

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1984
TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR — No. 238

APR 10 1984

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 National Bank, *President* (member since 1975)
- Mr. MAURICE AUBERT, Doctor of Laws, *Vice-President* (1979)
- Mr. VICTOR H. UMBRICH, Doctor of Laws, Managing Director, *Vice-President* (1970)
- Mr. JEAN PICTET, Doctor of Laws, former Vice-President of the ICRC (1967)
- 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. JACQUES F. DE ROUGEMONT, Doctor of Medicine (1967)
- Mr. GILBERT ETIENNE, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies and at the Institut universitaire 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, Doctor of Sociology (1973)
- Mr. HENRY HUGUENIN, Banker (1974)
- Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI, Doctor of Laws, former Vice-President of the ICRC (1977)
- Mr. ATHOS GALLINO, Doctor of Medicine, Mayor of Bellinzona (1977)
- Mr. ROBERT KOHLER, Master of Economics (1977)
- Mr. RUDOLF JÄCKLI, Doctor of Sciences (1979)
- Miss ANDRÉE WEITZEL, former head of the women's auxiliary service at the Federal Military Department, vice-president of the Swiss national Commission for Unesco (1979)
- Mr. OLIVIER LONG, Doctor of Laws and Doctor of Political Science, Ambassador, former Director General of GATT (1980)
- Mr. DIETRICH SCHINDLER, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the University of Zürich (1961-1973; 1980)
- Mr. HANS HAUG, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the St-Gall School of Advanced Economic and Social Studies, former President of the Swiss Red Cross (1983)
- Mr. PETER ARBENZ, Bachelor of Political Science, member of the Central Committee of Helvetas, municipal councillor of Winterthur (1983)

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

- Mr. ALEXANDRE HAY, *President*
Mr. MAURICE AUBERT
Mr. RICHARD PESTALOZZI
Mr. ATHOS GALLINO
Mr. RUDOLF JÄCKLI
Miss ANDRÉE WEITZEL
Mr. OLIVIER LONG

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), together with the League of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the 131 recognized National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, is one of the three components of the International Red Cross.

An independent humanitarian institution, the ICRC is the founding body of the Red Cross. As a neutral intermediary in case of armed conflicts or disturbances, it endeavours on its own initiative or on the basis of the Geneva Conventions to protect and assist the victims of international and civil wars and of internal troubles and tensions, thereby contributing to peace in the world.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS

ISSN 0020-8604

CONTENTS

January - February 1984 — No. 238

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Alexandre Hay: The ICRC and International Humanitarian Issues	3
Jean-Pierre Hocké: Humanitarian Action: Protection and Assistance	11
Hans-Peter Gasser: Some Reflections on the Future of International Humanitarian Law	18
States parties to the Geneva Conventions and to the Protocols	26

ICRC Appeal following the entry into force of the Convention on Prohibitions and Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons	30
Resignations and Appointments at the ICRC . .	31
Death of Mrs. M. Gautier-van Berchem . . .	32
Accession of the People's Republic of the Congo to the Protocols	33
Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to Protocol I	34
Accession of Bolivia to the Protocols	34
Accession of Costa Rica to the Protocols . . .	34
Special Fund for the disabled	35

External activities:

Africa — Latin America — Asia — Middle East	36
---	----

IN THE RED CROSS WORLD

Conference of the Nordic Red Cross Societies	48
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Amendments to the Radio Regulations concerning Medical Means of Transport and Neutral Means of Transport	50
--	----

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

Refugee Community Health Care	60
---	----

International Review of the Red Cross has been published, in French, under various titles, by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) since 1869. Its first complete edition in English was issued in 1961.

- As the official organ of the ICRC and the International Red Cross,
- specializing in international humanitarian law and ICRC doctrine,
- recording the international activities of the Red Cross, mainly for reference purpose, as a chronicle of events,

International Review of the Red Cross provides a constant flow of information and maintains the necessary link between the members of the International Red Cross.

International Review of the Red Cross appears once every two months in three languages:

in English: INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS (from 1961)

in French: REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE LA CROIX-ROUGE

in Spanish: REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE LA CRUZ ROJA (from 1976)

It also publishes, in German, a short edition, *Extracts*, of various articles which appear in the main editions.

EDITOR: Michel Testuz

ADDRESS: International Review of the Red Cross
17, Avenue de la Paix
CH - 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

SUBSCRIPTIONS: one year, Sw. frs. 30.—; single copy Sw. frs. 5.—
Extracts in German: one year, Sw. frs. 10.—; single copy
Sw. frs. 2.—

Postal Cheque Account: No. 12 - 1767 Geneva

Bank account No. 129.986 Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva

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

The ICRC and International Humanitarian Issues¹

by Alexandre Hay

I am glad to have the opportunity to address such a gathering of eminent personalities concerned with the increasingly grave humanitarian problems of our time.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has, for the last 120 years, served the cause of humanity in a world torn by conflicts.

In 1864, a year after the ICRC was founded, the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, the first multilateral humanitarian law treaty, established a legal basis for ICRC activities and brought about the recognition of the Red Cross movement by the States.

From ten articles in 1864 to some six hundred today, humanitarian law has made progress and ICRC activities have developed along with it, the one promoting the other.

The 1864 Convention afforded protection only to the wounded and sick soldiers of armies in the field; after the naval battle of Tsushima, it was adapted in 1907 to sea warfare.

After the First War, in the course of which the ICRC assisted and protected hundreds of thousands of prisoners of war, a new convention formally extended ICRC protection to prisoners of war.

The tragic experiences of the Spanish Civil War and of the Second World War led to a recasting of the Geneva Conventions in 1949 and widened their scope in two ways. There were.

1. four Conventions, which still constitute the basis of current humanitarian law in force in international armed conflicts;

¹ Speech by the ICRC President to the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues, New York, 12 November 1983.

- the First Convention, affording protection to wounded and sick soldiers;
 - the Second, affording protection to shipwrecked members of armed forces;
 - the Third, dealing with prisoners of war;
 - the Fourth, a new one, dealing with civilians; and there was
2. article 3 common to the four Conventions, a kind of small Convention in itself, affording protection to victims of non-international armed conflicts.

The war in Algeria, the war in Viet Nam, and all the armed struggles for independence showed both the practical value and also the limits of the four 1949 Conventions. Its achievements, and also the obstacles it encountered in helping the victims of these conflicts, led the ICRC to convene, in 1971 and 1972, two conferences of government experts to examine proposals for updating humanitarian law.

In 1977, a Diplomatic Conference, presided over by Federal Councillor Graber, who is also a member of this Independent Commission, adopted two Protocols additional to the 1949 Conventions: Protocol I affording protection to the victims of international armed conflicts and Protocol II protecting the victims of non-international armed conflicts. These two Protocols brought fundamental innovations in the field of contemporary humanitarian law: protection of civilians against the effects of hostilities, classification of wars of national liberation as international armed conflicts, extension of protection to combatants in guerrilla warfare.

* * *

Emmanuel Mounier said that “Law is always a precarious attempt to subjugate force to reason and to turn it towards love”. He added: “But it is also a struggle.”

This struggle is fought by the ICRC mainly in the field, in the heat of conflicts, alongside the victims of such conflicts. Today, the ICRC maintains about thirty delegations in the world, with 400 delegates, who are active in some 70 countries, with regular and special annual budgets of the order of a hundred million dollars (one third for the regular budget and two thirds for specially financed activities), serving primarily for the protection of, but also for assistance to, a growing number of victims of armed conflicts and internal troubles and tensions.

The Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Protocol I of 1977 provide for the following safeguards to ensure the rights of the victims of armed conflicts:

- the primary responsibility of the party States;
- The institution of the Protecting Power;
the role of the ICRC in assistance and protection and, in the field of assistance, that of the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement;
- the role of the United Nations;
- the establishment of an International Fact-Finding Commission;
- the procedures of enquiry, (art. 52 of Convention I, 53 of Convention II, 132 of Convention III and 149 of Convention IV).

According to article 1 common to the 1949 Conventions and to Protocol I, “The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the Conventions and Protocols in all circumstances.” The *party States* therefore have a dual responsibility, that of applying the stipulated provisions themselves, as well as a collective responsibility for ensuring their respect by other States even though no formal procedure for doing so has been stipulated.

The *Protecting Power* is a State, neutral or non-party to the conflict, which, nominated by one party to the conflict and accepted by the opposing party, is prepared to undertake the task of safeguarding the interests of the party to the conflict which nominated it. Its role basically is to supervise the condition of prisoners of war and interned civilians, parallel to ICRC’s activities in this domain.

Since 1949, a Protecting Power (Switzerland) was appointed in the following cases only: in the Suez conflict in 1956, the Goa conflict in 1961 and the war between India and Pakistan in 1971-1972, although in the latter case the mandate of Switzerland was not understood in the same way by both parties.

The role of the *International Committee of the Red Cross*, in accordance with the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Protocols is, generally speaking, to serve as a neutral intermediary between parties to conflicts in order to bring protection and assistance to the victims. More specifically, this entails the following activities:

- to visit and interview without witness prisoners of war (Article 126 of the Third Convention) and detained or interned civilians (Articles 76 and 143 of the Fourth Convention);
- to provide aid to the populations of occupied territories (Articles 59 and 61 of the Fourth Convention);

- to look for missing persons and transmit family messages to prisoners of war (Article 123 of the Third Convention) and to civilians (Article 140 of the Fourth Convention);
- to offer its services in the establishment of hospital zones and localities (Article 23 of the First Convention) and security zones and localities (Article 14 of the Fourth Convention);
- to receive requests for aid from protected persons (Article 30 of the Fourth Convention);
- to exercise its right of initiative; this means that it may ask the parties to a conflict to agree to its discharging other humanitarian functions in the event of non-international armed conflicts (Article 3 common to the four Geneva Conventions of 1949) and international armed conflicts (Article 9 of the First, Second and Third Conventions, and Article 10 of the Fourth Convention);
- to act, wherever necessary, as a substitute for the Protecting Power.

The assistance of the *Red Cross in general*, and, in particular, of the National Societies and their federation, the League, is defined by a general clause in Protocol I, Article 81.

The role of the *United Nations* is mentioned in Article 89 of Protocol I: “In situations of serious violations of the Conventions or of this Protocol, the High Contracting Parties undertake to act, jointly or individually, in co-operation with the United Nations and in conformity with the United Nations Charter.”

The facultative formation of an *International Fact-Finding Commission* was introduced, on a proposal by Sweden, in Article 90 of Protocol I. This Commission shall be convened when twenty High Contracting Parties have agreed to accept its competence.

All in all, it can be said that the international community today has an updated body of international law applicable in case of armed conflicts, together with the procedures for its implementation.

* * *

It should however be pointed out that as this law has been developed, and the number of its implementation procedures increased, the number of obstacles to its implementation has also increased.

In the worsening international climate there is a growing tendency to resort to force, both between and within States, increasing the number of conflicts as well as the number of victims.

Confronted with the present crises, governments are tempted to think only in the short term, to reject everything that does not fit in with immediate interests, and to relegate humanitarian considerations to a place behind what they consider to be the imperatives of politics and security.

This refusal to implement humanitarian law defies the whole international community (the States, the legal system, the organizations) and inflicts intolerable suffering on the victims of conflicts.

In 1981, at the 24th International Red Cross Conference in Manila, I said how concerned the ICRC was at the escalation of indiscriminate violence, the repeated violation of basic humanitarian principles, the politicization of humanitarian law and the arms race in a starving world.¹

The International Red Cross Conference adopted two resolutions (Resolutions IV and VI) reminding all parties to conflicts of their humanitarian obligations. The first of these two resolutions deplored the fact that the ICRC had been refused access to captured combatants and civilian detainees in the armed conflicts of Western Sahara, Ogaden and Afghanistan. It was no coincidence that these three situations were mixed conflicts, being both internal and international, whose legal status had political implications liable to jeopardize humanitarian action for the victims of the conflicts.

Two years after Manila, these refusals still stand, except in the case of Ogaden, and the list, regrettably, is not complete. It would be remiss of me not to remind you of the ICRC appeal last May to the whole international community as well as to Iraq and Iran concerning our activities in those two warring countries. Nor should I omit our repeated approaches to Israel to secure its recognition of the applicability of the Fourth Convention to the occupied territories and to ensure respect of the Convention in all areas.

Besides operating in situations of armed conflict, the ICRC, with the consent of the governments concerned, visits persons detained as a result of internal troubles and tensions. Since the end of the Second World War, the ICRC has visited more than 300,000 detainees in eighty countries.

But in numerous situations which are not covered by the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their 1977 Protocols, the ICRC was not allowed access to persons detained as a result of serious troubles.

¹ See the address by the ICRC President at the opening meeting of the Twenty-fourth International Red Cross Conference, in *International Review of the Red Cross*, January-February 1982.

As the initiator of the Red Cross movement and of humanitarian law, the ICRC works unceasingly to help innocent victims of conflicts and to foster the humanitarian spirit in action and in law.

