

SEPTEMBER 1976

SIXTEENTH YEAR — No. 186

international review of the red cross



INTER ARMA CARITAS

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

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

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

- Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, Lawyer, former Director-General of the Swiss Nation 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 (1967)
- Mr. WALDEMAR JUCKER, Doctor of Laws, Secretary, Union syndicale suisse (1967)
- Mr. VICTOR H. UMBRICH, Doctor of Laws, Managing Director (1970)
- Mr. PIERRE MICHELI, Bachelor of Laws, former Ambassador (1971)
- 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 LÜTHY, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of History at the University
of Basle (1975)

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

Messrs. HANS BACHMANN,

GUILLAUME BORDIER, PAUL CARRY,

Mrs. MARGUERITE GAUTIER-VAN BERCHEM,

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

RODOLFO OLGIATI, MAX PETITPIERRE, PAUL RUEGGER,

DIETRICH SCHINDLER, FRÉDÉRIC SIORDET, ALFREDO VANNOTTI.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mr. ROGER GALLOPIN, *President*

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

Mrs. DENISE BINDSCHEDLER-ROBERT

Mr. GILBERT ETIENNE

Dr. ULRICH MIDDENDORP

Mr. JEAN PICTET

Mr. GOTTFRIED DE SMIT

Mr. PIERRE MICHELI, *Deputy member*

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS

SEPTEMBER 1976 - No. 186

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

MISCELLANEOUS

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

Diplomatic Conference

Summary of third session's work 443

External activities:

Middle East — Africa — Latin America — Asia
— USSR. 468

Annual Report of the League 476

Cuba 477

Philippines 480

The Teaching of the Law of Armed Conflicts .. 482

. 483

**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.

Informationsmaterial über die Genfer Abkommen —
Die Besucher des IKRK — Hundertjahfeier des Dänischen Roten Kreuzes — Ausbildung im Kriegsrecht.

*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.— (\$10.—)
Single copy Sw. Fr. 3.— (\$1.—)

EDITOR: J.-G. LOSSIER

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

*Summary of third session's work*¹

Introduction

The third session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts was held from 21 April to 11 June 1976, at the International Conference Centre, Geneva. It was presided over by Mr. Pierre Graber, Federal Councillor and head of the Federal Political Department.

After two plenary sittings, the main Committees resumed work where they had left off at the close of the second session. They met for seven weeks, and a plenary sitting was held on 11 June to adopt their reports and lay plans for future work.

As it had done at the two previous sessions, the Conference continued to use as its basis for discussion the two draft Protocols additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, prepared by the International Committee of the Red Cross in 1973, one relating to international armed conflicts and the other to non-international armed conflicts.

By the end of the second session, the Conference had accomplished half the work it had before it. Hoping to conclude its work at the third session, the Conference adopted, on the Bureau's proposal, a plan providing

¹ In July 1975 *International Review* contained a summary of the second session's work. The present summary, which supplements it, deals solely with the proceedings of the third session.

for the completion of the bulk of the main Committees' work over a period of four weeks, for the finalization of the texts by the Drafting Committee in two weeks, and for the adoption of the articles at a plenary sitting scheduled to be held during the last two weeks of the Conference.

As the Conference was unable to conclude its work within the time set, a fourth and last session will be essential. It will be held from 17 March to 10 June 1977.

Like last year, the Committees were unremitting in their work, which they carried out in a constructive and conciliatory spirit. A certain slowing down in negotiations was mainly due to the difficult subjects dealt with and the emergence of fresh problems. While the Conference has not yet ended its work, the greater part has been accomplished: two-thirds of the articles have been adopted, and negotiations on a number of questions still under discussion have made considerable headway and some are in fact nearing fruition.

There is every indication that the next session will see the conclusion of the work and the signing of the texts adopted.

* * *

**DRAFT PROTOCOL I
RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF VICTIMS
OF INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICTS**

Part II — Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Persons

Committee II carried out the greater part of its work in this traditional field of the Geneva Conventions at the second session. It concluded the work at the third session, also adopting the essential technical Annex and an article laying down the procedure for a revision of that Annex.

The articles which remained in abeyance were mainly those concerning medical transports (Part II, Section II); but Article 17, on the role of the civilian population and of relief societies, was also left in abeyance as it was contingent on the articles on medical transport, and so was Article 8, embodying definitions which Committee II did not definitively want to adopt until all problems relating to medical transports were settled.

Moreover, following amendments submitted at the first session which gave rise to considerable discussion at the second session, Committee II finally adopted a section which had not been provided for in the ICRC drafts. That section (*Information on the victims of a conflict and remains of deceased*) is provisionally given as Section I *bis* and comprises three articles (at present 20 *bis*, 20 *ter* and 20 *quater*). Should it be maintained in Part II, a change will need to be made in the present title of *Part II (Wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons)*.

We shall now consider the articles which Committee II adopted at the third session, in the order in which they appear in the Protocol.

Section I — General Protection

Article 8 contains some terms which occur fairly often in Part II and should perhaps be defined. It should be noted, in particular, that the terms “wounded” and “sick”, as referred to in the Protocol, have a slightly different meaning from the current acceptation. The infirm, maternity cases, expectant mothers and new-born babies also come into

that category, but only persons who refrain from any act of hostility are considered “wounded” or “sick”.

Note should also be taken of the definition of the terms “permanent” and “temporary”, characterizing assignments over an indeterminate or limited period, but in both cases *exclusive* during that period. The terms apply to medical units and medical personnel alike. In the latter case they slightly alter the meaning which the Conventions give to “permanent medical personnel” and “temporary medical personnel”. On the other hand, they allow the introduction of a term hitherto overlooked: “temporary religious personnel”.

Article 8 also defines “shipwrecked”, “medical units”, “medical personnel”, “religious personnel” and “distinctive emblem”, and also “distinctive signal”, covering the new signalling methods provided in the technical Annex for medical units and transports.

Article 17 (3) laid down that ships and civilian craft to which the parties to a conflict appealed to collect the wounded, the sick, the shipwrecked and the dead, and which might carry out those tasks under their own initiative, should be afforded special protection in the execution of those tasks. Some delegates wanted this to extend to civilian air transports, but the majority finally decided to delete the provision entirely, considering the likelihood of applying it in practice too uncertain in an international conflict.

Section I bis — Information on the Victims of a Conflict and Remains of Deceased

The purpose of this new section is to recognize the right of families to learn the fate of their relatives (now Article 20 *bis*).

Article 20 *ter* relates to missing persons and provides that when circumstances permit, and at the latest when active hostilities end, each party to the conflict shall search for persons reported missing by an adverse party. It also contains rules on the recording, search and role of the Central Tracing Agency.

Article 20 *quater* urges respect for the remains and graves of persons who have died as a result of occupation or hostilities, or during detention owing to the hostilities or occupation. The question of the maintenance of, and access to, graves and the question of the repatriation of remains are also dealt with.

The articles are a welcome addition to the articles of the Geneva Conventions on those problems, since they are applicable to categories of persons so far not covered by the Conventions.

Section II — Medical Transports

Committee II reached a decision on all articles in Section II still in abeyance.

Article 24 (Other medical ships and craft) affords all medical ships and craft not as yet specifically protected by the Conventions or the Protocol the same protection as granted by the Conventions and the Protocol to mobile medical units. It thus fills a gap, allowing the protection of ships not originally meant for medical transport and only assigned to that function owing to an emergency.

Article 31 (Landing and inspection) covers cases in which a medical aircraft flies over a sector under the physical control of an adverse party or where such control is not clearly established. It embodies security measures corollary to the facilities granted to medical air transports. The party concerned may in such cases order the medical aircraft to land for inspection on the ground. That inspection may also be carried out where medical aircraft are obliged to land in such sectors for technical reasons.

Flight by medical aircraft over States not parties to the conflict is strictly regulated by Article 32, the last article in this section. The flight may be made only with the consent of the State concerned, which must apply any conditions and restrictions equally to all parties to the conflict. A medical aircraft may, however, for technical reasons, be obliged to fly over a State not party to the conflict, in which case it must endeavour to identify itself as soon as possible. In view of the security measures referred to above, the State not party to the conflict may order any medical aircraft flying over its territory (with or without previous agreement) to land for inspection purposes.

It will be noted that, in this Section II, Article 25 of the first draft was definitively deleted. It covered notification of all forms of transport. As the delegates preferred to deal separately with each form of transport, the general article became useless.

Part IV — Civilian Population

Chapter VI — Civil Defence

The purpose here is to provide special protection for civil defence bodies. If well organized, as experience in World War II showed very clearly, they can considerably diminish the losses and sufferings of civilians during conflicts.

Having been instructed to study this chapter, the Committee applied itself to the task during the third session at committee, working group and sub-working group level. A great deal of preparatory work was done on the new subject, and although no article was finally adopted, the major problems were clearly identified.

