the neutral role it plays as intermediary, the review goes on to discuss two important aspects of its activities—the origin and development of international humanitarian law and the Central Tracing Agency—each in a well-documented and well-illustrated text written with great understanding and feeling. Another aspect of ICRC activities—its relief work and the protection it has afforded in recent armed conflicts—is explained in pictorial form by a magnificent selection of coloured photographs showing ICRC delegates at work among prisoners of war, refugees and wounded, in the Middle East, the Asian Subcontinent, Indo-China, Africa and other places.

This issue of the "Cruz Roja Española" is superb. The excellent articles, while compiled in straightforward language that can be easily understood by nonspecialized readers, maintain a high standard of writing. We should like to congratulate the Spanish Red Cross on this success.

We would suggest that this part of the Spanish Red Cross review might also be read by Spanish-speaking readers in other parts of the world and that it might be reproduced by some National Societies to provide information for their own members and for the public at large.

*M. T.*

---

## **STATES PARTIES TO THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 12 AUGUST 1949**

Below we give the list, drawn up in chronological order, of the States which are Parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, as a result of ratification, accession or a declaration of succession deposited with the Swiss Government before 30 June 1977.

The names of the States are shown in abbreviated form; sometimes the official name of the State may differ from that given in our list. The number in the left-hand margin has no special significance, and has been placed there merely to facilitate reference.

The third column contains the official date of ratification, accession or declaration of succession, while the letter in the fourth column indicates the type of official act received in Berne: R = ratification, A = accession, S = declaration of succession.

A declaration of succession is a statement made by a newly independent country that it continues from the first day of its independence to be bound by the Geneva Conventions previously applied in that country by virtue of the ratification or accession of the State from which it has become independent. The date following the letter S in the fourth column is the date on which the declaration of succession took effect.

The word "Reservations" in the last column means that the signatory State has made reservations as to the application of the Geneva Conventions on its territory.

		OFFICIAL DATES OF RATIFICATIONS, ACCESSIONS OR DECLARATIONS OF SUCCESSION	FORM OF OFFICIAL ACT DEPOSITED AT BERNE	RESERVA- TIONS FORMULATED
<b>1950</b>				
1	Switzerland	31 March	R	
2	Yugoslavia	21 April	R	Reservations
3	Monaco	5 July	R	
4	Liechtenstein	21 September	R	
5	Chile	12 October	R	
6	India	9 November	R	
7	Czechoslovakia	19 December	R	Reservations
<b>1951</b>				
8	Vatican	22 February	R	
9	Philippines, Conv. I	7 March	R	
	Conv. II, III, IV	6 October (1952)	R	
10	Lebanon	10 April	R	
11	Jordan	29 May	A	
12	Pakistan	12 June	R	Reservations
13	Denmark	27 June	R	
14	France	28 June	R	
15	Israel	6 July	R	Reservations
16	Norway	3 August	R	
17	Italy	17 December	R	
<b>1952</b>				
18	Rep. of South Africa	31 March	A	
19	Guatemala	14 May	R	
20	Spain	4 August	R	Reservations
21	Belgium	3 September	R	
22	Mexico	29 October	R	
23	Egypt	10 November	R	
<b>1953</b>				
24	Japan	21 April	A	
25	Salvador	17 June	R	
26	Luxembourg	1 July	R	
27	Austria	27 August	R	
28	San Marino	29 August	A	
29	Syria	2 November	R	
30	Nicaragua	17 December	R	
31	Sweden	28 December	R	

**1954**

32	Turkey	10 February	R	
33	Liberia	29 March	A	
34	Cuba	15 April	R	
35	U.S.S.R.	10 May	R	Reservations
36	Rumania	1 June	R	Reservations
37	Bulgaria	22 July	R	Reservations
38	Ukraine	3 August	R	Reservations
39	Byelorussia	3 August	R	Reservations
40	Netherlands	3 August	R	Reservations
41	Hungary	3 August	R	Reservations
42	Ecuador	11 August	R	
43	Fed. Rep. of Germany	3 September	A	
44	Poland	26 November	R	Reservations
45	Thailand	29 December	A	