Over the last few years, the ICRC has seen its activities expand despite certain setbacks, and has also witnessed an increased need for all kinds of support to undertake operations wherever possible and to overcome obstacles.

On the outbreak of the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran, the ICRC reminded both parties of the applicability of the Geneva Conventions. It set up or strengthened its delegations in Baghdad and Teheran and maintained a constant dialogue with the authorities. Prompted by the numerous difficulties we came up against, I myself carried out several missions to both Baghdad and Teheran in order to meet the leaders of both countries. Since these discreet steps proved insufficient, the ICRC launched a public appeal to the two parties and to all the States bound by the Geneva Conventions.

* * *

On a general level, the ICRC has for several months been in touch with several governments and independent specialists on the matter of monitoring the application of humanitarian law and its underlying principles.

In 1984, the ICRC will step up these expert consultations and will pursue them further in 1985 and 1986. The aim should be to foster awareness of this problem, having in mind the 25th International Red Cross Conference in Geneva in 1986.

To this end, the ICRC would gladly continue its discussions with the Independent Commission or those of its members who are best informed on this subject.

The purpose of these discussions should be to agree with these specialists and politicians on ways of:

- a) improving knowledge of and respect for humanitarian law, not only in military circles, but also and above all among politicians in positions of authority;
- b) drawing the attention of parties to conflicts, and all the States bound by the Geneva Conventions to the existence in the Conventions and Protocols of procedures for their application (including the institution of Protecting Powers) and encouraging them to make use of such procedures to implement humanitarian law.

Even though this renewed affirmation of existing law and the procedures for its application is a matter of urgent concern and high priority, it should not exclude new developments.

As a matter of fact, several areas were left untouched when humanitarian law was recently supplemented. The ICRC has begun to consider improving the humanitarian rules governing, amongst other things, the following problems: sea warfare, neutrality, lawful methods and means of combat, medical transport, etc., to mention only a few areas where better protection of human beings in times of conflict seems to us to be necessary. In the near future, the ICRC will approach experts and States for consultations on these various topics.

The situation of the individual caught up in violence in a State, violence that ranges from simple internal tensions to more serious internal disturbance, is a cause of deep concern to the ICRC. A suggestion was made recently to draft a declaration of basic and inalienable rights applicable to cases of collective violence within States, in situations that would not already be covered by humanitarian law. The ICRC considers this idea worth pursuing and intends to examine it during its consultations with experts.

* * *

The main questions I would like to put to you today are these: how should one go about stimulating this awareness of humanitarian values among political leaders? How should one foster the humanitarian spirit in politics? How can one demonstrate that in every political situation there are humanitarian aspects which one ignores at one's peril?

We, who are every day confronted with the victims' plight, would be grateful should you be able, with your command of political affairs, to conceive of ways and means to promote the acceptance and application of humanitarian law and its principles among political leaders and to bring awareness to public opinion.

With your experience and standing, you have access to the highest political leaders and you can urge:

- a) the speedy ratification of the Additional Protocols, which are a basic supplement to humanitarian law in its main areas such as the protection of civilians against hostilities;
- b) a better knowledge of the existing instruments of humanitarian law;
- c) the faithful application of these instruments in all circumstances, and full co-operation with existing humanitarian organizations;

- d) a better use of the institutions and procedures provided for in existing statutory law: collective responsibility of the States party to the Conventions, Protecting Power, Fact-Finding Commission.

We should not forget that there are also questions of mediation between parties to conflicts, between States or within States, nor should we forget limited but especially acute problems, such as that of missing or stateless persons.

The ideal would obviously be to reach the stage where humanitarian principles would be such a matter of course that there would be no need for humanitarian institutions or law. But we are still a long way from achieving this.

* * *

Many other problems ought to be mentioned, many tragic and admirable cases reported. We could speak of them far longer.

For the moment, I would like to conclude with the wish that we may all continue to do our share for humanity wherever we may be of most service, supporting each other and restoring a little peace and solidarity to a world that so sorely needs it.

Alexandre Hay
President of the ICRC

Humanitarian Action : Protection and Assistance¹

by Jean-Pierre Hocké

At a time when so many tragic events are taking place in so many parts of the world, I do not think that your Commission would be satisfied with a technical account on the nature and conditions of humanitarian assistance. It would seem pointless because it would be outside the context of tragic reality. Let us think of what is happening in Lebanon, the large-scale fighting that could start up again at any time on the Planalto in Angola, the fate of the Afghan and Khmer people — to cite only those few examples.

The problem is not to know what has to be done, but how indeed to reach the victims so as to *assist* them, feed them, give them medical attention and *protect* them efficaciously.

While the humanitarian organizations, in particular the ICRC, are unwavering in their determination to reach persons in need wherever they are, the permission they have to obtain from those who control access to those human beings is far from being automatically granted. More and more, despite the various conventions in force and the commitment to respect fundamental humanitarian principles, the authorities, whether legal or not, often make such access to the helpless contingent upon some legal prerequisite and subject to such conditions that they actually delay or even block humanitarian operations.

Based on the experience of the past fifteen years, I observe unfortunately that there have been more and more of those requirements to be met. Two examples tend to confirm that dangerous development in the past ten years.

In the civil war in Nigeria where, as early as August 1968, it became clear that, regardless of the support governments wanted to give either

¹ Speech to the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues, New York, 12 November 1983.

to the legitimate authorities of Nigeria or to the secessionist in Biafra, the international community would not allow the conflict between the belligerents to cause the death from starvation of hundreds of thousands of innocent people, particularly children. The result was a humanitarian airlift, which was generously agreed to by Lagos.

In the conflict in Kampuchea where, in the spring of 1981, the ICRC was subjected to incredible pressure from various official or private quarters to induce it to privilege aid dispatched across the Khmer-Thai border to victims inside Kampuchea. There was nothing to justify sending through larger tonnages of food and seeds than those needed by the civilians who could be reached via that channel. The ICRC, in keeping with its principles of impartiality and neutrality, held its ground despite threats and slander.

I should like to stress that the Committee was acting in conformity with one of the golden rules of humanitarian organizations, namely that a very clear distinction should be made between the humanitarian and the political. In that respect, I feel more and more that governments should also observe that rule. Too often, the fate of the victims, even of whole populations, is automatically linked with the political stakes and thus they become a bargaining pawn.

In the first place, the lumping together of the humanitarian and the political is contrary to the commitment to respect him, who, soldier or civilian, can no longer do harm and to see to it that he be protected and assisted. Secondly, that practice prevents humanitarian activity from reducing the high tension resulting from hostilities. Lastly, with the humanitarian effort curtailed in that way and in danger of being paralyzed, political leaders can no longer shorten the time required to create conditions for resuming dialogue between the belligerents, in an effort to settle the conflict. In other words, the attempts made to deflect humanitarian action from its sole purpose, namely, *to protect and assist the victims*, are bound to exacerbate any conflict situation. If such practice were to persist, the ICRC and other humanitarian organizations would become mere purveyors of relief and medical care, which would be used as the immediate interest of the governments and of parties to a conflict fluctuate.

For its part, the ICRC is firmly resolved to oppose such tendencies: its mission to protect victims in situations of international or internal conflicts, internal disturbances or tensions is at stake.

Finally, the events leading up to those crises, the vital needs of the victims—indeed, their very survival—imply, as I have tried to show, *that in those crises, protection cannot be dissociated from assistance.*

However, the ICRC does not want to be and cannot be the only one both to oppose the linkage of the humanitarian with the political and to guarantee that indissoluble link between protection and assistance.

In recent years, many organizations have been increasingly active in the theatres of operations of man-made disasters. They can be classified in three main groups:

- the ICRC, supported by the Red Cross movement as a whole;
- the humanitarian assistance or co-ordination agencies of the United Nations system;
- non-governmental voluntary organizations.

Their presence in the field simultaneously is a matter of concern both:

- for the host governments, which are faced with the problems of their role and the freedom of action and movement they should enjoy, in situations which are explosive in terms of the complex political and security factors which brought them about, and
- for the donor overnments, which are genuinely and keenly concerned about an efficient and efficacious division of labour among the humanitarian organizations, as well as the co-ordinated utilization of the resources they place at their disposal.

Let me tell you frankly that, in my experience, here again the problem is much more political than technical. Actually—and so much the better—several of the organizations in the three groups I identified possess comparable medical, logistic and relief mobilization skills. What differentiates them, sometimes very basically, are the principles or the rules by which they are motivated or guided.

On the basis of those criteria, those organizations can be classified in a different way:

- those established by conventions or declarations accepted by the community of nations: for the ICRC, the 1949 Geneva Conventions; for the High Commissioner for Refugees, the 1951 Convention on Refugees; for UNICEF, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child;
- those that owe their existence to specific United Nations resolutions, such as WFP¹ or UNDRO², whose task is essentially assistance or co-ordination; and

¹ World Food Programme.

² Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator.

- the large number of voluntary agencies all over the world that are masters of their own decisions and can initiate and conduct their activities as they like because they are not bound either by a convention or any mandator.

Far be it from me to make the slightest value judgement which might imply that some are better than others in that respect. Rather, I would like to follow the thread which links and interlocks protection and assistance. You will not find it surprising then that the ICRC believes that those organizations which the international community has entrusted with the dual responsibility for protection and assistance have to assume that responsibility fully. Even more, it believes that the authorities concerned, the community of States and the international or private agencies involved in assistance, have to facilitate and support the protection afforded by these agencies to victims of man-made disasters. For that is the heart of the problem: all too often in the past ten years, a landslide of relief goods was poured out to certain countries without the precise conditions for their use having been agreed upon with the competent authorities.

It must be conceded that emotion, a certain competitive spirit and hasty action enabled political leaders to accept assistance while refusing protection. Of course the first thing is for a victim to survive; therefore he has to eat and receive medical attention. However, in the long term the victim must also retain his dignity, enjoy the freedoms to which every human being is entitled, conserve a future, sustain hope.

In that connection, what hope is there still for the millions of refugees all over the world confined to camps; for the quarter of a million civilians trapped for the last four years on the border between Thailand and Kampuchea, right in the middle of the battlefield; for the more than three million Afghans in Pakistan and, finally, for the Palestinians in the Arab world and the Israeli-occupied territories?

If we are to talk about co-ordination, it is first to ensure primarily that men and women and their children, beyond the arbitrary of violence which strikes them so often unfairly, will have a future.

* * *

Those who have worked in these situations know full well that there is no recipe or scheme which like a miracle will produce an easy answer to the problems encountered. Every crisis is so different from any other as to confront us with what amounts to a new situation each time. That is why it is indispensable for those involved in humanitarian activities to create a climate of dialogue and confidence, for it is the only way we

can be sure, when the time comes, of selecting the co-ordinator, the lead agency, which by its vocation, mandates and specific characteristics is best suited to direct the operation in a given situation.

If the ICRC, in armed conflicts, and the HCR, in the case of refugee flows, are more often than others responsible under the mandates for protection conferred upon them, for co-ordinating international action, they should do it in such a way as to avoid giving the impression that they are either defending a monopoly or trying to overshadow the efforts of everybody else involved: National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, their federation, the League, the Agencies of the United Nations system, the non-governmental organizations—without which it is hard to imagine that any humanitarian operation can be entirely successful.

It is with that concern and that experience in mind that the ICRC has taken the initiative in the last fifteen years, whenever it undertook a major operation, of setting up a consultation mechanism with its various partners. The Committee now intends to hold such consultations more frequently and to establish a system of regular consultation.

* * *

Given an increasingly politicized world where incompatible ideologies and dogma out of control clash, the ICRC has to conduct with authorities negotiations the outcome of which will influence the fate of prisoners in their power and of populations under their control, but these negotiations cannot take place outside the humanitarian field. This applies as well to the other humanitarian institutions.

Therefore, it seems to me that whenever it is necessary, we should be able to count on the political support of the international community to complement our efforts.

That support can take several forms. What Sir Robert Jackson¹ accomplished in South East Asia in that respect is remarkable. Some of the proposals made by Prince Sadrudin Aga Khan in his report to the General Assembly should certainly be taken into account. From time to time, government-to-government initiatives could alternate with multilateral action. In a word, what the humanitarians need is a political lightning-conductor which would shield them as much as possible from political controversy or propaganda exercises which restrict their action and even temporarily nullify it.

* * *

¹ Special Representative of the UN Secretary General for Humanitarian Operations in Kampuchea. (Ed.)

