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1. Introduction

Internationalized internal armed conflicts have become a common feature of the past decades. In numerous civil wars foreign armed forces have intervened in favour of one or the other party and thereby attempted to influence the outcome of the conflict. Various causes have led to this development. One of them is the increased interdependence of States, as a consequence of which every civil war will affect other States and, conversely, the attitudes of other States may have an impact on the outcome of the civil war, even without any intervention. Another cause can be found in the world's ideological cleavage which divides nations and results in the overlapping of internal and international conflicts. Among further causes we can mention the existence of military blocs and of regional groupings which have an interest in preventing the overthrow of regimes within the bloc and tend to encourage alterations in other blocs. Another factor to be taken into consideration is the prohibition of the use of force in international relations. Whereas in earlier times States waged open wars in order to increase their power, today, due to the prohibition of the use of force, they rather endeavour to achieve the same result by interfering in the internal affairs of other States. Interference in internal conflicts is often a substitute for an international war. The instability of many contemporary regimes, mainly of the Third World, further favours the internationalization of internal conflicts.

The first civil war with foreign interventions on a large scale was the Spanish Civil War in the 1930's. But only since World War II have internationalized civil wars occurred in greater numbers. The war in Vietnam has remained in our memory as the outstanding example. It
was during that war that the legal issues which are the subject of this paper were discussed for the first time. Apart from Vietnam the follow­ing armed conflicts may be mentioned as examples of "mixed" con­flicts. Hungary 1956, Congo 1960, Angola 1960—present, Yemen 1962­1970, Dominican Republic 1965, Chad at various occasions since 1968, Bangladesh (formerly East Pakistan) 1971, Cyprus 1974, Lebanon 1976 —present, Cambodia 1978—present, Afghanistan 1979—present.

The Geneva and the Hague Conventions contain no specific pro­visions on internationalized civil wars. The 1977 Protocols also fail to regulate this matter although the problem was well-known at the time of the Diplomatic Conference. It is therefore left to the practice of States and to legal doctrine to determine what law is to be applied in an internationalized internal conflict. No easy answers are possible. The subject is full of legal complexities.

At the time of the Vietnam war in the 1960's, two opinions were put forward regarding the applicability of international humanitarian law in internationalized civil wars. According to one, a civil war becomes an international armed conflict by the mere fact of military intervention by foreign powers. International humanitarian law would therefore be applicable in its entirety among all the parties to the conflict, even between the government of the State in which the civil war has broken out and the insurgents. The ICRC suggested this solution when, in June 1965, it requested all parties to the Vietnam conflict to apply the Geneva Conventions of 1949. 1 One writer, Meyrowitz, maintained that humani­tarian law in its entirety was applicable in the Vietnam war. 

According to the other opinion, an internationalized civil war should be broken down into its international and non-international components. 

---

Two of the relationships are considered as non-international, i.e. the relationships between the insurgents and the established government and between the insurgents and the foreign State which assists the established government. Two other relationships are of an international character. This holds good for conflict between the established government and a State intervening on behalf of the insurgents and for conflict between two States intervening on opposite sides of the civil war. Thus, of the four relationships which can be distinguished in an internationalized internal conflict, two are considered as non-international, and two as international. This concept has the disadvantage that different regulations are applicable depending on which of the parties to the conflict are involved.

At the Conference of Government Experts for the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law in Geneva in 1971 the ICRC proposed the adoption of the following provision: "When, in case of non-international armed conflict, one or the other party, or both, benefits from the assistance of operational armed forces afforded by a third State, the parties to the conflict shall apply the whole of the international humanitarian law applicable in international armed conflicts".4

Had it been accepted, this provision would have conferred the same protection on all victims of an internationalized civil war without regard to the party to which they belonged. But the proposition did not find sufficient support. The majority of the experts thought that such a provision would have encouraged insurgents to call for foreign assistance in order to improve their legal status.5

Opposition to this proposal prompted the ICRC to present to the second session of the Conference of Experts, convened in 1972, an amended draft combining the two concepts mentioned above.6 According to it the humanitarian rules in their entirety would have been applicable if the established government or both parties to the civil war were assisted by foreign States, but not if the insurgents alone received outside assistance. But this proposal also failed to win the approval of the experts, who felt that it still too strongly favoured the insurgents. The ICRC therefore abandoned its efforts to insert provisions on internationalized civil war in the drafts of the two protocols. At the Diplomatic Conference itself, the issue of internationalized civil war was not raised.