A list of civil defence tasks was prepared. Some delegates would have liked the list to be exhaustive as they felt it would not afford protection unless the tasks were clearly defined. Others wanted the list to serve as an example, open to any fresh tasks that might arise. The carrying of arms was also discussed at great length. Some favoured civil defence bodies that carried no arms and were exempt from any police activity, while others preferred them to be lightly armed, if only to ensure their own security. Discussion centred on the still more arduous problem—although connected with the subject—of protection for the military assigned to civil defence tasks. This revealed deep structural differences between national civil defence systems. Some regarded civil defence as a purely civil matter; others as an integral part of the army.

The opinions on the different problems are nevertheless closer than they were before, and this initial debate will undoubtedly enable the fourth session to find a solution that is imperative at a time when civilians are being increasingly affected by present conflicts.

Work on Protocol I which still remains to be done by Committee II

Committee II will need to find a solution acceptable to all regarding the civil defence problems identified, in order to make a definitive choice regarding a civil defence emblem and to finalize the text of the six or seven articles that will be devoted to civil defence. After this, Committee II will still need to consider Chapter V (concerning civil defence) of the Technical Annex adopted by the Technical Sub-Committee. Lastly, Committee II will need to study a subject not dealt with so far, relief, covered by Articles 60 to 62 of the ICRC draft.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE IDENTIFICATION, RECOGNITION AND MARKING OF MEDICAL PERSONNEL, UNITS AND MEANS OF TRANSPORT, AND CIVIL DEFENCE PERSONNEL, EQUIPMENT AND MEANS OF TRANSPORT

The Technical Sub-Committee of Committee II met from 21 April to 7 May 1976 to finalize its draft regulations on the marking and identification of medical and civil defence personnel, units and means of transport.

The draft regulations were drawn up by the Technical Sub-Committee during the first session of the Diplomatic Conference, in March 1974. They restated the essential points of the ICRC proposals embodied in the Annex to draft Protocol I and were published in document CDDH/49/Rev.1, of 2 September 1974. Several articles gave Committee II a choice between alternatives. As Committee II did not have time to study its Sub-Committee's report before the end of the first session, it decided to postpone consideration of the report to the second session.

On 10 April 1975, the report was approved by Committee II, by 32 votes to none, with 8 abstentions. Committee II further decided to convene its Technical Sub-Committee, which had not met during the second session, at the beginning of the Conference's third session, to consider the comments made during its study of the report. Lastly, Committee II adopted a resolution on "the need for national co-ordination on the radiocommunication matters raised in the Technical Annex to draft Protocol I". This resolution, which the Conference adopted at a plenary sitting, had the anticipated effect. Between the second and third sessions, several national telecommunication authorities approached the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and its International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB) for preliminary contacts which facilitated the Technical Sub-Committee's work on medical radio-communications, at the third session of the Conference.

At that session, the Sub-Committee prepared new draft regulations which included the following chapters.

Chapter I — Identity Card

Civilian and religious medical personnel, whether permanent or temporary, are to be provided with simplified identity cards.

Chapter II — Distinctive Sign

Articles 3 and 4 will allow a more effective use of the distinctive sign; it can be made visible by infra-red observation and photography and other detection techniques.

Chapter III — Distinctive Signals

For the first time since the Red Cross came into existence, provision is made for signalling methods other than by means of the distinctive signal. In addition to a flashing blue light, distinctive signals may include a radio signal and an electronic radar signal. The distinctive signals may be used by medical aircraft, and once agreement is reached between the parties concerned, possibly by hospital ships, medical craft and medical vehicles. The distinctive radio signal is a priority signal, subject to the approval of the Conference of the International Telecommunication Union.

Chapter IV — Communications

This chapter relates to the use by medical services of radiocommunications and international signal codes, and the observance by medical aircraft of the procedure laid down by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) regarding the diffusion of flight plans and the interception of civil aircraft.

Chapter V — Civil Defence

This chapter states that the identity card for civil defence personnel is governed by the provisions of Chapter I, Article 1. The international civil defence emblem proposed by the Technical Sub-Committee is an equilateral blue triangle on an orange ground. This chapter is contingent on what Committee II does regarding civil defence. As the work had not yet been completed, Chapter V was not included in the Technical Sub-Committee's report adopted by Committee II.

Chapter VI — Periodic Revision

The single article of this chapter, Article 16, has been deleted and replaced in draft Protocol I by a new Article 18 *bis* entitled "Revision of the Annex." This article enables the ICRC to convene a meeting of experts every four years to give their opinion on the advisability of bringing the technical provisions on marking up to date.

In May 1976, Committee II adopted by consensus the draft Annex of 13 articles, Article 18*bis*, and three resolutions directed at specialized agencies: International Telecommunication Union (ITU), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO). The purpose of the resolutions is to submit to these specialized agencies technical questions within their province relating to marking. In view of the conference timetable of those organizations, the resolutions have already been conveyed to them for their information.

Apart from the marking of civil defence personnel and equipment, the work of the Technical Sub-Committee is virtually concluded. The technical questions in suspense are within the purview of the specialized agencies: priority radio call sign for medical transports, radio frequencies to be used, secondary radar code, maritime signals, the introduction of the red cross flag in appropriate maritime documents, additional visual maritime marking of hospital ships and medical craft. Decisions on these questions should be adopted at the forthcoming international conferences of IMCO, ICAO and ITU. ITU's World Administrative Radio Conference is scheduled to be held in 1979.

Part III — Methods and Means of Combat; Prisoner-of-War Status

Section I — Methods and Means of Combat

Four of the nine articles in Section I of Protocol I were adopted by Committee III during the second session, namely *Article 33 (Basic rules)*, *Article 34 (New weapons)*, *Articles 36 and 37 (Recognized emblems and Emblems of nationality)*.

At the third session, the Committee adopted all the articles in Section I of Part III of Protocol I which were still in suspense, namely those relating to prohibition of perfidy (35), quarter (38), safeguard of an enemy *hors de combat* (38*bis*), aircraft occupants (39), independent missions (40), organization and discipline (41). With one sole exception (Article 21 of draft Protocol II, relating to the prohibition of perfidy, to which reference will be made further on), Committee III concluded its work on these subjects, unless of course discussion is resumed on one point or another, which although possible is hardly likely.

Article 35 deals with prohibition of perfidy. It is not perfidy as such that is prohibited, but the killing, wounding or capture of an adversary by perfidious means. Thus, the violation of a truce in order to carry out a retreat or disengagement would not be regarded as perfidious. A perfidious act is one designed to make the adversary believe, with complete confidence, that he has the right to receive, or the obligation to grant, the protection provided by international law—with the purpose of betraying such confidence. Feigned negotiations, incapacity or surrender are perfidious acts.

Yet one of the most frequent acts of simulation, that of a combatant feigning to be a civilian, was only reluctantly accepted as an example of perfidy. This can be explained by the fact that it is not the purpose of Article 42, which has not yet been adopted, to prohibit a guerrilla fighter from mingling with and disappearing in the civilian population, except in combat operations or where fighting is imminent. Any contradictions between Article 35 and Article 42 therefore had to be eliminated, and it was only when the desired guarantees were provided in Article 42 that Article 35 was adopted. As Article 42, which is to embody those guarantees, has not yet been approved, it may be questioned whether some delegations had accepted Article 35 only subject to their inclusion. This article also contains a paragraph on ruses of war. As it is a point traditionally covered by the Law of The Hague, it has posed no problem.

Articles 38 and 38 *bis* concern the prohibition to refuse to give quarter and the safeguarding of an enemy who is *hors de combat*. The prohibition regarding refusal to give quarter means that the enemy must not be declared outside the law and that the combat must not be conducted with a view to making sure that there are no survivors. Even a threat to conduct the combat in this way is prohibited. The principle of safeguarding the enemy who is *hors de combat* is stated thus in paragraph 1 of Article 38 *bis*:

“A person who is recognized or who, under the circumstances, should be recognized to be *hors de combat* shall not be made the object of attack.”

The purpose of this paragraph is to prohibit a deliberate attack against any person if the marksman sees that he is in a state of incapacity or can admit that state of incapacity. Safeguard does not relate to accidental cases such as where the wounded are again hit during the attack although not deliberately taken as a target. But it prohibits ruthless attacks

sustained beyond requirements, under the pretext that the marksman knows nothing about what is happening on the other side. The rule is therefore linked with the prohibition to refuse quarter. The article also provides for the release of prisoners who cannot be evacuated in the manner laid down by the Third Geneva Convention. This is an innovation. It is a solution envisaged only where necessary owing to "unusual conditions of combat". Does not guerrilla warfare, which is tending to become so widespread, offer one of those pre-eminently unusual conditions? This rule will therefore be of some practical value.

Article 39, on aircraft occupants, reads thus:

1. No person parachuting from an aircraft in distress shall be made the object of attack during his descent unless it is apparent that he will land in territory controlled by the party to which he belongs or by an ally of that party.

2. Upon reaching the ground in territory controlled by an adverse party, a person who has parachuted from an aircraft in distress shall be given an opportunity to surrender before being made the object of attack, unless it is apparent that he is engaging in a hostile act.