**1955**

46	Finland	22 February	R	
47	United States of America	2 August	R	Reservations

**1956**

48	Panama	10 February	A	
49	Venezuela	13 February	R	
50	Iraq	14 February	A	
51	Peru	15 February	R	
53	Libya	22 May	A	
53	Greece	5 June	R	
54	Morocco	26 July	A	
55	Argentina	18 September	R	
56	Afghanistan	26 September	R	
57	Laos	29 October	A	
58	Dem. Rep. of Germany	30 November	A	Reservations
59	People's Rep. of China	28 December	R	Reservations

**1957**

60	Iran	20 February	R	
61	Haiti	11 April	A	
62	Tunisia	4 May	A	
63	Albania	27 May	R	Reservations
64	Viet Nam	28 June	A	Reservations
65	Brazil	29 June	R	
66	Rep. of Korea	27 August	A	Reservations
67	United Kingdom	23 September	R	
68	Sudan	23 September	A	

**1958**

69	Dominican Rep.	22 January	A
70	Ghana	2 August	A
71	Indonesia	30 September	A
72	Australia	14 October	R
73	Cambodia	8 December	A
74	Mongolia	20 December	A

**1959**

75	Sri Lanka Conv. IV	23 February	A
	Conv. I, II, III	28 February	R
76	New Zealand	2 May	R

**1960**

77	Algeria	20 June	A
----	---------	---------	---

**1961**

78	Zaire	20 February	S — as from 30. 6.60	Reservations
79	Portugal	14 March	R	
80	Nigeria	9 June	S — as from 1.10.60	
81	Paraguay	23 October	R	
82	Upper Volta	7 November	S — as from 5. 8.60	
83	Colombia	8 November	R	
84	Benin	14 December	S — as from 1. 8.60	
85	Ivory Coast	28 December	S — as from 7. 8.60	

**1962**

86	Togo	6 January	S — as from 27. 4.60
87	Cyprus	23 May	A
88	Somalia	12 July	A
89	Malaysia	24 August	A
90	Ireland	27 September	R
91	Mauritania	27 October	S — as from 28.11.60
92	Tanzania	12 December	S — as from 9.12.61

**1963**

93	Senegal	23 April	S — as from 20. 6.60
94	Trinidad and Tobago Conv. I	17 May	A
	Conv. II, III, IV	24 September	A
95	Saudi Arabia	18 May	A
96	Malagasy Rep.	13 July	S — as from 26.6.60
97	Cameroon	16 September	S — as from 1. 1.60

**1964**

98	Nepal	7 February	A	
99	Rwanda	21 March	S — as from	1. 7.62
100	Niger	16 April	S — as from	3. 8.60
101	Uganda	18 May	A	
102	Jamaica	17 July	S — as from	6. 8.62

**1965**

103	Gabon	20 February	S — as from	17. 8.60
104	Canada	14 May	R	
105	Mali	24 May	A	
106	Sierra Leone	31 May	S — as from	27. 4.61
107	Iceland	10 August	A	
108	Honduras	31 December	A	

**1966**

109	Central African Emp.	1 August	S — as from	13. 8.60	
110	Rep. of Korea	16 August	A		Reservations
111	Kenya	20 September	A		
112	Gambia	11 October	S — as from	18. 2.65	
113	Zambia	19 October	A		

**1967**

114	Congo (Brazzaville)	30 January	S — as from	15. 8.60
115	Kuwait	2 September	A	

**1968**

116	Malawi	5 January	A	
117	Botswana	29 March	A	
118	Lesotho	20 May	S — as from	4.10.66
119	Guyana	22 July	S — as from	26. 5.66
120	Malta	22 August	S — as form	21. 9.64
121	Barbados	10 September	S — as from	30.11.66

**1969**

122	Uruguay	5 March	R		Reservations
123	Ethiopia	2 October	R		
124	Costa Rica	15 October	A		

**1970**

125	Yemen Arab Rep.	16 July	A	
126	Chad	5 August	A	
127	Mauritius	18 August	S — as from	12. 3.68

<b>1971</b>			
128	Fiji	9 August	S — as from 10.10.70
129	Bahrein	30 November	A
130	Burundi	27 December	S — as from 1. 7.62
<b>1972</b>			
131	Bangladesh	4 April	S — as from 26. 3.71
132	United Arab Emirates	10 May	A
<b>1973</b>			
133	Singapore	27 April	A
134	Swaziland	20 June	A
<b>1974</b>			
135	Oman	31 January	A
136	Guinea Bissau	21 February	A Reservations
<b>1975</b>			
137	Bahamas	11 July	S — as from 10. 7.73
138	Qatar	15 October	A
<b>1976</b>			
139	Sao Tomé and Príncipe	21 May	A
140	Papua - New Guinea	26 May	S — as from 16. 9.75
141	Surinam	13 October	S — as from 25.11.75
142	Bolivia	10 December	R
<b>1977</b>			
143	People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen	25 May	A