Time has come to summarize:

— Assistance cannot be dissociated from protection, the moment our aim is to come to the aid of the victims of international or internal conflicts, internal disturbances or tensions;

— The same standard must be applied to all vulnerable groups, particularly refugees, even when there are no open hostilities going on;

— The dual mandate of protection and assistance was conferred on ICRC and HCR by conventions, even though each of those institutions operates in different situations;

— It is indispensable for the other international or voluntary organizations, which are not bound by that dual responsibility, to help the ICRC and the HCR to succeed *in actual deeds* in guaranteeing the protection to which victims are entitled. That does not imply that their only option is to place themselves under the banner of either of the two institutions just mentioned. What it does mean is that those organizations assume full responsibilities from that very moment when, consciously or uncsciously, they allow authorities to accept assistance but reject protection;

— The concerted consultation to be established among the humanitarian organizations is founded on the vital necessity to have an operational co-ordination which would ensure the indissolubility of the binominal protection/assistance;

— This goal can only be achieved and then preserved if humanitarian organizations, whether or not they are founded on international law, enjoy the firm political support of the authorities which benefit from their action and from the donor governments which supply them with the means for action;

— That support has crumbled in recent crises. It must be restored totally and rapidly: the survival of millions of human beings is at stake. Moreover, the international community will rediscover that humanitarian action can help to resolve crises;

— The moment those notions are borne in mind and commitments are honoured, the material co-ordination of assistance operations will follow almost naturally. It will be the best conceivable guarantee to be given to the donors of the rational utilization of the resources they make available to the humanitarians;

— The special characteristics of every new emergency make it impossible to devise any rigid patterns or models which would be applicable in all cases where humanitarian organizations intervene. More attention should be given to those differences. On the other hand, they do not prevent the systematization of techniques of action and methods of work. A solid regional representation and a balanced expertise would considerably expedite the practical responses which must be found to the challenge of each new wave of victims.

* * *

There are, to be sure, a number of other points that I should talk about and elaborate, but I feel it is important to respect the tight schedule of your Committee and I wanted to stick to the essentials.

I should not like to conclude this statement, Mr. Chairman, without thanking you very sincerely as well as each of the members of the Committee for the opportunity you afforded me to bring to your attention the difficulties, doubts, and—why not mention it—the anguish which, day after day, are part of the hard work of the ICRC delegates and their colleagues and friends from the other humanitarian institutions.

I am grateful to you for the fruitful dialogue you made possible between us. Like ourselves, you are perfectly well aware of the profound distress of tens of millions of men, women and children all over the world and just as aware of their indomitable hope.

Jean-Pierre Hocké

*Member of the Directorate of the ICRC
Director for Operational Activities*

Some Reflections on the Future of International Humanitarian Law ¹

by Hans-Peter Gasser

The four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the protection of war victims and the two 1977 Additional Protocols are the written sources of modern international humanitarian law. This monumental work of some 600 articles represents an impressive investment of intellect, arduous political negotiation, financial resources and goodwill. Modern written international humanitarian law is the result of one of the greatest efforts of successive legal codifications we know of. And, of course, customary law supplements the written rules to a substantial extent.

What does the future hold for international humanitarian law? In venturing a reply, I should like to consider different issues of a humanitarian nature to which the ICRC should pay attention, in keeping with its mandate: to work not only *for the faithful application* of humanitarian law but also for its *improvement and dissemination*. At a later stage, priorities will have to be set, goals defined and procedures decided.

The principal task : ensuring respect for humanitarian law

It seems to us, however, that the greatest priority must be given, now and in the future, to the *acceptance of and better respect for existing humanitarian law*. This law has proved its value, and its further development in the 1977 Protocols marks a great step forward, a fundamental improvement of the lot of human beings caught in the turmoil of war.

Attention has to be paid, in the future even more than in the past, to the following objectives:

¹ Paper read at the Ninth Round Table on Current Problems of International Humanitarian Law, San Remo, September 1983. — The opinions expressed are those of the author.

First, the existing rules must be *accepted* by States in accordance with the formal procedures laid down by their respective constitution. I am obviously referring here to the ratification of the 1977 Protocols, as we have every reason to be proud of the degree of acceptance found by the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which have been accepted by 154 States. They have become universal law. This is not the case of the Protocols; today, six years after the end of the Diplomatic Conference that produced them, 38 States are bound by Protocol I, 31 by Protocol II.¹ This situation is not satisfactory and it causes the ICRC concern.

Secondly, the existing law must be *understood*. This is particularly true for the Protocols, as their complexity requires a certain effort in interpretation. This law must thus continue to be explained, by academics and other experts in humanitarian law, including those of the ICRC.

Thirdly, the existing law must be *known* and, even more important, it must be *assimilated* by those who ought to respect it. The only way to achieve this goal is and will be the instruction of the members of the armed forces, from the private to the commander-in-chief, his general staff, and all those whose activities have any bearing on the implementation, in time of armed conflict, of obligations under the Conventions.

Fourthly, the existing law must be *respected*. There is no need to draw attention to the breaches of the Conventions and the Protocols, even of their most essentially humanitarian regulations, to which we are all witnesses. A glance at the future leads us to predict a proliferation of troublespots and this should stimulate our imagination to think of ways of reinforcing existing supervision procedures and to find other means likely to guarantee better respect for humanitarian rules.

Like all human endeavours, the Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Protocols are not perfect, nor do they achieve the ultimate goal, namely full protection of helpless individuals against the effects of war. The carrying of humanitarian law a stage further in 1977—in particular, the new provisions limiting the right of belligerents to choose ways and means of conducting military operations, and those on the protection of civilians against direct effects of hostilities—has without any doubt felicitously supplemented the 1949 Conventions and respective customary law. The way we see the situation today makes it seem unlikely that a new attempt at development and codification of such scope is to be expected in the near future. What is likely is that efforts will be directed to making progress in certain particular areas.

¹ Figures as on 31 December 1983.

Indeed, another round in the development of important parts of humanitarian law seems to us not only improbable for some time to come, but even undesirable, for various reasons. For one thing, a look at the international scene reveals that our era suffers from an excess of international legal instruments. Because of this, the value of any new provision tends to diminish, and so does the likelihood of its being accepted.

Secondly, the humanitarian treaties have attained such a dimension and degree of sophistication and complexity that they have become difficult to comprehend and assimilate, not only by the persons who have to work with them, but even by legal experts. That analysis leads us to the conclusion that more efforts have to be made to explain the rules in force than to create new ones. Such endeavours have to focus particularly upon the underlying principles, barely visible in the present law, particularly in 1977 Protocol I.

Development of humanitarian law : scope and limits

Let us now turn to the areas and problems of humanitarian concern which, in our opinion, might require the development of humanitarian law provisions. We intentionally look beyond the limits of international humanitarian law in its strict sense and also intend our analysis to cover some areas on the fringe of that law or squarely outside it. As a lawyer on the staff of the ICRC, I can assure that the ICRC would take an initiative only on those issues which are of direct concern to it. The ICRC has no intention whatsoever of impinging on areas outside its terms of reference. But analysis has to be taken beyond the limits of our own domain in order to see the issues in a broader context.

Three categories of situations demand our attention:

- 1) Some domains of the law governing relations between States in time of armed conflicts were not taken up by the 1977 Diplomatic Conference (at the suggestion, incidentally, of the ICRC) and remain, therefore, in their pre-1977 state.
- 2) Other areas are constantly presenting us with new challenges, due to technological progress. The law must keep pace with these developments, which otherwise will run roughshod over it.
- 3) As part of public international law, humanitarian law is directly related to many other fields of law, such as human rights, refugee law, international penal law, etc. Changes in these areas could have repercussions on humanitarian law. It is consequently necessary to keep pace with what is going on elsewhere, to defend the attainments

of the Geneva Conventions and the Protocols and, if necessary, try to influence the development of public international law in other fields, in accordance with the goals of humanitarian policy.

Without giving at this stage an opinion on the priority to be accorded to each problem, we can mention several areas which should be on the agenda for future development of humanitarian law.

Possible areas for further development

Law on armed conflict at sea

The written regulations governing armed conflict at sea date back to 1907; they were drafted before the appearance of submarines and the large scale use of aircraft in naval operations. Only the Second Geneva Convention of 1949, as supplemented by 1977 Protocol I, develops adequately one important part of that law, i.e. the rules on the protection of the condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea. The state of customary law, on the other hand, is uncertain. —Are there grounds for looking into, and working towards a recasting of, the international rules on naval warfare?

Opinions differ among lawyers and diplomats. We should, however, take into account that efforts to bring about a new law of the sea have finally succeeded. What are the effects of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention on the law applicable in armed conflicts, especially on humanitarian issues? A fine analysis is necessary. The results of that analysis, coupled with the experience of the conflict in the South Atlantic (1982), may produce enough elements to permit a decision on whether a thorough debate on ways and means of better safeguarding humanitarian interests in armed conflicts at sea should be held. Quite obviously, the ICRC will focus its interests only on humanitarian issues, such as better protection of hospital ships, improvement of the lot of civilians caught in hostilities at sea, etc. The tremendous economic interests which would nowadays be at stake in a war on the high seas are beyond its scope.

Law of neutrality

Like the law on armed conflicts at sea, the law of neutrality was not on the agenda of the 1974-1977 Diplomatic Conference, and this quite deliberately so. The sources for the rules governing the rights and duties of neutral States during an armed conflict are to be found in the Vth and XIIIth Hague Conventions of 1907, to a very limited extent in the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and in customary law. It could hardly be claimed that the law, as it stands, meets present-day demands. Moreover,

governments' notions of neutrality are not necessarily now what they were at the beginning of the century. Any attempt to make proposals for the future of the law of neutrality would be premature, however, as there has been hardly any discussion by experts on this subject recently. Some issues will have close links with those covered by the law of armed conflict at sea, especially the protection of the shipping interests of neutral countries. It is clear that under this heading we are touching also upon highly political interests. First of all, we have therefore to single out those issues which are primarily of humanitarian concern.

Rules on means and methods of warfare

1977 Protocol I reaffirms two paramount rules of international humanitarian law, namely that "the right of the parties to the conflict to choose methods or means of warfare is not unlimited" and that "it is prohibited to employ weapons, projectiles and material and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering" (Article 35, paragraphs 1 and 2). Other provisions of this Protocol and of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons have already developed those general principles into specific prohibitions which are directly applicable. More work remains to be done: the basic tenet that there are limitations on the resort to means and methods of warfare has to be translated into operational rules. In particular, the constant development of armaments demands that efforts continue, consistent with the 1980 Convention, to examine other types of weaponry with a view to prohibition or restriction of their use. Should action be taken in areas outside the scope of that Convention? The question is open—for what is at stake warrants continuing reflection on this subject.

Medical transport

Along the same lines, close attention should be paid to all developments, technical or otherwise, likely to improve the protection of medical transport by land, sea or air, and of hospitals and medical personnel engaged in searching, transporting and caring for the wounded, sick and shipwrecked. Experience gained in a recent conflict has demonstrated to us the extreme importance of using available techniques for the identification of medical aircraft, in particular helicopters. We have to follow closely the progress of modern technology in this field. Of course, Protocol I lays down a procedure for the periodic revision of its Regulations Concerning Identification, thereby permitting advantage to be taken of technical developments for humanitarian concerns.

Improved protection of the individual

We are more than ever aware today of the overlapping of international humanitarian law and other areas of public international law with regard to the protection of the individual. Recent and future developments of the human rights law, the international instruments concerning refugees, major parts of international penal law and others may have a direct bearing on humanitarian law. Many projects are under way, all within the United Nations, or are in a preliminary phase of discussion. Suffice it to mention the work on a draft Code on Crimes against Peace and the Security of Humanity, the Draft Conventions on Torture and on Mercenaries, the proposals for improved physical protection of refugees in conflict situations, the discussion on movements of people, etc.

Of all these fields, we would like to draw particular attention to the problems which arise when internal conditions in a country can neither be qualified as an internal conflict falling under international humanitarian law relating to non-international armed conflicts (Article 3 common to the 1949 Conventions, Protocol II), nor, quite clearly, as peace. These situations of internal disturbances or tension, sometimes with civil war aspects, are often characterized, for example, by a declaration of a state of emergency, accompanied by martial law, by severe limitations on individual liberties and by a large number of detainees, deprived of their freedom because of the prevailing circumstances. Although such states of emergency by definition should be of a transient character, experience shows that harsh reactions to a crisis situation have the tendency to stay.

The approach taken by the two systems—human rights and humanitarian law—to such situations is quite different: the universal and regional conventions on human rights allow a government under certain circumstances to suspend the guarantee of human rights, with the exception of some fundamental rights (hard core). Humanitarian law on the other hand quite simply does not apply to this type of situation but it is well known that the ICRC may carry out its humanitarian activity on behalf of so-called “political” or “security” detainees, with the consent of the government concerned, on a case by case basis.

Do the applicable rules of public international law give adequate protection to those adversely affected by such a situation?—It has been said by many that the list of those human rights which may not be suspended, even in time of emergency threatening the life of the nation, is too short, that the number of non-derogable rights is insufficient, especially in the “older” treaties. A close examination of this problem

is under way in the United Nations. Those interested in improved protection of the individual in situations close to internal armed conflicts will follow the outcome of these discussions with the utmost interest.

It has also been pointed out that the borderline between situations of internal disturbances not covered by international humanitarian law on the one hand and non-international armed conflicts on the other is sometimes difficult to determine. Governments may, moreover, be unwilling to acknowledge the existence of a state of internal armed conflict, for obvious political reasons. What remains applicable, under the worst circumstances of a *de facto* internal armed conflict, is the non-derogable core of rights under the various human rights instruments, inadequate as the protection they confer may be. The situation is even less satisfactory if the State is not a party to any of the human rights instruments. The government may feel itself legally free to derogate from almost all of the human rights usually guaranteed by the major conventions, as their status under customary law is not always acknowledged. It has been suggested that a declaration of basic non-derogable human rights should be drafted and be applicable in all internal emergency situations characterized by violence, irrespective of their legal qualification by the government.