3. Airborne troops are not protected by this article.

It will be noted that the Committee was unable to decide, in paragraph 1, whether it should follow the course laid down in the army handbooks of the principal powers and in the ICRC draft, and prohibit firing on parachutists in distress who did not land in the territory of the adverse party and who consequently escaped. When the point was put to the vote, 28 voted for opening fire, 21 against, and 21 abstained. The article as a whole was adopted by 47 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions. As a delegate said later, explaining his position, the voting showed that with the development of aviation it was no longer possible to give pilots an advantage out of all proportion to the damage which aviation could inflict in modern warfare. Here, however, there was no consensus.

The scope of Article 40, which, in the draft prepared by the International Committee of the Red Cross, covered independent missions, has been increasingly reduced with the development of Articles 41 and 42. It no longer refers to spies, and it confirms the Law of The Hague in the matter of espionage. But it also protects residents of occupied territories, who must not be considered to be spies each time they look out of the window and soldiers happen to go by. Persons actually engaged in espionage are granted the same guarantees as those for the regular army, and they can be accused of spying only if caught in the act.

Article 41, referring to organization and discipline in the original text submitted by the ICRC, has been considerably enlarged and now not only covers organization and discipline, but also gives a definition of armed forces and of persons who are entitled to combatant status, and relates to the possibility of incorporating police forces in the armed forces. The definition holds good for all: recognized States or national liberation movements, regular army soldiers or part-time guerrillas. The article therefore represents a door that opens on the big attempt made in Article 42 and its supplement Article 42 *bis*. Armed forces are subject to international law. What is important in Article 41 is the fact that it gives a general definition of combatants, i.e. of those who have a right to commit acts of war, and that the definition relates both to members of the armed forces of member States of the international community and to those who take up arms for any reason. The conclusion to be drawn from Article 41 is that war concerns no longer States alone but parties to a conflict who submit to the conditions regarding military occupation laid down in Article 41. Thus Article 41 defines legal combatants, who usually but not necessarily belong to the armed forces of a State. Before they have any right to conduct hostilities they must be militarily organized in the manner laid down in Article 41, but that is enough to give them the right to do so.

All articles except Article 39 were adopted by consensus.

Section II — Prisoner-of-war Status

Article 42 (*New category of prisoners of war*) was discussed at considerable length by Committee III at the second session of the Diplomatic Conference.

The working group of Committee III recognized the ICRC's general purpose in submitting the article: to attenuate or even completely abolish the restrictions placed on the right of members of resistance and liberation movements to enjoy the guarantees enjoyed by prisoners of war. It failed, however, to find a formula acceptable to all which would have put members of the regular armed forces and other combatants on the same footing in obtaining prisoner-of-war status.

The main problem was to ascertain whether and how combatants could be distinguished from the civilian population. Some considered such a distinction impossible owing to the nature of contemporary hostilities. Others felt that there was a fundamental need for such a

distinction in order that the civilian population might not be endangered, and that it should therefore be a condition for securing prisoner-of-war status.

The working group thus attempted to reach a compromise, reaffirming the general principle of the distinction but pointing out that in certain types of conflict a situation might arise in which it would not be possible to distinguish a combatant from a civilian. In such a situation the combatant would maintain the status of combatant (and also of prisoner of war) if he carried arms openly “during each military engagement and during such time as he is visible to the adversary, that is, to enemy personnel, while he is engaged in a military deployment preceding the launching of an attack in which he is to participate.”

Despite the undeniable concurrence in the working group’s discussions, this important Article 42 was not adopted at the third session. Several delegations asked that the lengthy text produced by the working group should not be put to the vote by Committee III, as further consultation and discussion might make the text clearer and less subject to contradictory interpretation, so that it might be adopted by consensus at the fourth session without giving rise to reservations when the Protocols were ratified.

Article 42 *bis* was not, like most of the provisions of the two Protocols, originally submitted by the ICRC. It was following an amendment which several delegations submitted to the second session of the Diplomatic Conference that Committee III, at the third session, on 31 May 1976 adopted Article 42 *bis* granting minimum protection to any person captured in the course of hostilities. In case of doubt, paragraph 1 reaffirms a person’s right to the protection granted prisoners of war until his status is determined by a competent tribunal. Paragraph 3 nevertheless safeguards a number of basic guarantees contained in draft Article 65 of the Protocol.

Pursuant to the proposal put forward to the working group of Committee III by the delegation of Nigeria, the third session of the Diplomatic Conference had before it the problem of mercenaries.

The Nigerian proposal was to consider as a mercenary “any person not a member of the armed forces of a party to the conflict who is specially recruited abroad and who is motivated to fight or to take part in armed conflict essentially for monetary payment, reward or other private gain.”

The working group's debates showed wide differences of opinion regarding the definition of mercenary, both as regards form and substance. The working group, however, appears to have reached agreement on the fact that a mercenary is a combatant essentially or mainly motivated by pecuniary gain, recruited to take part in fighting, and not a national of a party to the conflict. Several delegations considered that the opprobrious concept of mercenary should not be applied to military advisers or technicians, or to volunteers.

As regards the effect of being described as a mercenary, it was generally recognized that a mercenary was not entitled to prisoner-of-war or combatant status. Views differed as to whether it should be laid down that the mercenary must in all cases be refused prisoner-of-war or combatant status, thereby increasing the deterrent effect, or whether the detaining power should be able to grant him prisoner-of-war or combatant status if it deemed it advisable to do so.

The members of the working party felt, however, that the mercenary had a right to be treated humanely, with or without reference to the minimum guarantees embodied in draft Article 65 of Protocol I.

As agreement was not reached, the text will again be considered at the fourth session.

Part IV — Civilian Population

Section III — Treatment of Persons in the Power of a Party to the Conflict

Section III comprised seven articles (63 to 69) plus an Article 64*bis* proposed by some thirty delegations. The articles are the following: 63 (*Field of application*), 64 (*Refugees and stateless persons*), 64*bis* (*Reunion of dispersed families*), 65 (*Fundamental guarantees*), 66 (*Objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population*), 67 (*Protection of women*), 68 (*Protection of children*), 69 (*Evacuation of children*).

These articles were submitted to Committee III and referred to its working group for consideration. Apart from Article 64*bis*, however, the working group did not have sufficient time to study the articles in depth and concentrated mainly on the debates about Article 42. The final wording of the articles will therefore not be known until the fourth session. Articles 64, 64*bis* and 65 are certainly of interest and may therefore already be described at this stage.

The purpose of Article 64 is to grant refugees a recognized status that will protect them vis-à-vis all parties to the conflict. The protection already afforded by the Fourth Convention is insufficient for it covers only some aspects of relations between refugees and the State of asylum and refugees and the occupying Power whose nationals they are. Article 64 is also intended to protect stateless persons, who to this day benefit only indirectly from the provisions of the Fourth Convention. Article 4 of that Convention, which defines protected persons, covers them implicitly.

Article 64 *bis*, which was adopted by consensus and to which there was no objection, states:

The High Contracting Parties and the Parties to the conflict shall facilitate in every possible way the reunion of families dispersed as a result of armed conflicts and shall encourage in particular the work of the humanitarian organizations engaged in this task in accordance with the provisions of the Conventions and the present Protocol and in conformity with their respective security regulations.

Owing to its importance, Article 65 gave rise to some discussion in the Committee. It states the minimum guarantees that must in all circumstances be enjoyed by persons not entitled to more favourable treatment by virtue of the Conventions or Protocol I. No fewer than fifteen amendments were submitted by various delegations, some tending to develop the text proposed by the ICRC; others, to restrict its scope. All were agreed, however, that it was extremely important, and some even went so far as to describe it as a “mini-Convention.” At the fourth session, the working group will need to reconcile the many opinions expressed at the third session.

Part V — Execution of the Conventions and of the Present Protocol

Section II — Repression of Breaches of the Conventions and of the Present Protocol

At the second session, Committee I adopted *Section I (General provisions)* of Part V of draft Protocol I (*Execution of the Conventions and of the present Protocol*).

Section II of *Part V (Repression of breaches of the Conventions and of the present Protocol)* was therefore to be considered at the third session.

The Committee adopted two important articles after they had been studied at length by its working group: Article 74 (*Repression of breaches of the present Protocol*), and Article 76 (*Failure to act*).

Article 74 states in paragraph 1: "The provisions of the Conventions relating to the repression of breaches and grave breaches, supplemented by the present section, shall apply to the repression of breaches and grave breaches of this Protocol". It therefore extends to draft Protocol I the system of the Geneva Conventions under which the High Contracting Parties are required to repress any act contrary to the Conventions and to take any legal measures necessary for the penal repression of grave breaches of those instruments. Moreover, grave breaches are subject to "universal jurisdiction", which means that any Contracting Party may either itself repress them or refer the matter to another Contracting Party prepared to take such repressive action.