On 30 June 1977, 143 States were Parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

**FIVE RECENT ICRC PUBLICATIONS  
ISSUED FOR THE DIPLOMATIC  
CONFERENCE  
ON THE REAFFIRMATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL  
HUMANITARIAN LAW  
APPLICABLE IN ARMED CONFLICTS**

Sw. Fr.

<b>Draft Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, Geneva, 1973; 8vo, 46 pp. . . . .</b>	10.—
<b>Draft Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, Commentary, Geneva, 1973; 8vo, 176 pp. . .</b>	20.—
<b>Conference of Government Experts on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, Geneva, (<i>first session</i>) 1975, 106 pp. . . . .</b>	15.—
<b>Conference of Government Experts on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, Geneva, (<i>second session</i>) 1976, 231 pp. . . . .</b>	22.—
<b>Reservations to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, (C. Pilloud) Geneva 1976, 44 pp. . . . .</b>	4.—

EXTRACT FROM THE STATUTES OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

ADOPTED 21 JUNE 1973

ART. 1. — *International Committee of the Red Cross*

1. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), founded in Geneva in 1863 and formally recognized in the Geneva Conventions and by International Conferences of the Red Cross, shall be an independent organization having its own Statutes.

2. It shall be a constituent part of the International Red Cross.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 2. — *Legal Status*

As an association governed by Articles 60 and following of the Swiss Civil Code, the ICRC shall have legal personality.

ART. 3. — *Headquarters and Emblem*

The headquarters of the ICRC shall be in Geneva.

Its emblem shall be a red cross on a white ground. Its motto shall be *Inter arma caritas*.

ART. 4. — *Role*

1. The special role of the ICRC shall be :

- (a) to maintain the fundamental principles of the Red Cross as proclaimed by the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross ;
- (b) to recognize any newly established or reconstituted National Red Cross Society which fulfils the conditions for recognition in force, and to notify other National Societies of such recognition ;
- (c) to undertake the tasks incumbent on it under the Geneva Conventions, to work for the faithful application of these Conventions and to take cognizance of any complaints regarding alleged breaches of the humanitarian Conventions ;

---

<sup>1</sup> The International Red Cross comprises the National Red Cross Societies, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies. The term "National Red Cross Societies" includes the Red Crescent Societies and the Red Lion and Sun Society.

- (d) to take action in its capacity as a neutral institution, especially in case of war, civil war or internal strife ; to endeavour to ensure at all times that the military and civilian victims of such conflicts and of their direct results receive protection and assistance, and to serve in humanitarian matters, as an intermediary between the parties ;
- (e) to ensure the operation of the Central Information Agencies provided for in the Geneva Conventions ;
- (f) to contribute, in view of such conflicts, to the preparation and development of medical personnel and medical equipment, in co-operation with the Red Cross organizations, the medical services of the armed forces, and other competent authorities ;
- (g) to work for the continual improvement of humanitarian international law and for the better understanding and diffusion of the Geneva Conventions and to prepare for their possible extension ;
- (h) to accept the mandates entrusted to it by the International Conferences of the Red Cross.

2. The ICRC may also take any humanitarian initiative which comes within its role as a specifically neutral and independent institution and consider any question requiring examination by such an institution.

ART. 6 (first paragraph). — *Membership of the ICRC*

The ICRC shall co-opt its members from among Swiss citizens. It shall comprise fifteen to twenty-five members.