We believe that such efforts are meritorious and should be encouraged. Indeed, basic humanitarian concerns have to be met even if the legal qualification of the acts of violence disrupting the normal life of a country is disputed.

How to develop the law ?

This issue raises an interesting question of a general nature which deserves to be mentioned (if not answered) in this context: What is the right way to develop the law—to draft new legal provisions in the form of a treaty binding on the parties or to work out a (non-binding) declaration of general principles whose applicability is proclaimed as a matter of course?—The approach based on a general declaration has proven its merits as a preliminary stage for the eventual elaboration of a legal instrument. The issue is however slightly different, it is submitted, when a situation is already covered by legal provisions, even if inadequately. What will then be the value and the effectiveness of a declaration which runs into competition with binding legal provisions?—Everything has to be done in order to avoid the weakening of existing law, with its elaborate provisions geared to specific issues and with its implementation machinery. Whether a general declaration may not tempt governments to move away from their specific and concrete obligations under treaty

law and to embrace general principles which necessarily leave much more room for governmental discretion, is a question to be studied carefully. Are not general principles much more easily pushed aside than law with effective implementation procedures? Is there not a danger that governments may hide behind general principles—which are more easily respected due to their general character—in order to evade specific treaty obligations?

* * *

The ICRC observes developments in all these neighbouring areas with great attention. It would welcome improved protection of the suffering human being in all circumstances. The ICRC nevertheless keeps in mind that it has to preserve what the humanitarian law conventions have already achieved for the protection of war victims. Any adverse encroachment on it has to be avoided.

Conclusions

As long as there are armed conflicts, the development of international humanitarian law should aim at improving the lot of their victims.

Any initiative to make new law has to be judged, it is submitted, according to the following criteria: Does the proposal significantly reinforce the protection of the human being caught in the turmoil of war? Does the proposed rule improve the effectiveness of humanitarian policy?

To return to what I said at the beginning: any new measure that succeeds in better guaranteeing compliance with existing humanitarian law by the parties to a conflict would under present circumstances be the most urgent and most beneficial contribution to humanitarian policy. The task for us all is and remains the promotion, perhaps, of the law as such, but even more important is that of ensuring its respect by governments.

Hans-Peter Gasser

*Legal Adviser,
International Committee of the
Red Cross*

States parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949

States parties to the Protocols of 8 June 1977

as at 31 December 1983

Below we give the lists, drawn up in chronological order as at 31 December 1983, of the States which became parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 during the past three years (1981-1982-1983), and of all the States parties to Protocols I and II additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, adopted on 8 June 1977.

The names of the States are shown in abbreviated form; the number in the left-hand margin has no special significance, and has been placed there merely to facilitate reference. The list of States parties to the Conventions starts at number 146; for the 145 States which had previously become parties to the Conventions see the International Review of the Red Cross, July-August 1982.

The numbering of States parties to the Protocols has been divided into two columns, the first for the States parties to Protocol I, the second for those parties to Protocol II.

The third column indicates the form of official act received by the depositary in Berne: R = ratification; A = accession; S = declaration of succession.

The fourth column indicates whether the signatory State has made any reservations as to the application of the Conventions or the Protocols, whether it has made any special declarations, and, by the abbreviation "Int. Commission", whether it has accepted the competence of the International Fact-finding Commission provided for in Art. 90, para. 2 of Protocol I.

States parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949

	OFFICIAL DATE OF REGISTRATION	TYPE OF ACT RECEIVED	REMARKS
1981			
146	Tuvalu 19 February	S-as from 1.10.78	
147	St. Vincent and the Grenadines 1 April	A	
148	Grenada 13 April	S-as from 7.2.74	
149	Solomon Islands 6 July	S-as from 7.7.78	
150	Saint Lucia 18 September	S-as from 22.2.79	
151	Commonwealth of Dominica 28 September	S-as from 3.11.78	
1982			
152	Rep. of Vanuatu 27 October	A	
1983			
153	Rep. of Zimbabwe 7 March	A	
154	People's Rep. of Mozambique 14 March	A	
155	Namibia (UN Council for) 18 October	A	

On 31 December 1983, 155 States were parties to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

States parties to the protocols of 8 June 1977

PROTOCOLS			OFFICIAL DATE	TYPE OF ACT	
I	II		OF REGISTRATION	RECEIVED	REMARKS
1978					
1	1	Ghana	28 February	R	
2	2	Libya	7 June	A	
<i>Date of entry into force of the Protocols: 7 December 1978</i>					
3	3	Salvador	23 November	R	
1979					
4	4	Ecuador	10 April	R	
5	5	Jordan	1 May	R	
6	6	Botswana	23 May	A	
7		Cyprus	1 June	R	Prot. I only
8	7	Niger	8 June	R	
9	8	Yugoslavia	11 June	R	Declaration
10	9	Tunisia	9 August	R	
11	10	Sweden	31 August	R	Reservation Int. Commission
1980					
12	11	Mauritania	14 March	A	
13	12	Gabon	8 April	A	
14	13	Bahamas	10 April	A	
15	14	Finland	7 August	R	Reservation and declarations Int. Commission
16	15	Bangladesh	8 September	A	
17	16	Laos	18 November	R	
1981					
18		Viet Nam	19 October	R	Prot. I only
19	17	Norway	14 December	R	Int. Commission
1982					
20	18	Rep. of Korea	15 January	R	Declaration
21	19	Switzerland	17 February	R	Reservations Int. Commission
22	20	Mauritius	22 March	A	
23		Zaire	3 June	A	Prot. I only
24	21	Denmark	17 June	R	Reservation Int. Commission Int. Commission
25	22	Austria	13 August	R	Int. Commission
26	23	Saint Lucia	7 October	A	
27		Cuba	25 November	A	Prot. I only

PROTOCOLS			OFFICIAL DATE	TYPE OF ACT	
I	II		OF REGISTRATION	RECEIVED	REMARKS
1983					
28	24	Tanzania	15 February	A	
29	25	United Arab Emirates	9 March	A	
30		Mexico	10 March	A	Prot. I only
31		Mozambique	14 March	A	Prot. I only
32	26	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	8 April	A	
33	27	People's Rep. of China	14 September	A	Reservation
34	28	Namibia (UN Council for)	18 October	A	
35	29	People's Rep. of Congo	10 November	A	
36		Syrian Arab Republic	14 November	A	Prot. I only
37	30	Bolivia	8 December	A	
38	31	Costa Rica	15 December	A	

On 31 December 1983, 38 States were parties to Protocol I and 31 States to Protocol II.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

ICRC Appeal

following the entry into force of the Convention on Prohibitions and Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons

The “Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may Be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects” entered into force on 2 December 1983, six months after twenty States had deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. The three Protocols annexed to the Convention also entered into force on that date; Protocol I prohibits the use of weapons with non-detectable fragments, Protocol II prohibits or limits the use of mines, booby-traps and other devices, and Protocol III prohibits or limits the use of incendiary weapons.

The *International Review of the Red Cross* published the text of the Convention and the three Protocols in its January-February 1981 issue. These treaties stipulate that not only civilians but also military objectives located within a concentration of civilians shall not be made the object of an attack by incendiary weapons and that the use of mines and booby-traps is limited so as to avoid civilian suffering as much as possible.

In modern armed conflicts an ever-increasing proportion of the civilian population suffers from the hostilities. Everyone knows the terrible suffering caused by burns; less known is the fact that more and more victims are wounded by mines or booby-traps and that they are very often left handicapped for life.

The ICRC therefore applauds the entry into force of the Convention and the Protocols. It takes this opportunity to appeal to all States to become parties to these treaties. It also appeals to all parties to armed conflicts to strictly observe their provisions, even if not formally bound by them and even if the conflict is non-international and thereby not covered by them. This is a humanitarian demand that goes beyond the strict limits of the law.

Resignations and Appointments at the ICRC

At its last session of the year, on 7 and 8 December 1983, the Assembly of the International Committee of the Red Cross took leave of four of its members: Mr. Hans-Peter Tschudi and Mr. Jakob Burckhardt, who are retiring owing to their age, Mr. Marcel A. Naville, former president of the ICRC (1969-1973) and Mr. Thomas Fleiner, who did not wish their terms to be renewed.

The Assembly appointed Mr. Maurice Aubert Vice-President of the ICRC. He will assume his duties on 1 January 1984, replacing Mr. Richard Pestalozzi, who has been Vice-President of the ICRC since July 1979. Mr. Pestalozzi will continue as a member of the Assembly and of the Executive Board of the ICRC.

The Assembly warmly thanked the Vice-President and members who are standing down for the services they had rendered to the ICRC and the entire Red Cross movement. It appointed Mr. H. P. Tschudi, Mr. J. Burckhardt and Mr. M. A. Naville honorary members of the ICRC.

The Assembly also elected a new member, Mr. Peter Arbenz, of Winterthur, who will take his seat at the beginning of 1984.

Mr. Maurice Aubert was born in Geneva in 1924. He is a doctor of Law and a lawyer; he devoted himself to a legal career in the service of a bank and to political activities in the legislative bodies of the city and canton of Geneva. At present, he is President of the Geneva Foundation of the University Institute for Development Studies. Mr. Aubert has been a member of the ICRC Assembly since January 1979 and a member of the Executive Board since September 1983. On becoming Vice-President of the ICRC, a post which will take up all his time, Mr. Aubert will naturally give up his current professional and political activities.

The new member of the ICRC, Mr. Peter Arbenz, was born in Winterthur in 1937. He has a degree in Political Science and is currently a municipal councillor in the city of his birth. He was formerly director of Helvetas, a Swiss association for technical assistance to developing countries; he has been a member of the association's Central Committee since 1973. Mr. Arbenz also worked for the Swiss Confederation as a specialist in development co-operation.

The ICRC is pleased of these appointments and to benefit from the co-operation of these new members.

Death of Mrs. M. Gautier-van Berchem

Mrs. Marguerite Gautier-van Berchem died on 23 January 1984, to the deep sorrow of all those who had the privilege of knowing her.

The daughter of the well-known scientist Max van Berchem, Marguerite Gautier continued in her father's footsteps and became a scholar in the field of archeology. She was the author of a number of highly esteemed publications.

When the First World War broke out in 1914, she offered her services as a voluntary worker to the ICRC, which had opened the International Prisoners of War Agency; the Agency was to make the name of the ICRC and Geneva known the world over. Marguerite van Berchem selflessly devoted her time and effort to the work at hand, and was soon appointed head of the German Service, a position she filled with skill and efficiency.

In 1939, when for the second time a generalized war made a battlefield of most of the world, Marguerite van Berchem returned to the ICRC. She had always been interested in Islamic culture, and saw the necessity of creating in the Agency a Colonial Service, separate from the French Service, to handle the cases of the many prisoners of war from the colonies. Because they spoke and wrote languages little-known beyond their borders, these POWs suffered in the European camps from the climate and the isolation, the lack of news and family parcels. For years, the Agency was the only link between them and their country. Marguerite van Berchem became the head of this Service, to which she brought her ability and her energy. After the war, the "colonial files" were of great usefulness to the French national POW bureaux whose documents had been destroyed or were incomplete.

In the meantime, as the hostilities spread, the ICRC had to increase considerably the number of its collaborators. Marguerite van Berchem had the idea of calling persons of good will in other Swiss towns for help. Thus, under her direction, the auxiliary sections to the Agency were created; at their peak, these sections had over 1,000 staff, whose work was of inestimable value.

Marguerite van Berchem represented the ICRC on several important occasions, and in particular at the Fifteenth International Red Cross Conference in Tokyo in 1934.

In 1951, she was elected a member of the ICRC, and in 1969 an honorary member. Until a few years ago, and in spite of her age, she faithfully attended every Assembly, where her points of view, which

reflected so much culture, experience and wisdom, were always well received. She also made generous donations to the staff pension fund, in aid of retired employees in need.

Those who knew her will not forget her engaging personality.

Accession of the People's Republic of the Congo to the Protocols

The People's Republic of the Congo deposited with the Swiss Government, on 10 November 1983, an instrument of accession to the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol I) and non-international armed conflicts (Protocol II), adopted in Geneva on 8 June 1977.

Pursuant to their provisions, the Protocols will enter into force for the People's Republic of the Congo on 10 May 1984, six months after the deposit of its instrument of accession.

The People's Republic of the Congo is the 34th State to become party to Protocol I and the 28th to Protocol II.

Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to Protocol I

On 14 November 1983, the Syrian Arab Republic deposited with the Swiss Government an instrument of accession to the Protocol additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol I).

In accordance with the articles of the Protocol, this accession will become effective on 14 May 1984, i.e. six months after the registration of the instrument of accession.