It will be recalled that under the Conventions the following acts are grave breaches when committed against the persons and the property they protect: wilful killing, torture or inhuman treatment, including biological experiments, wilful causing of great suffering or serious injury to body or health, to compel a prisoner of war to serve in the armed forces, to deprive a prisoner of fair and regular trial, and extensive destruction and appropriation of property not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly. Paragraph 2 of Article 74 refers to the foregoing list and extends it to further categories of persons protected by the Protocol.

Article 11 of the draft Protocol prohibits as a grave breach any act that endangers the mental health and integrity of persons who have fallen into the power of the adverse party or who are interned, detained or otherwise deprived of liberty. Paragraph 3 of Article 74 restates this and similarly qualifies the following acts committed wilfully, in violation of the Protocol, and causing death or serious injury to body or health: attacks on the civilian population; indiscriminate attacks which affect the civilian population or civilian objects and are out of proportion to the anticipated direct military advantage; attacks against works or installations containing dangerous forces which will cause injury to civilians or damage to civilian objects out of proportion to the anticipated direct military advantage; attack upon a person *hors de combat*; the perfidious use of the Red Cross, Red Crescent and Red Lion and Sun signs and of other protective signs recognized by the Conventions or the Protocol.

Paragraph 4 mentions some acts regarded as grave breaches when committed wilfully and in violation of the Conventions or the Protocol: the transfer by the occupying Power of parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies, or the transfer of all or parts of the population of that territory, in violation of Article 49 of the Fourth Convention; unjustifiable delay in the repatriation of prisoners of war or civilians; the practice of *apartheid* and other inhuman and degrading practices involving outrages upon personal dignity, based on racial discrimination; attacks on historic monuments, places of worship or works of art which constitute the cultural heritage of peoples and to which special protection has been given by special arrangement, if not located in the proximity of military objectives and not used for military purposes; depriving a person protected by the Conventions or by certain articles of the Protocol of fair and regular trial.

Lastly, in paragraph 5, without prejudice to the application of the Conventions and of the Protocol, grave breaches of those instruments are regarded as war crimes.

Article 74 was adopted by consensus, first paragraph by paragraph and then as a whole. Some delegations, however, entered reservations regarding some of the provisions.

Article 76 covers breaches of the Conventions or of the Protocol resulting from failure to act when under a duty to do so; the High Contracting Parties must repress all such breaches and suppress grave breaches (first paragraph).

The second paragraph refers to a specific failure to act by someone who, knowing or having information which should have led him to conclude that one of his subordinates was committing or going to commit a breach, did not take all feasible measures to prevent or stop the breach. In such a case, the fact that the breach was committed by a subordinate does not absolve his superior from penal or disciplinary responsibility as the case may be.

While the wording of this article gave rise to a rather lengthy discussion, the substance of the ICRC draft was left unchanged. Committee I adopted the article by consensus.

At the next session, the Committee should conclude its study of a number of questions, either on the basis of the ICRC draft or of new proposals: for example, new Articles 70 *bis* prohibiting reprisals; Article 74*bis* on measures to enforce respect of the law by the enemy; Arti-

cle 76*bis* on the duty of commanders; Article 77 on superior orders; Article 78 on extradition; and Article 79*bis* on international enquiry commissions.

**DRAFT PROTOCOL II
RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF VICTIMS
OF NON-INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICTS**

**Part II — Humane Treatment of Persons in the Power of
the Parties to the Conflict**

Committee I adopted Article 10 (*Penal prosecutions*) which ensures at least minimum judicial guarantees for any person accused of having committed an offence relating to the armed conflict.

The original ICRC draft consisted of two articles on penal sanctions: Article 9 (*Principles of penal law*) and Article 10 (*Penal prosecutions*). After a preliminary study by the Committee at the second session, it was decided to continue the discussion in a sub-working group, on the basis of a proposal put forward by Belgium, New Zealand and the Netherlands that the two articles be merged into a single article. At the third session, the sub-group drafted Article 10, subsequently adopted by the Committee, embodying the essential features of Articles 9 and 10 in the ICRC draft.

Having stated the principle that “no sentence shall be passed or penalty executed on a person found guilty of an offence except pursuant to a conviction pronounced by a tribunal offering the essential guarantees of independence and impartiality”, Article 10 enumerated a series of judicial guarantees, *inter alia* that the accused be informed of the offence alleged against him, the principle of individual responsibility, the principle of *nullum crimen sine lege* and the principle of the presumption of innocence.

Part of the discussion dealt with the specific problem of the death penalty pronounced on a person found guilty of an offence relating to the armed conflict.

While the ICRC draft did not prejudice the authorities’ right to pass the death sentence, it proposed that where pronounced it should not be carried out before the end of hostilities. The delegations considered at some length the advisability of introducing such a measure in the article,

and some expressed doubts as to whether it was really humanitarian, while some regarded it as mental cruelty rather than mercy. Others, in support of the maintenance of the paragraph, pointed out that this rule, combined with the possibility of a post-war amnesty that the authorities in power were urged to declare, would greatly contribute to diminishing the number of executions.

Lastly, Committee I agreed on a provision more restrictive than that proposed by the ICRC, relating only to combatants prosecuted for the mere fact of having taken part in the hostilities, even though during combat they respected the rules of the Protocol. Even if confined to that clearly defined category of persons, the provision constitutes a notable step forward in the development of protection for victims of non-international armed conflicts. Moreover, this provision is supplemented by a rule under which “the death penalty shall not be pronounced on persons below eighteen years of age at the time of the offence and shall not be carried out on pregnant women and mothers of young children”.

These two provisions are a significant contribution to the international community's endeavours to abolish the death penalty in all circumstances.

Part III — Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Persons

Committee II practically completed its work on this Part, leaving in suspense only Article 14 (3) parallel to Article 17 (3) of draft Protocol I, to which reference has already been made, and Article 11 concerning definitions, which also was not adopted pending decisions regarding Article 8 (*Definitions*) of Draft Protocol I.

Article 11 restates, in general, the definitions of Article 8 of Protocol I, with a few changes and some simplification required by the nature of Protocol II. It contains a definition of “medical transportation” and “medical transport” which does not appear in Article 8 of Protocol I, the reason being that medical transportation, in Protocol I, is dealt with in a special Section at the beginning of which these terms are defined whereas Protocol II has no such Section. On the other hand, “distinctive signal” is not defined in Article 11 of Protocol II, since that term is in correlation with the technical Annex which concerns Protocol I alone.

Unlike Article 17 (3) of Protocol I, which was finally deleted, Article 14 (3) of Protocol II was maintained by Committee II. It was

recognized that, in a conflict covered by Protocol II, private persons in charge of civilian transports of any kind (and not merely maritime transports as formerly laid down) should be given the possibility of taking on board wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons, and to collect the dead in response to an appeal from a party to a conflict, or on their own initiative, and that those persons should receive “all reasonable assistance” to perform those tasks.

Part V — Civilian Population

Committee II, responsible for Chapter II of this *Part (Civil defence)*, has so far discussed the problem of civil defence only in general terms, and the precise drafting of Articles 30 and 31 has not yet been undertaken.

Work still to be done on Protocol II by Committee II

In addition to the question of civil defence, Committee II will also need to study three articles which it has not yet dealt with: Article 33 (*Relief actions*), Article 34 (*Recording and information*) and Article 35 (*National Red Cross and other relief societies*).

Part IV — Methods and Means of Combat

Committee III had not adopted a single article in this Part at the time when the work of the third session began. The articles on the prohibition of unnecessary injury (Article 20), the protection of cultural objects and of places of worship (Article 20 *bis*), the prohibition of perfidy (Article 21), quarter (Article 22) and recognized signs (Article 23) had been submitted to the Committee by the ICRC expert and, after a brief general discussion, referred to the working group, but the latter was unable to conclude its work by the end of the second session.

Discussion centred on the very principle of the introduction of rules relating to the behaviour of combatants in Protocol II. The delegations were divided and there were two major tendencies. One of these saw in the armed conflicts covered by Protocol II exceptional situations where international law prevailed over internal law including rules on the conduct of hostilities. The other maintained that the Protocol should comprise only humanitarian rules to ensure the protection of conflict victims not or no longer taking part in the hostilities, and that the internal

legislation would prevail in everything connected with recourse to force in order to restore public order.

The real problem, as some delegates pointed out, was whether or not the rules on combatants' behaviour were to be introduced in Protocol II; no problem arose regarding the actual content of the rules, which could not differ fundamentally whether applicable in international or non-international armed conflicts.

By adopting the aforementioned articles Committee III opted for the first tendency. Note should, however, be taken of the exception made in Article 21 on the prohibition of perfidy which the Committee referred back to its working group for further study at the last session of the Conference.

While the substance of the rules adopted for Protocol II does not differ from that of the corresponding articles of Protocol I, their wording has sometimes been simplified in order to meet the specific requirements of a non-international armed conflict. Thus the fundamental rule relating to the prohibition of unnecessary injury (combatants' behaviour and protection of the civilian population) reads as follows:

1. In any armed conflict to which this Protocol applies, the right of the parties to the conflict to choose methods or means of combat is not unlimited.