---

## ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES

- AFGHANISTAN — Afghan Red Crescent, Puli Artan, *Kabul*.
- PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA — Albanian Red Cross, 35, Rruga e Barrikadavet, *Tirana*.
- ALGERIA (Democratic and People's Republic) — Algerian Red Crescent Society, 15 bis, Boulevard Mohamed V, *Algiers*.
- ARGENTINA — Argentine Red Cross, H. Yrigoyen 2068, 1089 *Buenos Aires*.
- AUSTRALIA — Australian Red Cross, 122 Flinders Street, *Melbourne 3000*.
- AUSTRIA — Austrian Red Cross, 3 Gusshausstrasse, Postfach 39, *Vienna 4*.
- BAHAMAS — Bahamas Red Cross Society, P.O. Box N 91, *Nassau*.
- BAHRAIN — Bahrain Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 882, *Manama*.
- BANGLADESH — Bangladesh Red Cross Society, 34, Bangabandhu Avenue, *Dacca 2*.
- PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BENIN — Red Cross of Benin, B.P. 1, *Porto Novo*.
- BELGIUM — Belgian Red Cross, 98 Chaussée de Vleurgat, 1050 *Brussels*.
- BOLIVIA — Bolivian Red Cross, Avenida Simón Bolívar, 1515, *La Paz*.
- BOTSWANA — Botswana Red Cross Society, Independence Avenue, P.O. Box 485, *Gaborone*.
- BRAZIL — Brazilian Red Cross, Praça Cruz Vermelha 10-12, *Rio de Janeiro*.
- BULGARIA — Bulgarian Red Cross, 1, Boul. Biruzov, *Sofia 27*.
- BURMA (Socialist Republic of the Union of) — Burma Red Cross, 42 Strand Road, Red Cross Building, *Rangoon*.
- BURUNDI — Red Cross Society of Burundi, rue du Marché 3, P.O. Box 324, *Bujumbura*.
- CAMEROON — Cameroon Red Cross Society, rue Henry-Dunant, P.O.B. 631, *Yaoundé*.
- CANADA — Canadian Red Cross, 95 Wellesley Street East, *Toronto, Ontario, M4Y 1H6*.
- CENTRAL AFRICAN EMPIRE — Central African Red Cross, B.P. 1428, *Bangui*.
- CHILE — Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa Maria 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 246V., *Santiago*.
- CHINA — Red Cross Society of China, 22 Kanmien Hutung, *Peking, E*.
- COLOMBIA — Colombian Red Cross, Carrera 7a, 34-65, Apartado nacional 1110, *Bogotá D.E.*
- CONGO, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE — Croix-Rouge Congolaise, place de la Paix, *Brazzaville*.
- COSTA RICA — Costa Rican Red Cross, Calle 14, Avenida 8, Apartado 1025, *San José*.
- CUBA — Cuban Red Cross, Calle 23 201 esq. N. Vedado, *Havana*.
- CZECHOSLOVAKIA — Czechoslovak Red Cross, Thunovska 18, 118 04 *Prague 1*.
- DENMARK — Danish Red Cross, Ny Vestergade 17, DK-1741 *Copenhagen K*.
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC — Dominican Red Cross, Apartado Postal 1293, *Santo Domingo*.
- ECUADOR — Ecuadorian Red Cross, Calle de la Cruz Roja y Avenida Colombia, 118, *Quito*.
- EGYPT (Arab Republic of) — Egyptian Red Crescent Society, 34 rue Ramses, *Cairo*.
- EL SALVADOR — El Salvador Red Cross, 3a Avenida Norte y 3a Calle Poniente, *San Salvador, C.A.*