The Syrian Arab Republic is the 36th State to accede to Protocol I. The number of States parties to Protocol II remains 29.

Accession of Bolivia to the Protocols

The Republic of Bolivia deposited with the Swiss Government, on 8 December 1983, an instrument of accession to the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol I) and non-international armed conflicts (Protocol II), adopted in Geneva on 8 June 1977.

Pursuant to their provisions, the Protocols will enter into force for the Republic of Bolivia on 8 June 1984.

This is the 37th State to become party to Protocol I and the 30th to Protocol II.

Accession of Costa Rica to the Protocols

The Government of the Republic of Costa Rica deposited with the Swiss Government, on 15 December 1983, an instrument of accession to the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol I) and non-international armed conflicts (Protocol II), adopted in Geneva on 8 June 1977.

Pursuant to their provisions, the Protocols will enter into force for the Republic of Costa Rica on 15 June 1984.

This is the 38th State to become party to Protocol I and the 31st to Protocol II.

Special Fund for the disabled

Geneva, 20 January 1984

CIRCULAR N° 528

*To the Central Committees of the National Red Cross
and Red Crescent Societies*

The ICRC is pleased to inform the National Societies that it has established a special fund for the benefit of the disabled as a result of armed conflicts.

The fund is intended to finance long-term projects for persons disabled as a result of armed conflicts. The fund will first give help to war amputees and paraplegics. It will endeavour to help invalids in a manner proportionate to their suffering, with priority for distress most urgently demanding relief.

The fund will finance in particular the creation by the ICRC itself of workshops for the production of artificial limbs and orthotic appliances and for rehabilitation and occupational retraining. Projects by National Societies and other humanitarian bodies will also be able to benefit from this fund.

Projects should be suited to conditions in the country where they are undertaken. They should allow for participation by patients and should become independent of the fund in not more than three years.

A committee will examine projects submitted to it. It will see in particular that those of which it approves will be undertaken in co-operation with the authorities and National Societies of the countries for which the projects are intended.

The constitution of a fund for the benefit of the disabled was recommended by Resolution XXVII of the Twenty-fourth International Red Cross Conference which asked that the fund be administered jointly by the ICRC and the League. After an exchange of views between the institutions on the categories of disabled persons whom the fund should benefit, the League Secretariat judged it preferable not to join in the venture. It took the view that the fund should benefit a wider category of disabled than the war-disabled for whom the fund instituted by the ICRC was intended and that it should promote direct action on concrete projects between "participating" and "operating" Societies. Consequently, the ICRC decided, in agreement with the League Secretariat, to set up the fund alone.

EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

November-December 1983

Africa

Missions by the delegate-general

From 30 November to 6 December, ICRC delegate-general for Africa Jean-Marc Bornet was on mission in *Chad*, where he had talks with the Ministers of the Interior and of Finance and also with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

On 27 and 28 December Mr. Bornet was in *Mozambique*, where he reviewed with the authorities potential ICRC action; he had interviews with the Vice-Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Health, as well as with representatives of the "Mozambique Red Cross".

Southern Africa

Four ICRC delegates, one of them a doctor, attended the release and transfer of twenty-eight persons detained by UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola). On 23 and 29 December aircraft chartered by the ICRC conveyed these persons to Southern Africa where they were handed over to their own consular representatives.

The group included nineteen Portuguese civilians—twelve of whom were children—seven nuns, Canadian, Brazilian, Spanish and Portuguese, one Uruguayan priest and one person from Cape Verde.

Republic of South Africa

In November and December the ICRC delegation in Pretoria continued its assistance to detainees' and former detainees' families in straitened circumstances. It distributed 949 food parcels, bringing up to 4,990 the number of such parcels distributed in 1983, to a value of 312,000 Swiss francs.

The ICRC also paid the fares of families going to visit relatives in places of detention: 1,079 persons benefited in 1983 from this aid amounting to 262,000 Swiss francs.

Namibia / South-West Africa

ICRC delegates in Namibia, on 17 and 18 November, visited fourteen Angolan prisoners of war and 31 security detainees. The ICRC delegation continued distributing relief to detainees and their needy families.

Angola

Some 350 tons of relief, mainly food, but including seeds and clothing, was distributed in November and in December to displaced persons in Angola. In addition, 625 tons of relief was handed to the "Angolan Red Cross" and other charitable organizations for distribution to various groups of needy people.

The two ICRC prosthetists continued providing technical assistance to the Bomba Alta orthopedic centre in the Huambo province. Each month the centre fits an average of fifteen amputees with artificial limbs. In the south of the country, the medical personnel based at N'Giva continued tending patients in and around the town.

The ICRC tracing offices at Luanda, Lubango and N'Giva transmitted 166 family messages and registered 48 requests for the institution of enquiries.

Zaire

Continuing their protection activities, the ICRC delegates in Zaire, in November and December, made nine visits to places of detention where there were 591 detainees of all categories. The delegates provided relief at the same time.

Rwanda

An ICRC team of five delegates, a doctor and a specialist in hygiene, completed the series of visits begun in September to the prisons of Rwanda. From 7 to 25 November, they had access to nine places of detention in which there were 7033 detainees of all categories. The delegates provided relief and medical assistance.

Uganda

The Red Cross emergency action in Uganda, begun in the last week of October by the ICRC in close co-operation with the Ugandan Red Cross and the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, was developed in November and December. Several assistance programmes

were started for the benefit of displaced persons in the Luwero, Mpigi and Mubende districts to the north of Kampala. These programmes had been drawn up after consultation with the Ugandan authorities and with representatives of the UN agencies and non-governmental organizations operating in the country.

Programmes of weekly food distributions were devised after consultation with the authorities in Kampala. Each week seven Red Cross teams distribute to some hundred thousand people rations of rice, corn, beans, milk powder and other food from thirty-three distribution centres. In November and December, the relief provided weighed 1,295 tons.

ICRC doctors and representatives from the Ugandan Red Cross, Save the Children Fund and OXFAM undertook a mission to assess medical needs of displaced persons. Seven medical teams (one of which was assigned to an inoculation programme) examined 83,000 persons in a score of camps. They treated 18,540 people and evacuated ninety-seven of them to hospitals. A thousand persons were inoculated against measles.

In close collaboration with the Ugandan Red Cross tracing section, the ICRC Tracing Agency Office in Kampala registered 660 enquiries between 14 November and 31 December. In the same period it received 594 requests for the reuniting of families (it proved possible to reunite 34 of them) and it transmitted 103 family messages.

By 31 December 1983 ICRC staff strength in Kampala was 41 persons, ten of whom had been seconded by the National Red Cross Societies of Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The Ugandan Red Cross had assigned more than 200 persons to the action.

* * *

On 24 November tragedy struck the Red Cross action in Uganda: a Ugandan Red Cross vehicle conveying a medical team was fired upon by unidentified attackers at Waluleta, to the west of the Nakasongola road (Luwero district). One doctor and the driver were killed and another doctor and a female nurse were wounded.

Ethiopia

On 13 and 14 December, four ICRC delegates, one of them a doctor, visited in Harar 207 Somali prisoners of war captured during the Ogaden conflict.

The food assistance provided by the ICRC in Ethiopia, part of the relief operation undertaken jointly with the Ethiopian Red Cross,

amounted in November and December to 1,393 tons. It was distributed to some 75,000 victims of the internal tension and drought. Of this assistance, 484 tons went to Eritrea, 334 tons to Bale, 316 tons to Tigre, 231 tons to Gondar and 28 tons to Hararge.

From 2 to 6 November, the relief co-ordinator at the ICRC Addis Ababa delegation was in Tigre province to assess at Mekele, Axoum and elsewhere the needs of displaced persons. On 14 November a new feeding centre was opened at Chiri Ballo, near Genale, where some 500 children suffering from malnutrition are now being cared for.

An ICRC doctor was appointed to the ICRC Addis Ababa delegation in mid-November. His function is:

- to assess the medical needs of conflict victims and to devise appropriate assistance programmes;
- to co-ordinate medical and food aid for displaced persons and train the personnel necessary for this work in co-operation with the Ethiopian Red Cross;
- take part in the protection of Somali prisoners of war in Ethiopian hands.

The ICRC continued its medical assistance in the orthopedic centres for civilian amputees at Harar and Asmara. It also provided medical supplies to hospitals and dispensaries.

Somalia

In November three ICRC delegates, one of them a doctor, started a new series of visits to 209 Ethiopian and one Cuban prisoners of war.

In addition, an ICRC doctor went to three hospitals in Mogadishu and one at Belet Uen to assess medical needs.

Chad

With the agreement of all the parties, the ICRC on 13 November opened a delegation at Bardaï, the administrative capital of the Tibesti sub-prefecture. Its purpose in doing so was to extend to all regions of Chad its activities to protect and assist conflict victims. The delegation, of five delegates, a medical delegate and a female nurse, immediately began visiting prisoners of war, collecting family messages and assessing the food and medical situation of the civilian population.

By the end of December the ICRC delegation had visited and registered 177 prisoners of war detained in several townships in the regions of Zoumri, Zouar and Yebbi Bou, and also ten security detainees. The

persons visited were provided with blankets. The ICRC medical team undertook also survey missions in dispensaries and medical centres.

The ICRC delegation in N'Djamena continued its efforts to obtain access to prisoners held by the Chad governmental authorities; its efforts up to the end of December proved vain.

Regional delegation in Togo

The ICRC regional delegation for West Africa, in Lomé (Togo), continued its activities in the countries within its sphere of operations.

In *Ghana* from 15 to 22 November, the regional delegate conferred with the authorities on ICRC protection activities. He had talks also with the Ghanaian Red Cross leaders.

The ICRC regional delegate for West Africa was also in *Benin* from 12 to 17 December, with a view to explaining to the authorities the ICRC's protection activities.

Previously, in November, the Lomé delegate for dissemination gave a series of lectures in Benin on international humanitarian law and the activities of the Red Cross movement to the recruits at the National Police School in Cotonou and to some 300 student nurses and social workers at the Benin medico-social institute.

Latin America

Missions from Geneva

Dr. Athos Gallino, a member of the ICRC, took part as an observer in the ordinary meeting of the Inter-American Regional Committee of National Red Cross Societies (CORI), which was held in *Caracas, Venezuela*, from 9 to 11 December. Dr. Gallino was accompanied by Mr. Edmond Corthésy, ICRC deputy delegate general for Latin America, who spoke on ICRC activities in Latin America and in particular in Grenada.

Mr. Corthésy then went to *Peru* where, between 13 and 17 December, he met the President of the Republic, Mr. Fernando Belaunde Terry, the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Minister of War, the Minister of the Interior and the Deputy Minister of Justice. He obtained the authorities' agreement to the opening of a permanent ICRC office in Lima and to the expansion of its protection activities to the places of detention under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. Mr. Cor-

they also visited the national headquarters of the Peruvian Red Cross, where he conferred with the President and his assistants.

In November, Mr. André Pasquier, delegate general for Latin America and the Caribbean, carried out a mission to *El Salvador*, *Honduras*, *Nicaragua* and *Costa Rica*. He spoke with leaders of National Societies and with government authorities about ICRC activities in their countries. During working sessions with ICRC delegates, Mr. Pasquier clarified the institution's objectives in Central America for 1984.

In relation to ICRC action in Grenada, the delegate general was in *Cuba* from 2 to 6 November, where he met with President Fidel Castro and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. During his stay, the delegate general had talks also with the President and the Secretary General of the Cuban Red Cross.

El Salvador

In November and December, ICRC delegates in El Salvador carried out 359 visits to places of detention in the capital and the provinces. They interviewed without witness and registered 199 persons detained for reasons of security. At Christmas, the ICRC delegates visited all the penal centres in the country and distributed to each detainee a parcel and recreation articles.

The ICRC's three tracing offices in San Salvador, San Miguel and Santa Ana continued to receive each month several hundred visitors enquiring about missing relatives. During 1983, 3,124 cases of persons missing or presumed detained were brought to the attention of the ICRC.

As during the previous months, military operations considerably hindered ICRC assistance activities, especially in the eastern regions of the country. While 360 tons of food was distributed to 37,000 persons in 24 villages in the central zone, only 8 villages in departments to the east and inhabited by 17,000 persons received food relief.

The medical team based in San Salvador gave consultations in some fifty villages to the displaced civilian population. The medical team operating out of San Miguel gave medical consultations in 25 villages in the departments of Usulután, San Miguel and La Unión.

Besides these activities, the ICRC medical delegates took part in visits to places of detention. The medical team in San Salvador works in the centre and north of the country, the one in San Miguel in the eastern region.

Nicaragua

In November and December, the ICRC delegation in Managua continued its activities and distributed over 53 tons of relief supplies to displaced persons, mainly in the border areas with Honduras. Furthermore, 2,143 monthly food parcels were distributed to detainees' families in need. This assistance as a whole represented the amount of 155,000 Swiss francs.

Grenada

On 24 November, ICRC delegates on the island of Grenada visited the prison of Richmond Hill, where they saw 51 detainees, including 3 women. Furthermore, an ICRC doctor visited 5 wounded persons in the prison section of Saint George Hospital.