2. It is forbidden to employ weapons, projectiles, and material and methods of combat of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering.

Part V — Civilian Population

Most of the provisions relating to the protection of the civilian population against hostilities were adopted by Committee III at the second session of the Conference. The question of the safeguard of objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, however, was left in suspense. The Committee adopted by consensus a succinct prohibition to attack, destroy, remove or render useless such objects.

The Committee has thus virtually completed its work. There remains in suspense only Article 32 on privileged treatment for children.

Part VII — Execution of the Present Protocol

Committee I considered Part VII (*Execution of the present Protocol*) containing general provisions to ensure observance of Protocol II. It is composed of four closely interconnected articles which restate in

simplified terms the legal rules in force or which are based on articles of draft Protocol I already adopted at the second session of the Conference.

Article 36 (*Measures for execution*), without any amendment, was adopted by consensus by Committee I. It restates in simplified terms paragraph 2 of Article 70 of draft Protocol I, which has already been adopted and which is also based on Articles 46 and 45 of the First and Second Conventions. This article, under which parties to a conflict shall take adequate executive measures to ensure observance of the Protocol in specific situations, reads: "Each Party to the conflict shall take the necessary measures to ensure observance of this Protocol by its military and civilian agents and persons subject to its control".

This provision repeats the wording of the ICRC draft, except that the word "control" is preferred to "authority" as being more appropriate to an insurgent, the term "authority" seeming to connote an authority regularly constituted in accordance with national legislation.

Article 37 (*Dissemination*) relates to one of the essential measures designed to ensure the application of the rules of draft Protocol II.

This provision, which is based on Article 72 (1) of draft Protocol I, is composed of two distinct paragraphs, in keeping with the specific nature of non-international armed conflict: paragraph 1 concerns measures to be taken in time of peace while paragraph 2 concerns those to be taken in time of armed conflict. The distinction is necessary because in time of peace it is the High Contracting Party which is required to disseminate the Protocol whereas during the conflict that duty is assigned not only to government authorities but also to the leaders of the insurgent party.

The ICRC draft stated in paragraph 1, by way of example, some measures to ensure the dissemination of the Protocol in time of peace, such as the study of the Protocol in military and civil instruction programmes.

At first some of the delegations who favoured the idea suggested using the terms adopted in Article 72 of draft Protocol I, namely "to include the study thereof in their programmes of military instruction and to encourage the study thereof by the civilian population", bearing in mind the requirements of civil instruction in federal States. Some other delegations, however, considering that the choice of the means of dissemination should be left to each of the Parties to the Protocol,

wanted this wording deleted. Finally the Committee chose the more general formula: "The High Contracting Parties undertake to disseminate the present Protocol as widely as possible in time of peace, so that it may become known to the armed forces and to the civilian population".

Article 38 (*Special agreements*) reaffirms and supplements the third paragraph of Article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions.

The purpose of this article is to grant victims of non-international armed conflicts maximum protection by the application of the largest possible number of humanitarian rules. It therefore urges the parties in conflict to bring into force all or part of the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and of Protocol I, either by means of special agreements as provided for in common Article 3 or by mutual declarations. It provides a means of supplementing draft Protocol II, which confines itself to reaffirming the basic rules of the Geneva Conventions and of draft Protocol I with a view to making them applicable to non-international armed conflicts.

Article 39 (*Co-operation in the observance of the present Protocol*) aimed, in the first version proposed by the ICRC, at encouraging the parties to a conflict to appeal to a body offering every guarantee of impartiality to co-operate in the observance of the Protocol. It also reaffirmed the ICRC's right of initiative already provided for in the second paragraph of Article 3 common to the Conventions. This provision, which was by no means mandatory, was based on the principle that it rested in the first place with the parties to the conflict to apply the Protocol and ensure its application, it being understood that in certain circumstances the co-operation of a humanitarian body might prove useful.

Despite its optional nature, the provision was discussed at length, and widely differing views were voiced. The Committee finally approved a very simple text, which in concise terms reaffirmed the ICRC's right of initiative:

"The International Committee of the Red Cross may offer its services to the Parties to the conflict."

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

The Drafting Committee comprises fifteen members including the rapporteurs of the main Committees. Its task consists principally in

co-ordinating and revising the drafting of all texts adopted and in submitting a report thereon to the Conference.

At the second session, the Drafting Committee met a few times to fix its working methods. At the third session it started work and studied the drafting of some ten articles. It also established a few general drafting rules. It asked, for instance, that the terminology of the 1949 Geneva Conventions be used unless a change proved necessary. One of the principal difficulties encountered by the Committee was that most of the articles had been adopted by the Committees in three or four languages and that the terms used in each language frequently differed.

The work will be resumed at the fourth session. It is even planned that the Drafting Committee alone will meet during the first three weeks of that session, which will open on 17 March 1977. Preparatory work will be done by the General Secretariat of the Diplomatic Conference, with the help of the ICRC, in order to facilitate the discussions of the Drafting Committee.

CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

The ad hoc Committee responsible for dealing with questions relating to so-called conventional weapons that cause excessive suffering or have indiscriminate effects expressed the hope, last year, that a second session of the Conference of Government Experts (the first was held at Lucerne, Switzerland, in the autumn of 1974) might enable it to increase the technical data available on some agenda items.

That Conference, held in Lugano at the beginning of 1976, contributed to a large extent to the deliberations of the ad hoc Committee at the third session: a number of proposals put forward at Lugano were submitted to the Diplomatic Conference in their original form or in a new version which took into account the criticism voiced at Lugano.

The brief time which elapsed between the two conferences, however, did not permit all governments to make a thorough study of the various proposals put forward at Lugano and reach a definitive opinion on each one.

There are three proposals on *incendiary weapons*. The first, which is the revised version of an existing document, submitted by more than twenty States, entirely prohibits the use of such weapons except for certain specific use. Total prohibition, in the opinion of its advocates,

is justified by excessive injury inflicted by those weapons on combatants and non-combatants alike. The second proposal, which was presented by three States, is intended to ensure better protection for civilians against the indiscriminate effects of an attack launched with incendiary weapons. Another State proposed a protocol confining the use of incendiary weapons to duly recognized military objectives and banning its use against persons or where it might impair the environment.

In the category of *delayed-action weapons and perfidious weapons*, three proposals restrict or regulate the use of mines and booby-traps. A ban would be placed *inter alia* on the use of booby-traps attached to sick or wounded persons or to the dead, and on the use of those camouflaged in toys or in articles in current civilian use.

In the case of *small-calibre projectiles*, it appears to be established that the calibre and the speed of the projectile do not alone determine its effects, and that the shape and the substance of the projectile are also important. The already existing proposition regarding small-calibre projectiles was revised to take this factor into account.

A proposal concerning *blast and fragmentation weapons* already proposed the prohibition of weapons projecting multiple prefragmented shrapnel or flechettes. Two new proposals restrict the use of fuel-air explosives and prohibit weapons projecting splinters that cannot be detected in the human body by usual medical methods.

The various proposals listed will be studied before the next session by governments, who will thus be able to define their attitude with regard to each. As regards small-calibre projectiles, we should mention that an international gathering of technical experts on that subject was held at Göteborg, Sweden, in August 1975.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

Middle East

Lebanon ¹

Throughout July and the first few days of August the ICRC was greatly concerned about the wounded in the Palestinian camp, Tel al-Zaatar. It tried repeatedly to obtain from all parties to the fighting their agreement to the removal of the casualties from the camp, which had been under siege since the end of June.

After several attempts which failed because the cease-fire agreements were not respected, Mr. J. Hoefliger, head of the ICRC delegation in Lebanon, and two other delegates, one of whom was a doctor, managed to enter the camp on 23 July: some thousand wounded were in a desperate situation; medical supplies were exhausted; gangrene and tetanus were rife; the shortage of water aggravated the risk of epidemics. It was apparent that a cease-fire lasting several days would be necessary for the evacuation operation; not the least of the difficulties was the need to clear the road to the camp and make it practicable for lorries and ambulances.

Yet the fighting did not stop; it was resumed as soon as the ICRC delegates had left the camp.

The ICRC redoubled its efforts to induce the parties to make arrangements and give orders to their troops so that the urgently required evacuation operation might take place.

A further attempt to remove the wounded failed on 29 July, because again the essential minimum conditions for the safety of the victims and their rescuers were not provided. Finally, the operation began on 3 August. On the first day 91 casualties were removed on stretchers to the camp entrance where ICRC lorries and ambulances were waiting to take them to the "Palestinian Red Crescent" hospital in the basement of the Arab University in West Beirut.

Next day a further 243 casualties were taken to the same hospital.

However, on 6 August, the third trip had to be called off, and only 74 people were evacuated in distressing circumstances. The population of the camp gave way to panic when the ICRC convoy arrived. Hundreds

¹ *Plate.*

of men, women and children rushed out of the camp onto the football pitch where the lorries and ambulances were parked, and fought to clamber aboard.