- ETHIOPIA — Ethiopian Red Cross, Ras Desta Damtew Avenue, *Addis Ababa*.
- FIJI — Fiji Red Cross Society, 193 Rodwell Road. P.O. Box 569, *Suva*.
- FINLAND — Finnish Red Cross, Tehtaankatu 1 A, Box 168, 00141 *Helsinki 14/15*.
- FRANCE — French Red Cross, 17 rue Quentin Bauchart, F-75384 *Paris CEDEX 08*.
- GAMBIA — The Gambia Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 472, *Banjul*.
- GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — German Red Cross in the German Democratic Republic, Kaitzerstrasse 2, DDR 801 *Dresden 1*.
- GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF — German Red Cross in the Federal Republic of Germany, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 71, 5300, *Bonn 1*, Postfach (D.B.R.).
- GHANA — Ghana Red Cross, National Headquarters, Ministries Annex A3, P.O. Box 835, *Accra*.
- GREECE — Hellenic Red Cross, rue Lycavittou 1, *Athens 135*.
- GUATEMALA — Guatemalan Red Cross, 3ª Calle 8-40, Zona 1, *Ciudad de Guatemala*.
- GUYANA — Guyana Red Cross. P.O. Box 351, Eve Leary, *Georgetown*.
- HAITI — Haiti Red Cross, Place des Nations Unies, B.P. 1337, *Port-au-Prince*.
- HONDURAS — Honduran Red Cross, 1ª Avenida entre 3a y 4a Calles, Nº 313, *Comayagüela, D.C.*
- HUNGARY — Hungarian Red Cross, V. Arany János utca 31, *Budapest V*. Mail Add.: 1367 *Budapest 5*, Pf. 249.
- ICELAND — Icelandic Red Cross, Nóatúni 21, *Reykjavik*.
- INDIA — Indian Red Cross, 1 Red Cross Road, *New Delhi 110001*.
- INDONESIA — Indonesian Red Cross, Jalan Abdul Muis 66, P.O. Box 2009, *Jakarta*.
- IRAN — Iranian Red Lion and Sun Society, Av. Villa, Carrefour Takteh Djamchi, *Teheran*.
- IRAQ — Iraqi Red Crescent, Al-Mansour, *Baghdad*.
- IRELAND — Irish Red Cross, 16 Merrion Square, *Dublin 2*.
- ITALY — Italian Red Cross, 12 via Toscana, *Rome*.
- IVORY COAST — Ivory Coast Red Cross Society, B.P. 1244, *Abidjan*.
- JAMAICA — Jamaica Red Cross Society, 76 Arnold Road, *Kingston 5*.
- JAPAN — Japanese Red Cross, 1-3 Shiba-Daimon 1-chome, Minato-Ku, *Tokyo 105*.
- JORDAN — Jordan National Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 10 001, *Amman*.
- KENYA — Kenya Red Cross Society, St. John's Gate, P.O. Box 40712, *Nairobi*.
- KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF — Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, *Pyongyang*.
- KOREA, REPUBLIC OF — The Republic of Korea National Red Cross, 32-3Ka Nam San-Dong, *Seoul*.
- KUWAIT — Kuwait Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 1350, *Kuwait*.
- LAO PEOPLES' DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — Lao Red Cross, P.B. 650, *Vientiane*.
- LEBANON — Lebanese Red Cross, rue Spears, *Beirut*.
- LESOTHO — Lesotho Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 366, *Maseru*.