In October and November 1983, following the military intervention by a multinational force in Grenada, a team of 14 ICRC delegates from Geneva and the regional delegation in Bogota, visited and registered Cuban and Grenadian prisoners; it organized the repatriation of Cuban prisoners—wounded first—and of the mortal remains of 24 Cubans killed during the military operations (see the previous issue of the *Review*). At the end of November, the delegates from the regional delegation returned to Bogota from where they will go to Grenada at regular intervals.

Uruguay

From 21 November to 16 December, the ICRC carried out a new series of visits to places of detention in Uruguay. From 21 to 25 November, ICRC delegates visited the women's prison Punta de Rieles, where 109 detainees were being held; from 28 November to 9 December they visited the prison of Libertad, where they saw 669 detainees. They also visited 12 detainees at the armed forces central hospital, and one detainee at a psychiatric hospital.

All of these visits took place in accordance with normal ICRC procedure.

Asia

Missions from Geneva

Mr. Rudolf Jäckli, a member of the ICRC, carried out a mission to *Pakistan* from 21 to 27 November, during which he met with repre-

sentatives of the Government and the Pakistan Red Crescent Society in Peshawar and Islamabad. He visited also the Afghan refugee camp at Adisai.

From 6 to 10 December, Mr. Jean de Courten, ICRC delegate general for Asia and Oceania, visited *Indonesia*, where he spoke with the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces about the ICRC's protection activities in Indonesia and East-Timor.

After leaving Jakarta, Mr. de Courten visited *Japan* and the *Republic of Korea* at the invitation of the National Societies of the two countries. The ICRC delegate general met, as well as leaders of both National Societies, representatives of their Governments, with whom he reviewed ICRC activities in the world and in particular in Asia.

Thailand

With the end of the rainy season the ICRC delegates were again able to reach the refugee camps along the Khmer-Thai border to carry out their protection and assistance activities.

The wounded continued to be evacuated to the ICRC hospitals at Khao-I-Dang and Kab Cherng, to be treated by the medical teams made available by various National Red Cross Societies. In November and December, the hospital at Khao-I-Dang admitted 365 patients (including 126 war-wounded) and the hospital at Kab Cherng admitted 147 patients (including 48 war-wounded).

The ICRC also distributed relief, mainly to particularly vulnerable groups such as Vietnamese refugees. Such relief, comprising medicaments, paramedical supplies and food, was valued at 1.5 million Swiss francs in 1983.

For its part, the tracing office of the ICRC delegation in Bangkok transmitted 2,984 letters exchanged between the refugees and their families either abroad or in another camp. It also received 976 requests for news, carried out 97 transfers and reunited 54 families.

Kampuchea

The ICRC completed its assistance programme for five orphanages in the provinces of Prey Veng, Kandal and Pursat. This programme, which included the provision of sleeping mats, blankets and various relief supplies, amounted to approximately 85,000 Swiss francs. In December, ICRC delegates visited several orphanages in the regions of Kompong Cham and Kampot, to assess needs preparatory to a new assistance programme in 1984.

The ICRC also kept up in November and December, the weekly flights it organizes between Bangkok, Ho-Chi-Minh City and Phnom Penh, to convey medical and paramedical relief supplies to Kampuchea. In 1983, the total volume of relief transported was 26.1 tons, for the ICRC 13.6 tons and for other humanitarian organizations working in the country 12.5 tons.

Pakistan

The ICRC delegation in Pakistan continued its medical assistance for the Afghan victims of the armed clashes in the interior of their country.

The arrival of winter brought about a decrease in the number of war-wounded Afghans admitted to the ICRC surgical hospitals in Peshawar and Quetta: in November and December, 283 patients were admitted in Peshawar, compared to 450 in September and October. At the Peshawar hospital an ICRC team and a team made available by the Red Cross of the Federal Republic of Germany performed 424 operations and gave 1,508 consultations to outpatients during the last two months of 1983.

The hospital at Quetta, where operations are performed by an Italian Red Cross surgical team, admitted 139 wounded Afghans, performed 155 operations and gave 594 consultations to outpatients, during the same period.

A further first aid team of the Pakistan Red Crescent Society, set up with the aid of the ICRC, started work at the beginning of December in Wana, South Waziristan, bringing to five the number of mobile teams evacuating the wounded from the Afghan border to the ICRC hospitals. These teams, financed by the ICRC, are currently based in Parachinar, Miram Shah, Chaman, Badini and Wana. In November and December, they gave first aid to 173 wounded and brought 93 others to the ICRC hospitals.

Furthermore, the prosthetic workshop in Peshawar produced 118 orthopaedic appliances and the paraplegic centre admitted 17 new patients, bringing to 77 the number of persons being treated.

Finally, 33 Afghans took the first aid course given by ICRC personnel. Since the beginning of the programme in February 1982, 330 Afghans have been taught first aid.

Indonesia

The annual series of visits to places of detention in Indonesia came to an end on 14 November, when a team of two ICRC delegates had

access to 7 places of detention, where they saw 51 detainees belonging to the category "Ex-G.30.S/PKI" (persons detained following the 1965 attempted coup d'Etat). From 20 January to 24 March 1983, 201 "Ex-G.30.S/PKI" detainees had been visited in 16 places of detention.

Philippines

From 3 October to 9 December, three ICRC teams visited 40 places of detention in the Philippines; they saw 340 security detainees ("public order violators"), including 45 women.

Burma

At the request of the French Government and with the agreement of all the parties concerned, the ICRC negotiated, as a neutral intermediary and for strictly humanitarian reasons, the release of a French couple held for several months by the Karen insurgents in Burma. On 25 November, the released couple was confided to three ICRC delegates based in Thailand, who then escorted them to the French embassy in Bangkok.

Middle East

Lebanon

The ICRC continued its activities to protect and assist civilian victims of the events in Tripoli, Beirut, the Chouf, the Bekaa and the south of the country.

In co-operation with the Lebanese Red Cross, the ICRC on 17 December arranged the removal of 94 wounded Palestinians from Tripoli to Larnaca (Cyprus). The wounded, who had been examined by ICRC doctors, were embarked aboard the vessel "Appia" loaned by the Italian Government and marked for the occasion with the protective emblem of the Red Cross. Aboard the ship were two Italian doctors, four doctors and a female nurse of the "Palestinian Red Crescent", seven first-aiders from the Lebanese Red Cross and two doctors, three female nurses and a delegate from the ICRC. Upon arrival at Larnaca the wounded were conveyed to the airport by "Cyprus Red Cross" first-aiders and then flown to Egypt, Jordan and Yugoslavia for hospitalization.

Following that operation the Tripoli Islamic Hospital and the neighbouring Franco-Lebanese high school—which had been neutralized on 5 November by the ICRC—resumed their normal functions and the Red Cross flags were removed from the buildings. On the other hand, the ICRC delegates continued supplying the Tripoli hospitals and dispensaries with medical and paramedical supplies.

The ICRC medical personnel continued its regular distributions of medical supplies in the southern suburbs of Beirut, the “caza” d’Aley, the Upper Metn and the Bekaa. In the Chouf mountains an ICRC female nurse assessed the needs of several infirmaries and provided medical supplies. Medical supplies were also provided to the Baakline medical centre and a Nabatiyeh hospital.

ICRC medical assistance in Lebanon from 16 November to 20 December was valued at more than a million francs and included 590 units of blood (valued at 40,000 francs) provided by the Red Cross Societies of Belgium, Finland, France and Norway. Moreover, the field hospital provided by the Norwegian Red Cross was handed over to the “Palestinian Red Crescent” for use in Tripoli.

With the agreement of all parties concerned, the ICRC organized the evacuation from the encircled village of Deir-el-Kamar of displaced persons who had sought refuge there. This operation, carried out jointly with the Lebanese Red Cross, involved the conveyance of 5,130 people, in eight convoys, to Beirut and Saida, between 15 and 22 December. Seven of the convoys each consisted of a dozen buses and one of 485 private vehicles. The people taken to Beirut were received by their families or by a welfare committee.

The siege having been lifted, the ICRC ceased its relief action to Deir-el-Kamar on 31 December. From the beginning of the operation on 12 September, 21 convoys took 1,106 tons of food, fuel, blankets, kitchen utensils and cleaning products to the displaced persons in that locality.

Relief distributions continued also in other regions of Lebanon and in November and December totalled 1,710 tons (to a value of 370,000 francs) of which 1,016 tons went to the Chouf, 359 tons to Tripoli, 70 tons to Beirut and 242 tons to Upper Metn.

To provide protection to prisoners detained by the various armed forces present in Lebanon, the ICRC continued visiting them in accordance with its customary conditions.

On 15 November and 19 and 20 December, ICRC delegates visited 293 Syrian prisoners of war in Israel; one prisoner was repatriated for medical reasons.

On 26 November, two Israelis held by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, General Command, were seen by the ICRC.

On 1 December, ICRC delegates visited three Israeli prisoners of war in Syrian hands.

On 8 December, an American pilot captured by the Syrians four days earlier was seen by ICRC delegates in Damascus and he was able to send Red Cross messages to his family.

On 24 December, ICRC delegates went to the former women's prison near Nabatiyeh and saw 54 detainees.

On 26, 27 and 28 December, the Ansar camp was visited and 83 prisoners there were registered.

A number of prisoners who should have been included in the release of prisoners by Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization on 24 November were not in fact released. Aware that in an operation on such a scale and carried out in so short a time errors were liable to occur, the ICRC has appealed to the Israeli Government to release these prisoners, consistent with the agreement.

Conflict between Iran and Iraq

The ICRC delegations in Baghdad and Teheran continued to carry out, as far as possible, the tasks devolving on them by virtue of the Geneva Conventions.

In *Iraq*, the ICRC delegates visited the prisoner-of-war camps each month. They also paid two visits to the civilian Iranian Kurds interned at Al Tash camp.

In *Iran*, the ICRC principal activity consisted in transmitting messages from Iraqi prisoners of war to their families. Visits to prisoner-of-war camps were suspended in Iran at the end of July 1983, as conditions were unsuitable for the work of the ICRC.

The plight of the civilian victims of the conflict continued to be of particular concern to the ICRC. Informed in December that Iranian cities had once again been bombed, the ICRC published a press release in which it stressed that civilians as such are not to be the object of attack or reprisals, and it appealed to the parties to the conflict to respect, at all times and in all places, this basic humanitarian rule.

Conference of the Nordic Red Cross Societies

A Conference of the Nordic Red Cross Societies was held at Copenhagen from 25 to 27 August 1983. The theme for discussion was "The Red Cross and human rights". Some forty-five participants from the National Societies of Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the host and organizing Danish Red Cross Society took part in the Conference. Mr. Høegh, Secretary General, and Mrs. Camporini, Officer for Statutory Matters of the League, took part in the meeting. The ICRC was represented by Mr. Moreillon, Director for General Affairs, and Miss Lacroix of the National Societies Division. The Henry Dunant Institute was represented by Mr. J. Toman, Deputy Director.

The Conference of the Nordic Societies on the Red Cross and human rights was especially interesting as it was the first meeting held by a group of National Societies on this theme.

Three major questions dominated the general discussion at the Copenhagen Conference:

- How does the Red Cross define human rights and to which rights can it make a contribution? Certain participants emphasized that the two Covenants adopted by the United Nations on economic, social and cultural rights and on civil and political rights expressed an ideal that the Red Cross movement could adopt. Other participants sought to broaden this definition to include notions of peace and development.
- How can the Red Cross undertake to promote and establish human rights, taking into account its specific characteristics, national priorities, the needs of the population and the vital necessity for the Red Cross movement to respect its fundamental principles (neutrality, independence, etc.)?
- Of its numerous activities, some of long standing and contributing to the promotion of one or more human rights (sometimes without the National Societies being aware of it), which offer scope for the Red

Cross in the field of human rights? On the other hand, what are the National Societies' limitations in their contribution to human rights?

The various aspects of the problems of the Red Cross and human rights were then examined by five working groups. Following their work, the Conference formulated and adopted various recommendations and conclusions. The participants from the five National Societies represented unanimously approved a draft resolution on "The Red Cross and human rights", to be submitted to the Council of Delegates in October 1983.

This draft resolution placed particular emphasis on the correlation between the contribution of the Red Cross to peace and its contribution to human rights and, in consequence, the need to consider in greater depth the exact nature of this two-way relationship within the movement. The draft also requested that consideration should be given to the feasibility of adding human rights to the terms of reference of the Commission on the Red Cross and Peace.

Amendments to the Radio Regulations concerning Medical Means of Transport and Neutral Means of Transport

In 1979, the World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC 79), which was held in Geneva under the auspices of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), adopted a new Section II on "Medical Transports", for inclusion in Article 40, "Urgency and Safety Transmissions, and Medical Transports", of the Radio Regulations. Article 40 was printed in its entirety in the July-August 1982 issue of the *International Review of the Red Cross*; the work of WARC 79 was also mentioned in the March-April 1980 and November-December 1982 issues of the Review.