At the same time, snipers began to fire on the wounded people lying on stretchers. Four of these helpless casualties were hit. The ICRC vehicles finally managed to leave with their wounded and with some civilians who clung to them.

The situation being so grave, the ICRC, after consulting its delegates in Lebanon, decided to stop the evacuation operation. It conveyed its decision to the parties and stated that the only genuinely humanitarian solution would be to remove not only the wounded but the whole civilian population from the besieged camp.

Negotiations to that end were begun, but on 12 August Tel al-Zaatar fell. In dramatic circumstances the delegation managed to convey to the "progressive" zone about a thousand Palestinian civilians who had fled Tel al-Zaatar and were in the Christian Dekouane sector.

The ICRC wishes to point out that most of the negotiations for the evacuation of Tel al-Zaatar were carried out in close co-operation with the Arab League representative in Lebanon, Mr. Hassan Sabri Al Kholi.

During the three trips to remove the wounded, the ICRC was helped by volunteers from the Lebanese Red Cross and the "Palestinian Red Crescent" and by drivers who in transporting and looking after the wounded showed courage of a high order.

The ICRC delegation pursued its negotiations with all the parties to the conflict with the aim of ensuring that prisoners would be treated in conformity with the principles underlying the Geneva Conventions. Assurances with respect to those principles were given to the delegation, which on 14 August visited about 80 Palestinian combatants held by the Phalangists.

* * *

The *ICRC hospital* in Beirut (operated by 14 doctors and nurses from the Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish National Red Cross Societies) was kept very busy, as may be seen from the following figures covering the period from 8 to 14 August:

Outpatients	849
Major operations	18
Minor operations	147
Physiotherapy patients	122
Patient-nights	344

From 6 July, when the airlift started, to 11 August, the aircraft chartered by the ICRC made thirty-six flights between Larnaca and Beirut and carried about 370 tons of relief supplies.

During that same period thirteen consignments were sent by sea to Jounieh and one to Tripoli; altogether 323 tons were shipped.

From the time when relief operations in Lebanon began in the autumn of 1975 to 13 August 1976, the ICRC sent some 1,260 tons of relief supplies (medical supplies of all kinds, foodstuffs, blankets and clothes) to a value of 10.4 million Swiss francs.

As always, the ICRC endeavoured to come to the aid of all the victims on both sides, without making any discrimination. It should be mentioned that it was possible to provide aid only thanks to the contributions from numerous governments, National Societies and various international organizations in response to ICRC appeals.

The ICRC delegation in Lebanon received in July over 4,300 enquiries about missing persons.

Africa

Angola

As mentioned in the June 1976 issue of *International Review*, the ICRC phased out in that month its assistance programme in Angola, following talks with the Angolan Government.

From the time the ICRC began its action in June 1975 until June 1976, it sent (or forwarded) in aid of the victims of the conflict 1,378 tons of relief supplies, to a value of nearly 5.7 million Swiss francs, consisting of 68 tons of medical supplies, 1,250 tons of foodstuffs, 26,000 blankets and 338 tents. Most of these goods were shipped to Luanda, but some were also sent to Kinshasa (for Angolan refugees in Zaire) and Windhoek (to camps of displaced persons set up south of Angola). The actual figures were:

Angola	1,274 tons
Kinshasa	7 „
Windhoek	97 „
	<hr/>
Total	<u>1,378 tons</u>

This assistance would not have been possible without the help, in cash and in kind, provided to the ICRC by numerous governments, National Societies and international organizations.

Since the end of June, the ICRC has two delegates stationed in Luanda, who will keep in touch with problems in abeyance (in particular, handing over tracing activities to the budding Angolan Red Cross Society).

South Africa

In mid-July, the ICRC regional delegate, Mr. N. de Rougemont, visited in a military prison in Pretoria three Cuban prisoners of war in South African hands. This was the third visit made by the ICRC to these prisoners.

French Territory of the Afars and the Issas

On 12 August all the prisoners in Djibouti were visited by ICRC delegates. They saw 247 prisoners with whom they spoke without witnesses. The report on the visit will be transmitted by the ICRC to the competent authorities.

Upper Volta

The Government of Upper Volta informed the ICRC that it released in July 1976 seven nationals of Mali who had been interned at Ouagadougou. These civilian internees, who had been arrested after a frontier clash between Upper Volta and Mali in December 1974, were visited by the ICRC five times. Some other civilians had been released earlier in 1975.

Two nationals of Upper Volta, held as prisoners of war in Mali and whom the ICRC had twice visited at Bamako, had been released in June 1975.

Latin America

Mission by the new regional delegate for countries of the Andes

Regional delegates Mr. E. Leemann and Mr. L. Isler continued their tour of countries of the Andes. Between 24 June and 23 July, they went to *Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador*, where Mr. Leemann introduced Mr. Isler, who has succeeded him as regional delegate for the countries of the

Andes, to leaders of the National Societies and to government officials. They had talks on ICRC work in each of those countries, its activities including visits to places of detention, assistance to detainees and to families of detainees in particularly difficult circumstances, and the dissemination of knowledge of the Geneva Conventions among members of the armed forces and young people.

In *Bolivia*, the ICRC delegates visited seven places of detention in La Paz and outlying districts, holding altogether 175 persons detained for political crimes or on political grounds. The delegates spoke with detainees of their choice without witnesses. They provided detainees with various relief items, such as medicines, mattresses, blankets, toilet articles and games, to a value of 3,650 dollars.

Chile

In July, the ICRC delegation led by Mr. R. R. Jenny visited twenty-one places of detention, holding in all 471 detainees. As customary, the ICRC delegates distributed various relief supplies to a value of some 3,500 dollars. These included medicines, dental hygiene articles, cleaning products and disinfectants, toilet articles, clothing, mattresses, blankets, foodstuffs, and games.

At the same time, the delegation continued its assistance to detainees' families. In Santiago 507 families, and in the provinces 1,275 families received aid, to a value of 30,000 dollars.

Asia

Philippines

Following the mission which Mr. S. Nessi, ICRC delegate-general, carried out in Manila,¹ a series of visits to places of detention in the Philippines took place from 14 June to 16 July 1976.

Two ICRC delegates, Mr. A. Pasquier, regional delegate for South East Asia, and Mr. J. F. Labarthe, ICRC consultant on detention problems, went to eighteen places of detention, holding altogether 1,760 prisoners, of whom about 200 were detainees for political crimes or on political grounds. In all those places of detention, located in widely scattered parts of the country, the delegates spoke with detainees of their choice without witnesses. However, the delegates decided not

¹ See *International Review*, July 1976.

BEIRUT



Red Cross trucks waiting at the entrance of the Palestinian camp of Tel al-Zaatar for the wounded...

Photo Glantz/ICRC

BEIRUT



... who are transported to West Beirut to be cared for in hospitals.

Photo Glantz/ICRC

to visit Bicutan Prison, near Manila, as the authorities had refused to allow them to speak with the detainees without witnesses.

Relief programmes for the places they visited were planned by the ICRC delegates, in co-operation with the various local branches of the Philippine Red Cross, which will be responsible for putting them into practice. The programmes included mainly the supply of bedding, toilet articles, workshop materials, games and so forth.

As customary, reports on this series of visits will be sent by the ICRC to the Philippine Government alone. It should be recalled that the ICRC does not communicate to any other persons observations of any kind on the conditions of detention its delegates may have found.

The previous series of visits to places of detention in the Philippines took place in 1974.

USSR

Visit by the President of the Executive Board

At the invitation of the Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the USSR, Mr. R. Gallopin, President of the ICRC Executive Board, Mr. J.-P. Hocké, Director of the ICRC Operations Department, and Mr. M. Borsinger, ICRC delegate general for Europe, were in the Soviet Union from 11 to 23 July 1976.

In Moscow, the ICRC representatives had talks at the Alliance Executive Committee offices where they were received by Dr. V. A. Baltyski, President of the Executive Committee, Professor Y. E. Danilov, First Vice-President, Dr. A. F. Reshetov and Dr. Y. P. Ostalski, Vice-Presidents, and other senior officials. Discussions centered on the ICRC's activities throughout the world and future prospects for the Red Cross movement.

The ICRC representatives visited various units of the Moscow Red Cross, presided over by Dr. L. I. Molchanova. They went also to Leningrad, where they were received at the headquarters of the Central Committee of the Red Cross in the autonomous region of Leningrad by its President, Dr. V. M. Sokholov.

The President of the ICRC Executive Board was received in audience at the Palace of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin by Mr. M. Kholov, First Vice-President, and Mr. M. P. Georgadze, Secretary of the Presidium. At this meeting views were exchanged on the Alliance's activities, on various social problems and on the Red Cross contribution to the maintenance of peace.

IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LEAGUE

The League of Red Cross Societies has published its report of activities for 1975. Abundantly illustrated, the various sections are entitled: The Geneva meetings—Statutory affairs—General activities—International relations—Relief—Disaster relief preparedness—Relief supplies—Services to National Societies—Development Programme—Training—Health—Blood programme—Social welfare—Nursing—Youth—Information—Administration and control—Financial situation.