- LIBERIA** — Liberian National Red Cross, National Headquarters, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, *Monrovia*.
- LIBYAN ARAB PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC** — Libyan Arab Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, *Benghazi*.
- LIECHTENSTEIN** — Liechtenstein Red Cross, *Vaduz*.
- LUXEMBOURG** — Luxembourg Red Cross, Parc de la Ville, C.P. 404, *Luxembourg*.
- MALAGASY REPUBLIC** — Red Cross Society of the Malagasy Republic, rue Clémenceau, P.O. Box 1168, *Antananarivo*.
- MALAWI** — Malawi Red Cross, Hall Road, *Blantyre* (P.O. Box 30080, Chichiri, *Blantyre 3*).
- MALAYSIA** — Malaysian Red Crescent Society, 519 Jalan Belfield, *Kuala Lumpur 08-03*.
- MALI** — Mali Red Cross, B.P. 280, *Bamako*.
- MAURITANIA** — Mauritanian Red Crescent Society, B.P. 344, Avenue Gamal Abdel Nasser, *Nouakchott*.
- MEXICO** — Mexican Red Cross, Avenida Ejército Nacional n° 1032, *México 10 D.F.*
- MONACO** — Red Cross of Monaco, 27 boul. de Suisse, *Monte Carlo*.
- MONGOLIA** — Red Cross Society of the Mongolian People's Republic, Central Post Office, Post Box 537, *Ulan Bator*.
- MOROCCO** — Moroccan Red Crescent, B.P. 189, *Rabat*.
- NEPAL** — Nepal Red Cross Society, Tahachal, P.B. 217, *Kathmandu*.
- NETHERLANDS** — Netherlands Red Cross, 27 Prinsessegracht, *The Hague*.
- NEW ZEALAND** — New Zealand Red Cross, Red Cross House, 14 Hill Street, *Wellington 1* (P.O. Box 12-140, *Wellington North*.)
- NICARAGUA** — Nicaraguan Red Cross, D.N. Apartado 3279, *Managua*.
- NIGER** — Red Cross Society of Niger, B.P. 386, *Niamey*.
- NIGERIA** — Nigerian Red Cross Society, Eko Aketa Close, off St. Gregory Rd., P.O. Box 764, *Lagos*.
- NORWAY** — Norwegian Red Cross, Parkveien 33b, *Oslo*. Mail Add.: *Postboks 7034 H-Oslo 3*.
- PAKISTAN** — Pakistan Red Crescent Society, National Headquarters, 169, Sarwar Road, *Rawalpindi*.
- PANAMA** — Panamanian Red Cross, Apartado Postal 668, Zona 1, *Panamá*.
- PARAGUAY** — Paraguayan Red Cross, Brasil 216, *Asunción*.
- PERU** — Peruvian Red Cross, Jirón Chancay 881, *Lima*.
- PHILIPPINES** — Philippine National Red Cross, 860 United Nations Avenue, P.O.B. 280, *Manila 2801*.
- POLAND** — Polish Red Cross, Mokotowska 14, *Warsaw*.
- PORTUGAL** — Portuguese Red Cross, Jardim 9 Abril, 1 a 5, *Lisbon 3*.
- ROMANIA** — Red Cross of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Strada Biserica Amzei 29, *Bucarest*.
- SAN MARINO** — San Marino Red Cross, Palais gouvernemental, *San Marino*.
- SAUDI ARABIA** — Saudi Arabian Red Crescent, *Riyadh*.
- SENEGAL** — Senegalese Red Cross Society, Bd Franklin-Roosevelt, P.O.B. 299, *Dakar*.
- SIERRA LEONE** — Sierra Leone Red Cross Society, 6A Liverpool Street, P.O.B. 427, *Freetown*.
- SINGAPORE** — Singapore Red Cross Society, 15 Penang Lane, *Singapore 9*.
- SOMALI REPUBLIC** — Somali Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 937, *Mogadishu*.
- SOUTH AFRICA** — South African Red Cross, Cor. Kruis & Market Streets, P.O.B. 8726, *Johannesburg 2001*.
- SPAIN** — Spanish Red Cross, Eduardo Dato 16, *Madrid 10*.
- SRI LANKA** — Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, 106 Dharmapala Mawatha, *Colombo 7*.
- SUDAN** — Sudanese Red Crescent, P.O. Box 235, *Khartoum*.
- SWEDEN** — Swedish Red Cross, Fack, S-104 40 *Stockholm 14*.
- SWITZERLAND** — Swiss Red Cross, Taubenstrasse 8, B.P. 2699, *3001 Berne*.
- SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC** — Syrian Red Crescent, Bd Mahdi Ben Barake, *Damascus*.
- TANZANIA** — Tanzania Red Cross Society, Upanga Road, P.O.B. 1133, *Dar es Salaam*.
- THAILAND** — Thai Red Cross Society, Paribatra Building, Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, *Bangkok*.
- TOGO** — Togolese Red Cross Society, 51 rue Boko Soga, P.O. Box 655, *Lomé*.
- TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO** — Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society, Wrightson Road West, P.O. Box 357, *Port of Spain*, Trinidad, West Indies.
- TUNISIA** — Tunisian Red Crescent, 19 rue d'Angleterre, *Tunis*.
- TURKEY** — Turkish Red Crescent, Yenisehir, *Ankara*.
- UGANDA** — Uganda Red Cross, Nabunya Road, P.O. Box 494, *Kampala*.
- UNITED KINGDOM** — British Red Cross, 9 Grosvenor Crescent, *London, SW1X 7EJ*.
- UPPER VOLTA** — Upper Volta Red Cross, P.O.B. 340, *Ouagadougou*.
- URUGUAY** — Uruguayan Red Cross, Avenida 8 de Octubre 2990, *Montevideo*.
- U.S.A.** — American National Red Cross, 17th and D Streets, N.W., *Washington, D.C. 20006*.
- U.S.S.R.** — Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, I. Tcheremushkinskii proezd 5, *Moscow 117036*.
- VENEZUELA** — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello No. 4, Apart. 3185, *Caracas*.
- VIET NAM, SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF** — Red Cross of Viet Nam, 68 rue Bà-Triệu, *Hanoi*.
- YUGOSLAVIA** — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, *Belgrade*.
- REPUBLIC OF ZAIRE** — Red Cross of the Republic of Zaire, 41 av. de la Justice, B.P. 1712, *Kinshasa*.
- ZAMBIA** — Zambia Red Cross, P.O. Box R.W.1, 2837 Brentwood Drive, *Lusaka*.