WARC 79 also examined the need of ships and aircraft of States not parties to an armed conflict, i.e. neutral ships and aircraft, for means of identification by radio, and adopted Resolution 11 to this effect. This Resolution, which is incorporated in the present Radio Regulations, invited the Administrative Council of the ITU to consider including this subject on the agenda of the next competent World Administrative Radio Conference.

The texts of Article 40 Section II, and of Resolution 11 and its Annex were communicated by the ITU to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) so that they could take the appropriate steps.

The World Administrative Radio Conference for the Maritime and Aeronautical Mobile Services, which was held by the ITU in Geneva from 28 February to 18 March 1983, was competent to include on its agenda the identification by radio of medical transports by air and at sea, and the subject raised in Resolution 11.

WARC MOB 1983 revised several parts of the Radio Regulations and cancelled, replaced or amended certain provisions, which will be rescinded when the new provisions come into force on the set date of 15 January 1985 at 0001 UTC (Universal Time Coordinated).

It unanimously adopted improvements to Section II of Article 40, which is reproduced below; modifications are indicated by the letters MOD and additions by the letters ADD.

Paragraph 3201 of Article 40 was supplemented with additional distress frequencies. These frequencies, which could also be included in paragraph 3224, are subject to the special conditions for use as stipulated in Article 8 of the Radio Regulations, in the Table of Frequency Allocations.

It will be noted that Paragraph 3209 of Section II was amended to include neutral vessels and aircraft assisting shipwrecked persons, in application of Article 21 of the Second Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949. This amendment was made in response to the request formulated in Resolution VIII, para. 3, by the Twenty-fourth International Red Cross Conference (Manila, 1981).

It must be recalled that coastal rescue craft i.e. craft which are land-based with permanent coastal installations and sometimes have an operational radius on the high seas of more than 50 nautical miles from their base, are protected under Article 27 of the Second Geneva Convention, in the same capacity as hospital ships. The rescue of shipwrecked persons is mentioned in Protocol I, Article 8 (b), and coastal rescue craft in Article 22; the Regulations Concerning Identification annexed to Protocol I apply to them. Such rescue craft are therefore entitled to identify themselves by radio and by radar in accordance with the provisions of Article 40, Section II, of the Radio Regulations.

The identification by radar of medical transports at sea or of aircraft medical transports was specified in Paragraph 3219 by adding subparagraphs 3219A and 3219B.

Radar identification codes for medical aircraft and ITU's work on standard maritime radar transponders are mentioned in the July-August 1982 and the November-December 1982 issues of the *International Review of the Red Cross*. WARC MOB 83 had included in its agenda Recommendation 605, adopted by WARC 79, on the subject of maritime radar transponders. After examination, the provisions of Recommendation 605 remained unchanged and the ITU is continuing to study the question. It will therefore be possible to take into consideration the particular needs of protected vessels for means of identification by radar. This is a new and important safety factor for them, and should be incorporated in Protocol I during one of the periodic revisions for which provision is made in the Regulations Concerning Identification.

Resolution 11 and its Annex, included in the agenda of WARC MOB 83, was studied by an *ad hoc* working group and finally replaced by a new Resolution 18, reproduced below.

Resolution 18 repeats the provisions laid down in the Annex to Resolution 11 and mentions the identification by radar of neutral vessels and aircraft. Paragraph 5 stipulates that the use of the radio signal "Neutral" would not confer or imply recognition of any rights or duties of a State not party to an armed conflict or a party to the conflict, except as may be recognized by common agreement between the parties to the conflict and a non-party. Resolution 18 encourages the parties to a conflict to enter into such agreements.

It has not been possible to incorporate the text of Resolution 18 in one of the articles of the Radio Regulations, but it is a part of the Regulations and, in the current context, it does enable the use of radio and radar for the identification of neutral ships and aircraft. This possibility is of interest to the International Red Cross and in particular the ICRC, in view of the large number of neutral aircraft and ships used in armed conflicts to transport relief supplies and evacuate civilians or soldiers.

The provisions of Resolution 18 are an important innovation for neutral maritime navigation in time of war at sea in that they constitute a permanent international procedure for identification and location by radio and by radar once standard radar transponders have been put into service. As early as 1944, during the second World War, the Allied naval authorities required neutral ships to make known their position by transmitting a radio signal every four hours in the Mediterranean and once a day in the Atlantic. This procedure was stopped when hostilities came to an end.

During the aeronaval conflict in the South Atlantic in 1982, transfers of prisoners of war were carried out by agreement between the belligerents by means of unarmed merchant vessels. Such transfers are not entirely without risk, as was demonstrated during the second World War (the "Laconia" affair). In wars at sea during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the belligerents entered into "cartel" agreements to allow vessels of truce or "cartel ships" to sail between enemy ports and transport or exchange prisoners of war, especially captured crews. These cartel ships hoisted the white flag of truce on their foremast, and it was customary to hoist the enemy flag there as well. These means of identification would be insufficient, however, for the cartel ships used during the aeronaval conflicts of our age; it would be more appropriate to adopt a radio and radar procedure similar to that defined in Resolution 18; in radiotelephony, for example, the word "cartel" could be used.

In this connection agreements between belligerents are absolutely essential for the identification of vessels and to ensure the safe transport of prisoners of war by sea.

Philippe Eberlin

ICRC Technical Advisor

Excerpt from the Radio Regulations

ARTICLE 40

Urgency and Safety Transmissions, and Medical Transports

Section I. Urgency Signal and Messages

- 3196 § 1. (1) In radiotelegraphy, the urgency signal consists of three repetitions of the group XXX, sent with the letters of each group and the successive groups clearly separated from each other. It shall be transmitted before the call.
- 3197 (2) In radiotelephony, the urgency signal consists of three repetitions of the group of words PAN PAN, each word of the group pronounced as the French word "panne". The urgency signal shall be transmitted before the call.
- 3198 § 2. (1) The urgency signal shall be sent only on the authority of the master or the person responsible for the ship, aircraft or other vehicle carrying the mobile station or mobile earth station in the maritime mobile-satellite service.
- 3199 (2) The urgency signal may be transmitted by a land station or an earth station in the maritime mobile-satellite service at specified fixed points only with the approval of the responsible authority.
- 3200 § 3. (1) The urgency signal indicates that the calling station has a very urgent message to transmit concerning the safety of a ship, aircraft or other vehicle, or the safety of a person.
- MOD (2) The urgency signal and message following it shall be sent
3201 on one or more of the international distress frequencies 500 kHz,
Mob-83 2 182 kHz, 156.8 MHz, the supplementary distress frequencies
4 125 kHz and 6 215.5 kHz, the aeronautical emergency frequency
121.5 MHz, the frequency 243 MHz, or any other frequency which
may be used in case of distress.
- 3202 (3) However, in the maritime mobile service, the message shall be transmitted on a working frequency:

- a) in the case of a long message or a medical call; *or*
- b) in areas of heavy traffic in the case of the repetition of a message transmitted in accordance with the provision as laid down in No. 3201.

An indication to this effect shall be given at the end of the call.

3203 (4) The urgency signal shall have priority over all other communications, except distress. All stations which hear it shall take care not to interfere with the transmission of the message which follows the urgency signal.

3204 (5) In the maritime mobile service, urgency messages may be addressed either to all stations or to a particular station.

3205 § 4. Messages preceded by the urgency signal shall, as a general rule, be drawn up in plain language.

3206 § 5. (1) Mobile stations which hear the urgency signal shall continue to listen for at least three minutes. At the end of this period, if no urgency message has been heard, a land station should, if possible, be notified of the receipt of the urgency signal. Thereafter, normal working may be resumed.

3207 (2) However, land and mobile stations which are in communication on frequencies other than those used for the transmission of the urgency signal and of the call which follows it may continue their normal work without interruption provided the urgency message is not addressed "to all stations" (CQ).

3208 § 6. When the urgency signal has been sent before transmitting a message "to all stations" (CQ) which calls for action by the stations receiving the message, the station responsible for its transmission shall cancel it as soon as it knows that action is no longer necessary. This message of cancellation shall likewise be addressed "to all stations" (CQ).

Section II. Medical Transports

MOD § 7. The term "medical transports" as defined in the 1949 Geneva
3209 Conventions and Additional Protocols, refers to any means of trans-
Mob-83 portation by land, water or air, whether military or civilian, permanent or temporary, assigned exclusively to medical transportation and under the control of a competent authority of a party to a conflict or of neutral States and of other States not parties to an armed

conflict, when these ships, craft and aircraft assist the wounded, the sick and the shipwrecked.

3210 § 8. For the purpose of announcing and identifying medical transports which are protected under the above-mentioned Conventions, a complete transmission of the urgency signals described in Nos. 3196 and 3197 shall be followed by the addition of the single group YYY in radiotelegraphy and by the addition of the single word MAY-DEE-CAL, pronounced as in French “médical”, in radiotelephony.

3211 § 9. [The frequencies specified in No. 3201 may be used by medical transports for the purpose of self-identification and to establish communications. As soon as practicable, communications shall be transferred to an appropriate working frequency.

3212 § 10. The use of the signals described in No.3210 indicates that the message which follows concerns a protected medical transport. The message shall convey the following data:

3213 a) the call sign or other recognized means of identification of the medical transport;

3214 b) position of the medical transport;

3215 c) number and type of medical transports;

3216 d) intended route;

3217 e) estimated time en route and of departure and arrival, as appropriate;

3218 f) any other information, such as flight altitude, radio frequencies guarded, languages used and secondary surveillance radar modes and codes.

3219 § 11. The provisions of Section I of this Article shall apply as appropriate to the use of the urgency signal by medical transports.

ADD § 11A. The identification and location of medical transports at
3219A sea may be effected by means of appropriate standard maritime
Mob-83 radar transponders.

ADD § 11B. The identification and location of aircraft medical trans-
3219B ports may be effected by the use of the secondary surveillance radar
Mob-83 (SSR) system specified in Annex 10 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.

3220 § 12. The use of radiocommunications for announcing and identifying medical transports is optional; however, if they are used, the

provisions of these Regulations and particularly of this Section and of Articles 37 and 38 shall apply.

Section III. Safety Signal and Messages

- 3221 § 13. (1) In radiotelegraphy, the safety signal consists of three repetitions of the group TTT, the individual letters of each group and the successive groups being clearly separated from each other. It shall be sent before the call.
- 3222 (2) In radiotelephony, the safety signal consists of the word "SÉCURITÉ" pronounced clearly as in French, spoken three times and transmitted before the call.
- 3223 § 14. (1) The safety signal indicates that the station is about to transmit a message containing an important navigational or important meteorological warning.
- 3224 (2) The safety signal and call shall be sent on one or more of the international distress frequencies (500 kHz, 2 182 kHz, 1568. MHz) or on any other frequency which may be used in case of distress.
- 3225 (3) The safety message which follows the call should be sent on a working frequency. A suitable announcement to this effect shall be made at the end of the call.
- 3226 (4) In the maritime mobile service, safety messages shall generally be addressed to all stations. In some cases, however, they may be addressed to a particular station.
- 3227 § 15. (1) With the exception of messages transmitted at fixed times, the safety signal, when used in the maritime mobile service, shall be transmitted towards the end of the first available period of silence (see No. 3038 for radiotelegraphy and No. 3052 for radiotelephony); the message shall be transmitted immediately after the period of silence.
- 3228 (2) In the cases prescribed in Nos. 3328, 3331 and 3335, the safety signal and the message which follows it shall be transmitted as soon as possible, and shall be repeated at the end of the first period of silence which follows.
- 3229 § 16. All stations hearing the safety signal shall listen to the safety message until they are satisfied that the message is of no concern to them. They shall not make any transmission likely to interfere with the message.