Mr. H. Beer, Secretary General, introduces the report by reviewing the principal demands made on the League during the year. He stresses the importance of the final report of the Study on the Reappraisal of the Role of the Red Cross, now being examined by the national and international Red Cross institutions. “The important thing”, says Mr. Beer, “is ... that the report has shown clearly that the Red Cross should make an effort to think out its problems as a basis for future building, and that it encourages members of the Red Cross at all levels to make this effort.”

The Annual Report of the League shows particularly the efforts made by the institution to adapt itself to the modern system of international co-operation. As the Secretary General pointed out: “This co-operation has demands of its own. It requires the need to adapt its policy constantly according to the kind of organization concerned; to take part more often in international and regional meetings; and to work in common with bodies whose goals and objectives are identical with those of the Red Cross. All of these measures are necessary if the essential role of the Red Cross is still to be recognized by the international community.”

CUBA

During his last visit to Cuba, in February of this year, Mr. S. Nessi, ICRC Delegate General, asked the Cuban Red Cross for information about its activities. The National Society has accordingly been kind enough to prepare a memorandum for the ICRC, extracts of which we summarize below, to acquaint our readers with the many and varied activities, carried out with great efficiency, by the Cuban Society.

Relief in the event of disasters and other emergency situations

The Red Cross assumes responsibility for the work of medical brigades which go to the aid of the victims, with all the resources at their disposal. It co-ordinates the various national activities in such circumstances. It provides its assistance both inside the country and abroad, when disasters occur in Cuba or in other parts of the world.

Other national responsibilities

It co-operates in carrying out public health projects.

It provides transport for the sick and injured, being charged with this responsibility by the State, with equipment supplied by the State. This service is free and is for everyone. The personnel is specially trained to administer first aid.

A marine security and rescue service is at work on the beaches, in children's holiday camps and at swimming pools. Due to the steady increase in the number of recreation centres, it was necessary to provide a corresponding increase in the resources for action, employing the most modern life-saving techniques. All the personnel assigned to this Service are highly trained in first aid, enabling them to deal immediately with any crisis.

Courses are organized for this purpose, with the scientific and technical assistance of the Ministry of Public Health and the co-operation

of doctors, nurses, nursing assistants and other members of services concerned with public health.

In Cuba, commercial trade in human blood has been completely suppressed. The needs for blood throughout the country are met by voluntary donors, recruited by trade unions and mass organizations and also through campaigns undertaken by specialized organizations, including the Cuban Red Cross.

Work in preventive medicine and vaccination campaigns is carried out in both rural and urban areas.

One of the most spectacular successes of the mass vaccination campaigns directed by the Ministry of Health with the co-operation of Red Cross medical brigades, was the eradication of poliomyelitis. Every child under the age of nine years has been vaccinated. Likewise, the struggle against malaria has been so successful that according to qualified international organizations the disease has been wiped out in Cuba.

Aid is given to persons injured in natural disasters and accidents.

Assistance is provided in homes for the aged, in health centres, maternity centres, etc.

First aid workers are present at national and international sports events.

Medical assistance is given to industrial and agricultural workers. First aid and health workers of the Cuban Red Cross take an active part in this work.

Special attention should be drawn to the work carried out in this connection by the first aid and health workers of the Cuban Red Cross in putting into effect the plans for agriculture. They carry on their work in the sugar refineries, in co-operation with Public Health doctors and other specialists. They provide effective preventive action, devoting themselves to the health of the workers and to hygienic conditions in the production centres and the living quarters of the agricultural personnel. Every year, 7,000 members of the Red Cross health services are at work in this connection. They also organize meetings and film shows, and give advice to injured or sick workers.

Nursing

Co-ordination in nursing care has been arranged between the health brigades of the Red Cross and other health workers in order to develop particular activities, such as home care, health education, care for premature infants, etc. In addition, as part of the programme for nursing study, first aid courses have been instituted, enabling the graduating students to become teachers in the Red Cross health brigades.

Social services

The work of the National Society includes the following: help in carrying out the programme against tuberculosis and other diseases of the respiratory tract, along with vaccination campaigns; overseeing the hygienic aspects of working conditions in agricultural centres and industrial plants; making sure that people use medicines correctly, and informing them on how to prevent illness; help in the social rehabilitation of poor people—along with other major activities in the field of social services.

Youth activities

The Junior Red Cross has encouraged the formation of health brigades by young people and students. Co-ordinating its activities with those of the Ministry of Education and of mass organizations, it pursues such objectives as: training in first aid, prevention of accidents and contagious diseases, carrying out community programmes for home care, participation in Red Cross study centres, organization of first aid services in schools by properly trained members of the health brigades.

Diffusion of the Geneva Conventions

As part of its information material, the Cuban Red Cross has included documentation designed to spread awareness of the Geneva Conventions and Red Cross principles. It arranges the diffusion of this information through seminars, courses and study groups for its personnel.

PHILIPPINES

Large tracts of the Philippines were devastated in May by a typhoon and tidal wave. As can be seen from the following article by Mr. J. M. Goudstikker, the Philippine National Red Cross immediately went into action, providing emergency aid to hundreds of thousands of victims.

The Philippine National Red Cross has 79 branches and a permanent staff of 500 throughout the Philippines, in all provinces and towns. Its activities extend to the tiniest hamlet and to all the mountain tribes so often cut off from the rest of the country for several months of the year. When Typhoon Olga and its attendant rains and floods hit the Philippine Islands between 18 and 27 May 1976, the National Red Cross Society mobilised all its resources and staff to provide emergency help to all those affected.

Hundreds of young volunteers also lent a hand for several days at a time to get essential foods and medicines by amphibians or army helicopters to communities increasingly cut off by rising floods and sorely tried by strong winds, turbulent rivers devastating everything in their path, and lack of electricity, food and blankets. This difficult situation lasted a week. The Government of the Philippines and the Philippine National Red Cross made an all-out attack on it through the National Disaster Coordinator Committee (NDCC) formed after the 1972 floods.

The main problem of the NDCC assistance operation was to get sufficient food and medical aid to completely isolated towns and villages, and sometimes also to evacuate persons marooned on a few square yards of slightly raised ground. Bulacan, Pampanga, Tarlac, Penguasinan, Nueva Ecija and Cavite Provinces, and the entire metropolitan area of Manila, were for several days under water which, from the second and third day of rain onwards, was over nine feet deep. The region is normally a vast plain which is the national "rice granary". Seen from the air it looked like an immense artificial lake on whose muddy waters drifted the wreckage of houses and bridges, even the bodies of drowned persons.

It took several days to reach some villages, and getting supplies to the inhabitants was not without its dangers, even by helicopter. The propeller blades produced strong air currents which could cause people who had taken refuge on roofs to fall into the water, and sacks of rice dropped from the helicopter could be carried away by the current or hit a sharp ridge and burst. In spite of all these unavoidable difficulties thousands of people have been helped or evacuated. The Philippine National Red Cross, which was called on to distribute food in over one hundred evacuation centres throughout the country, soon set about buying where it could—partly from government sources—the sacks of rice which were transported by Army helicopters. After a week's rain the storm abated and the floods began to subside.

Three days later—about 31 May—the principal highway to the North over the flooded plain was re-opened to traffic and Philippine National Red Cross lorries could start resupplying the local branches, many of which had come to the end of their resources and stocks. The Philippine Red Cross appeal to the League of Red Cross Societies on 26 May gave good grounds for hoping for the speedy arrival of essential aid from abroad, and this put heart into first aiders exhausted by the constant demands made on them and difficulties in buying food. . . .

On 31 May the Philippine Red Cross announced that it had assisted nearly 479,000 persons at some time or other during the previous twelve days—an impressive achievement, taking into account the difficulties involved. Much remained to be done; thousands of people in Manila and elsewhere whose homes had been swept away by floods at the height of the storm were in evacuation centres, and flooded roads and destroyed bridges were still preventing help from reaching large communities. Three weeks after the disaster, some villages could only be reached by boat and some isolated houses were supplied by volunteers on foot and carrying sacks weighing a hundredweight for one or two kilometres across the ricefields over which little plank bridges are laid.

Medical problems are the same as ever, gastro-enteritis and dressing of wounds infected by dirty water. Two teams of twenty-five persons each, comprising a doctor and Red Cross nurses, were formed a few days after the typhoon began and toured evacuation centres in the capital before going on to the provinces.

The Philippine Red Cross considered prolonging its emergency assistance throughout the month of June. At least eight hundred thousand people have thus received assistance. . . .

THE TEACHING OF THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICTS

Courses on human rights have been organized by the International Institute of Human Rights (René Cassin Foundation) since 1969. This year, the courses took place at Strasbourg University from 5 to 30 July and the last week was devoted, as usual, to humanitarian law.

The Henry Dunant Institute and the ICRC co-operated in those courses and the introductory lecture was given by the ICRC's Vice-President, Mr. Jean Pictet, who is also the Director of the Henry Dunant Institute and Associate Professor at the University of Geneva.

Mr. Pictet spoke more particularly on the deliberations of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts.

Two other specialists gave courses on problems related to the implementation of the Geneva Conventions and on questions regarding national liberation movements. They were Mr. G. Abi-Saab, professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, and Mr. A. Eide, Director of the International Institute for Peace Research in Oslo. The study group on humanitarian law, led by a staff member of the ICRC, Mr. M. Veuthey, examined some specific problems related to the application of humanitarian law, with special regard to guerrilla warfare.

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

“BULLETIN” OF THE SOCIÉTÉ HENRY DUNANT¹

In its October 1975 issue, the *International Review of the Red Cross* reported the creation in Geneva of the Société Henry Dunant. This body has now published the first number of its “Bulletin”, which contains news of the Society’s activities and information on plays and television programmes relating to Dunant. It also features a hitherto unpublished letter from Dunant to his faithful friend and confidant, Rudolf Müller, and three articles of exceptional interest.

The first is by Mr. Willy Heudtlass, former head of Red Cross press and radio services in the Federal Republic of Germany, and author of a significant book on Dunant and of several studies which have appeared in the *Review*. He writes of Dunant and his friends in various countries. The second article is by the President of the Society, Mr. Roger Durand, and is entitled « Henry Dunant and his family ». In the third article, Mr. Philippe M. Monnier gives details of the recent acquisition by the public and university library of Geneva of a collection of documents relating to the author of “A Memory of Solferino” and formerly the property of Mr. Manfred Müller, who inherited them from his father, Rudolf Müller.

On the subject of the latter, Mr. Heudtlass writes in his documented article:

“...One of the turning points in Dunant’s life occurred in 1879. While strolling around Stuttgart, he fell into conversation with a young student, Rudolf Müller. Neither of them could have foreseen that they would form a friendship lasting several decades, and that the younger man would play a decisive role in restoring the older one’s reputation. The chance encounter bore its first fruits about thirteen years later. Müller, by then a teacher in a secondary school, published an article on Dunant in the *Ulmer Tagblatt*. Dunant wrote to thank him, and sent him

¹ Geneva, No. 1, 1975.

several documents, saying 'I can send you many more'. So began a relationship of trust between the two men which remained firm to the end of Dunant's life. Unceasingly, the Stuttgart teacher strove to rescue Dunant's reputation. In the Netherlands, he succeeded in interesting the journalist Haje in his efforts. From Zurich, the industrialist J.-J. Bourcart, an old friend of Dunant, offered his services, as, in Stuttgart, did A. Greater, influential member of the Order of the Temple, who had already helped Dunant during his difficult period of exile in Paris. After four years of collaboration, Müller's book, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Roten Kreuzes und der Genfer Konvention* (The Creation of the Red Cross and the Geneva Convention) appeared in 1896. A Dunant foundation set up in Stuttgart, with Müller participating, succeeded in collecting about 25,000 Reichsmarks, which covered most of the printing costs. Some copies were issued as a luxury edition, with gilt-edged pages.

"The book attracted the attention of important personalities in Switzerland and elsewhere. Among them was Professor Leclère, who told Müller that, with the agreement of professors of Brussels University, he had proposed Dunant for the first Nobel Peace Prize at Christiania. But it was on Björnstjerne Björnson, member of the Norwegian Nobel Prize Committee, that the book had a decisive influence. At the same time, a fruitful meeting arranged by Dunant took place between Müller and the Norwegian doctor Hans Daae. The latter immediately joined in the efforts being made by Müller for the Nobel Peace Prize to be granted to their friend. Daae met Björnson, and found his compatriot well prepared by his reading of Müller's book, and a supporter of Dunant. The Nobel Committee, however, decided to divide the prize equally between Dunant and the Frenchman Frédéric Passy. Dunant and his two friends accepted this decision, which constituted the vindication they desired." . . .

The article by Mr. Durand illustrates very clearly that the Dunant family, confronted with the misfortune of one of its members, showed its solidarity in a very definite way. Mr. Durand concludes:

" . . . Despite the shame brought about by the bankruptcy of 1867 and the material sacrifices entailed, the Dunant family did not turn its back on its great man in his downfall. On the contrary, it supported him.

"When Dunant went into voluntary exile, the family kept in close touch by letter and showed him real affection. Through Pierre-Louis, Henry's brother, the family sent money, in spite of the fact that in Paris Dunant was perpetually in need of funds, always in pursuit of an unattainable ideal. The family provided a life annuity, thanks to the prudent

foresight of an uncle. Above all, it defended his rights when his creditors were attempting to snatch the bread from his mouth.

“Even if there is still some doubt as to how long the payments were made, it is known that Dunant received sums for his personal use from 1874 to 1894, at least. The small but regular income kept away the threat of hunger, during a period in which Dunant was believed to be destitute.

“The family’s support, therefore, had its effects. And Dunant paid tribute to his relatives when, twenty-five years later in 1892, he wrote:

‘I would be happy enough if a new German translation of *A Memory of Solferino* could be printed, as whether for my family’s sake or for the sake of justice itself, I cannot tolerate the injustice that has been done me.’

and thirty years later:

‘I have written to my brother, who has always been very loyal, to ask his advice; I will make the first decision only after having received this advice.’

“Nearly forty-five years later, moreover, he chose his own nephew to act as executor of his will, in a sense making him his spiritual heir. He requested him to make a number of donations. But, far more significant, he left in his personal care his priceless manuscripts, carefully preserved and endlessly rewritten for thirty or perhaps forty years: his final message of international brotherhood to the human race, as it rushed headlong, unknowingly, towards 1914.”

This bulletin will be of interest to everyone concerned with the work and thought of Henry Dunant. We must hope that research will continue, to shed light upon obscure areas in the life of the man who, despite the oppressive bitterness from which he suffered, still had the courage to assert, in *L’Avenir Sanglant*, “We must never allow ourselves to submit to doubt, because doubt is a moral infirmity”.

J.-G. L.

RE-APPRAISAL OF THE ROLE OF THE RED CROSS—INDEX ¹

This is an alphabetical and analytical index of the problems studied during several years of work in re-appraising the role of the Red Cross. Since these questions are of interest to the whole Red Cross movement, this book is extremely useful, for those who compiled it clearly intended it to bring out the significance of the final Report as well as to make reference to it easier. That Report was published a few months ago under the title « An Agenda for Red Cross », as mentioned in our issue of last October. The index refers also to the six « Background Papers » which were published separately from the Report.

¹ Available, for the moment only in English, from the Henry Dunant Institute (Geneva), 8 Sw.fr. per copy.

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.¹

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 ;

¹ 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.



THE ONLY 747s FLYING EAST

AIR-INDIA Boeing 747s fly to New York from Paris, Frankfurt, Rome and London with very convenient connections from Geneva. Like other airlines. But unlike others, AIR-INDIA are the first to operate BOEING 747 FLIGHTS to the EAST. AIR-INDIA give passengers their first ever chance to fly eastwards on a Boeing 747 aircraft.

AIR-INDIA

Geneva, 7, Chantepoulet, Phone (022) 32 06 60



H. Ritschard & Cie. S.A.

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT

TRAVEL AGENCY

GENEVA, 49, route des Jeunes

Telephone 43 76 00 - Teleprinter 22 167

Exchange - Tickets - Sea passages

Insurance - Customs Agency

Road haulage - Storage

Home delivery of air and rail tickets on request by telephone

Branches :

LAUSANNE - ANNEMASSE (France)

ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES

- AFGHANISTAN — Afghan Red Crescent, Puli Artan, *Kabul*.
- ALBANIA — Albanian Red Cross, 35, Rruga e Barrikadave, *Tirana*.
- ALGERIA — 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*.
- 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*.
- CAMBODIA — The new address of the Red Cross Society is not yet known.
- 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 REPUBLIC — Central African Red Cross, B.P. 1428, *Bangui*.
- CHILE — Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa María 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 246V., *Santiago de Chile*.
- 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*.
- 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 I*.
- DENMARK — Danish Red Cross, Ny Vestergade 17, DK-1471 *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, *Djakarta*.
- IRAN — Iranian Red Lion and Sun Society, Av. Villa, Carrefour Takhté Djamchid, *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, 29-12 Shiba 5-chome, Minato-Ku, *Tokyo 108*.
- 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 Général 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 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. 1806, *Luxembourg*.
- DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR — Red Cross Society of the Malagasy Republic, rue Clémenceau, P.O. Box 1168, *Tananarive*.
- 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, route de Koulikora, *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, *Managua, D.N.*
- 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 D-408*.
- 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 2000*.
- 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, Tcheremushki, I. Tcheremushkinskii proezd 5, *Moscow 117 036*.
- VENEZUELA — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello No. 4, Apart. 3185, *Caracas*.
- VIET NAM, SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF — Red Cross of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, 68 rue Bà-Triệu, *Hanoi*.
- YUGOSLAVIA — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, *Belgrade*.
- ZAIRE (Republic of) — 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*.