RESOLUTION No. 18 (Mob-83)

**Relating to the Procedure for Identifying and
Announcing the Position of Ships and Aircraft of
States Not Parties to an Armed Conflict**

The World Administrative Radio Conference for the Mobile Services,
Geneva, 1983;

considering

- a) that ships and aircraft encounter considerable risk in the vicinity of an area of armed conflict;
- b) that for the safety of life and property it is desirable for ships and aircraft of States not parties to an armed conflict to be able to identify themselves and announce their position in such circumstances;
- c) that radiocommunication offers such ships and aircraft a rapid means of self-identification and providing location information prior to their entering areas of armed conflict and during their passage through the areas;
- d) that it is considered desirable to provide a supplementary signal and procedure for use, in accordance with customary practice, in the area of armed conflict by ships and aircraft of States representing themselves as not parties to an armed conflict;

resolves

1. that the frequencies specified in No. 3201 of the Radio Regulations may be used by ships and aircraft of States not parties to an armed conflict for self-identification and establishing communications. The transmission will consist of the urgency or safety signals, as appropriate, described in Article 40 followed by the addition of the single group "NNN" in radiotelegraphy and by the addition of the single word "NEUTRAL" pronounced as in French "neutral" in radiotelephony. As soon as practicable, communications shall be transferred to an appropriate working frequency;
2. that the use of the signal as described in the preceding paragraph indicates that the message which follows concerns a ship or aircraft of a State not party to an armed conflict. The message shall convey at least the following data:
 - a) call sign or other recognized means of identification of such ship or aircraft;
 - b) position of such ship or aircraft;
 - c) number and type of such ships or aircrafts;
 - d) intended route;
 - e) estimated time en route and of departure and arrival, as appropriate;

f) any other information, such as flight altitude, radio frequencies guarded, languages and secondary surveillance radar modes and codes;

3. that the provisions of Sections I and III of Article 40 shall apply as appropriate to the use of the urgency and safety signals, respectively, by such ship or aircraft;

4. that the identification and location of ships of a State not party to an armed conflict may be affected by means of appropriate standard maritime radar transponders. The identification and location of aircraft of a State not party to an armed conflict may be effected by the use of the secondary surveillance radar (SSR) system in accordance with procedures to be recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO);

5. that the use of the signals described above would not confer or imply recognition of any rights or duties of a State not party to an armed conflict or a party to the conflict, except as may be recognized by common agreement between the parties to the conflict and a non-party;

6. to encourage parties to a conflict to enter into such agreements;

requests the Secretary-General

to communicate the contents of this Resolution to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) for such action as they may consider appropriate;

requests the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR)

to recommend an appropriate signal in the digital selective calling system for use in the maritime mobile service and other appropriate information as necessary.

Refugee Community Health Care ¹

There are more refugees in the world today than many countries have inhabitants. They need continued health care, not just occasional medical treatment. The book we present in this issue explains how to set up such health care, how to plan the appropriate health services and carry them out; it covers all the aspects, from water supply to vaccination programmes and health and hygiene education for the refugee population.

The book is the outcome of collaboration by about twenty authors, all of whom have many years of experience working with refugees. Many of them are members of the University of London's School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, others belong to other institutions such as the World Health Organization in Geneva.

The book is a useful guide for all those who work with refugees. It will also be very helpful to those who plan to work, even temporarily, among refugees or the inhabitants of a developing country. Its pages contain an overall view of this kind of work as well as studies on specific points—the yield of practical experience—that will be of great interest to them. Gone are the days when the goodwill of amateurs sufficed; today refugee work requires qualified and knowledgeable people skilled in coping with the enormous difficulties this task presents. The book is an answer to that need.

¹ *Refugee Community Health Care*, edited by Stephanie Simmonds, Patrick Vaughan and S. William Gunn. Oxford University Press, 1983, 360 pp. Price: £ 2.95. Available only in English.

ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES

- AFGHANISTAN (Democratic Republic) — Afghan Red Crescent, Puli Artan, *Kabul*.
- PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA — Albanian Red Cross, 35, Rruga e Barrikadave, *Tirana*.
- ALGERIA (Democratic and People's Republic) — Algerian Red Crescent Society, 15 bis, Boulevard Mohamed V, *Algiers*.
- ARGENTINA — Argentine Red Cross, H. Yrigoyen 2068, 1089 *Buenos Aires*.
- AUSTRALIA — Australian Red Cross, 206, Clarendon Street, *East Melbourne 3002*.
- AUSTRIA — Austrian Red Cross, 3 Gusshausstrasse, Postfach 39, *Vienna 4*.
- BAHAMAS — Bahamas Red Cross Society, P.O. Box N 91, *Nassau*.
- BAHRAIN — Bahrain Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 882, *Manama*.
- BANGLADESH — Bangladesh Red Cross Society, 34, Bangabandhu Avenue, *Dhaka 2*.
- PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BENIN — Red Cross of Benin, B.P. 1, *Porto Novo*.
- BELGIUM — Belgian Red Cross, 98 Chaussée de Vleurgat, 1050 *Brussels*.
- BOLIVIA — Bolivian Red Cross, Avenida Simón Bolívar, 1515, *La Paz*.
- BOTSWANA — Botswana Red Cross Society, Independence Avenue, P.O. Box 485, *Gaborone*.
- BRAZIL — Brazilian Red Cross, Praça Cruz Vermelha 10-12, *Rio de Janeiro*.
- BULGARIA — Bulgarian Red Cross, 1, Boul. Biruzov, *Sofia 27*.
- BURMA (Socialist Republic of the Union of) — Burma Red Cross, 42 Strand Road, Red Cross Building, *Rangoon*.
- BURUNDI — Red Cross Society of Burundi, rue du Marché 3, P.O. Box 324, *Bujumbura*.
- CAMEROON — Cameroon Red Cross Society, rue Henry-Dunant, P.O.B. 631, *Yaoundé*.
- CANADA — Canadian Red Cross, 95 Wellesley Street East, *Toronto, Ontario, M4Y 1H6*.
- CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC — Central African Red Cross, B.P. 1428, *Bangui*.
- CHILE — Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa María 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 246V., *Santiago*.
- CHINA (People's Republic) — Red Cross Society of China, 53 Kanmien Hutung, *Peking*.
- COLOMBIA — Colombian Red Cross, Avenida 68, No. 66-31, Apartado Aéreo 11-10, *Bogotá D.E.*
- CONGO, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE — Croix-Rouge Congolaise, place de la Paix, *Brazzaville*.
- COSTA RICA — Costa Rican Red Cross, Calle 14, Avenida 8, Apartado 1025, *San José*.
- CUBA — Cuban Red Cross, Calle 23 No. 201 esq. N. Vedado, *Havana*.
- CZECHOSLOVAKIA — Czechoslovak Red Cross, Thunovska 18, 118 04 *Prague 1*.
- DENMARK — Danish Red Cross, Dag Hammarskjöld's Allé 28, Postboks 2600, 2100 København Ø.
- 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, 29, El-Galaa Street, *Cairo*.
- EL SALVADOR — El Salvador Red Cross, 17 Av. Norte y 7a. Calle Poniente, Centro de Gobierno, *San Salvador*, Apartado Postal 2672.
- ETHIOPIA — Ethiopian Red Cross, Rass 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 1460 (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, 7a Calle, 1a y 2a Avenidas, *Comayagüela, D.M.*
- HUNGARY — Hungarian Red Cross, V. Arany János utca 31, *Budapest V*. Mail Add.: 1367 *Budapest 5*, Pf. 121.
- ICELAND — Icelandic Red Cross, Nóatúni 21, 105 *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 Crescent, Avenue Ostad Nejatollahi, Carrefour Ayatollah Taleghani, *Teheran*.
- IRAQ — Iraqi Red Crescent, Al-Mansour, *Baghdad*.
- IRELAND — Irish Red Cross, 16 Merrion Square, *Dublin 2*.
- ITALY — Italian Red Cross, 12 via Toscana, *Rome*.
- IVORY COAST — Ivory Coast Red Cross Society, B.P. 1244, *Abidjan*.
- JAMAICA — Jamaica Red Cross Society, 76 Arnold Road, *Kingston 5*.
- JAPAN — Japanese Red Cross, 1-3 Shiba-Daimon 1-chome, Minato-Ku, *Tokyo 105*.
- JORDAN — Jordan National Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 10 001, *Amman*.
- KENYA — Kenya Red Cross Society, St. John's Gate, P.O. Box 40712, *Nairobi*.
- KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF — Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, *Pyeongyang*.
- 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 PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — Lao Red Cross, P.B. 650, *Vientiane*.
- LEBANON — Lebanese Red Cross, rue Spears, *Beirut*.
- LESOTHO — Lesotho Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 366, *Maseru*.

- LIBERIA** — Liberian National Red Cross, National Headquarters, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, *Monrovia*.
- LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA** — Libyan Arab Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, *Benghazi*.
- LIECHTENSTEIN** — Liechtenstein Red Cross, *Vaduz*.
- LUXEMBOURG** — Luxembourg Red Cross, Parc de la Ville, C.P. 404, *Luxembourg*.
- MALAGASY REPUBLIC** — Red Cross Society of the Malagasy Republic, rue Patrice Lumumba, *Antananarivo*.
- MALAWI** — Malawi Red Cross, Hall Road, *Blantyre* (P.O. Box 30080, Chichiri, *Blantyre* 3).
- MALAYSIA** — Malaysian Red Crescent Society, National HQ, No. 32 Jalan Nipah off Jalan Ampang, *Kuala Lumpur*.
- MALI** — Mali Red Cross, B.P. 280, *Bamako*.
- MAURITANIA** — Mauritanian Red Crescent Society, B.P. 344, Avenue Gamal Abdel Nasser, *Nouakchott*.
- MAURITIUS** — Mauritius Red Cross, Ste Thérèse Street, *Curepipe*.
- MEXICO** — Mexican Red Cross, Avenida Ejército Nacional nº 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, P.O.B. 30427, *2500 GK The Hague*.
- NEW ZEALAND** — New Zealand Red Cross, Red Cross House, 14 Hill Street, *Wellington 1*. (P.O. Box 12-140, *Wellington North*.)
- NICARAGUA** — Nicaragua Red Cross, D.N. Apartado 3279, *Managua*.
- NIGER** — Red Cross Society of Niger, B.P. 386, *Namey*.
- NIGERIA** — Nigerian Red Cross Society, Eko Aketa Close, off St. Gregory Rd., P.O. Box 764, *Lagos*.
- NORWAY** — Norwegian Red Cross, Drammensveien 20 A, *Oslo 2*, Mail add.: *Postboks 2338, Solli, Oslo 2*.
- PAKISTAN** — Pakistan Red Crescent Society, National Headquarters, 169, Sarwar Road, *Rawalpindi*.
- PAPUA NEW GUINEA** — Red Cross of Papua New Guinea, P.O. Box 6545, *Boroko*.
- PANAMA** — Panamanian Red Cross, Apartado Postal 668, Zona 1, *Panamá*.
- PARAGUAY** — Paraguayan Red Cross, Brasil 216, *Asunción*.
- PERU** — Peruvian Red Cross, Av. Camino del Inca y Nazarenas, Urb. Las Gardenias - Surco - Apartado 1534, *Lima*.
- PHILIPPINES** — Philippine National Red Cross, Bonifacio Drive, Port Area, P.O. Box 280, *Manila 2803*.
- POLAND** — Polish Red Cross, Mokotowska 14, *Warsaw*.
- PORTUGAL** — Portuguese Red Cross, Jardim 9 Abril, 1 a 5, *Lisbon 3*.
- QATAR** — Qatar Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 5449, *Doha*.
- ROMANIA** — Red Cross of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Strada Biserica Amzei 29, *Bucarest*.
- RWANDA** — Rwanda Red Cross, B.P. 425, *Kigali*.
- 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 0923*.
- SOMALIA (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC)** — Somali Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 937, *Mogadishu*.
- SOUTH AFRICA** — South African Red Cross, 77, de Villiers Street), P.O.B. 8726, *Johannesburg 2000*.
- SPAIN** — Spanish Red Cross, Eduardo Dato 16, *Madrid 10*.
- SRI LANKA (Dem. Soc. Rep. of)** — Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, 106 Dharmapala Mawatha, *Colombo 7*.
- SUDAN** — Sudanese Red Crescent, P.O. Box 235, *Khartoum*.
- SWAZILAND** — Baphalali Swaziland Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 377, *Mbabane*.
- SWEDEN** — Swedish Red Cross, Fack, S-104 40 *Stockholm 14*.
- SWITZERLAND** — Swiss Red Cross, Rainmattstr. 10, 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*.
- TONGA** — Tonga Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 456, *Nuku'alofa*.
- TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO** — Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society, Wrightson Road West, P.O. Box 357, *Port of Spain*, Trinidad, West Indies.
- TUNISIA** — Tunisian Red Crescent, 19 rue d'Angleterre, *Tunis*.
- TURKEY** — Turkish Red Crescent, Yenisehir, *Ankara*.
- UGANDA** — Uganda Red Cross, Nabunya Road, P.O. Box 494, *Kampala*.
- UNITED KINGDOM** — British Red Cross, 9 Grosvenor Crescent, *London, SW1X 7EJ*.
- UPPER VOLTA** — Upper Volta Red Cross, P.O.B. 340, *Ouagadougou*.
- URUGUAY** — Uruguayan Red Cross, Avenida 8 de Octubre 2990, *Montevideo*.
- U.S.A.** — American National Red Cross, 17th and D Streets, N.W., *Washington, D.C. 20006*.
- U.S.S.R.** — Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, I. Tcheremushkinskii proezd 5, *Moscow 117036*.
- VENEZUELA** — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello No. 4, Apart. 3185, *Caracas*.
- VIET NAM, SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF** — Red Cross of Viet Nam, 68 rue Bà-Triêu, *Hanoi*.
- YEMEN (Arab Republic)** — Yemen Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 1471, *Sana'a*.
- YUGOSLAVIA** — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, *Belgrade*.
- REPUBLIC OF ZAIRE** — Red Cross of the Republic of Zaire, 41 av. de la Justice, B.P. 1712, *Kinshasa*.
- ZAMBIA** — Zambia Red Cross, P.O. Box R.W.1, 2837 Brentwood Drive, *Lusaka*.
- ZIMBABWE** — The Zimbabwe Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 1406, *Harare*.