---

5 Ibid., para. 301.
at all. The Diplomatic Conference consolidated the traditional dichotomY between international and non-international conflicts. Significantly, the Norwegian proposal for a single protocol applicable in both international and non-international conflicts attracted no support. Therefore today we have to proceed from the standpoint that in internationalized civil war a distinction has to be made between its international and non-international components.

The following remarks will deal first with the four different relationships which can be distinguished in internationalized internal armed conflicts. Thereafter the particular situation arising from the forcible installation of a new government by a foreign State will be discussed. The question of the legality of foreign intervention in civil wars will be left aside as it has no bearing on the applicability of international humanitarian law.

2. The four different relationships in internationalized internal armed conflicts

Let us start with the two relationships which are clearly international. The first one is the one between two foreign States intervening on behalf of the two parties to a civil war. If their armed forces engage in hostilities with one another, or if one of these States encroaches upon the territory of the other, international humanitarian law in its entirety is applicable between them. All the treaties on armed conflicts to which the relevant States are parties have to be applied, as well as the customary rules of the laws of war.

The second relationship, between the foreign State which assists the insurgents, on the one hand, and the established government, on the other hand, also indisputably falls within the scope of rules relating to international armed conflicts, since it involves two subjects of international law. A special problem arises when the foreign State which assists the insurgents takes combatants of the established government prisoner and hands them over to the insurgents. Art. 12 of the Third


8 In the Vietnam war the relationship between the United States and North Vietnam was considered as falling into this category.

9 In the Vietnam war the relationship between North and South Vietnam was considered as falling into this category.
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Geneva Convention provides that prisoners of war may be transferred only from a detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and only after the detaining Power has satisfied itself that the Power in question is willing and able to apply the Convention. Therefore, the combatants of the established government who have been taken prisoner may not be transferred to the insurgents who are not and cannot become a party to the Conventions as long as they are insurgents. A corresponding provision in the Fourth Geneva Convention (Article 45) prohibits the transfer of enemy civilians who are on the territory of the intervening State to a Power which is not a party to that Convention. However, if the insurgents are victorious and take over the government in their State, they will themselves become the representatives of a party to the Geneva Conventions. Thereupon, prisoners of war and civilians may be transferred to them.

The third relationship, between the established government and the insurgents, is one of a non-international armed conflict in which only Art. 3 of the four Geneva Conventions and Protocol II—if its conditions are met—are to be applied. There are, however, several possibilities to make international humanitarian law in its entirety applicable between these two parties:

1. Article 3 calls upon the parties to a non-international conflict to bring into force, by means of special agreements, all or part of the other provisions of the Conventions. They may do so also by unilateral declarations. In the Vietnam war, the United States and South Vietnam declared their readiness to apply international humanitarian law to the Vietcong to a further extent than Article 3 stipulates.

2. According to traditional international law the established government may recognize the insurgents as belligerents. If it does so the laws of war become applicable in their entirety between it and the insurgents. However, such a recognition has not happened for several decades so that it has lost its practical importance. Nevertheless, it has been argued that acceptance of foreign military aid by the established government constitutes an implicit recognition of belligerency. This view was at

---

10 In the Vietnam war the relationship between the government of South Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (NLF, Vietcong) was considered as falling into this category.

the origin of the proposal made by the ICRC in 1971, mentioned above. Yet, after the negative reaction of the government experts in 1971 and 1972 this conception can hardly be upheld.

3. If the insurgents are assisted by an outside State they could be regarded as an organized resistance movement belonging to that State. Article 4, A, 2 of the Third Geneva Convention (corresponding to Article 13, 2 of the First and of the Second Convention) provides that members of “organized resistance movements, belonging to a Party to the conflict” shall be prisoners of war if they have fallen into the power of the enemy. International humanitarian law would have to be applied in its entirety to them. In the Vietnam conflict Meyrowitz argued that the Vietcong could be regarded as a resistance movement belonging to North Vietnam. Insurgents will, however, hardly make use of this possibility since they wish to prove their independence and will therefore avoid being considered as belonging to a foreign State. While the word “belonging” in the 1949 Conventions does not allude to a bond of dependence in a legal sense, but rather to a de facto connection, Article 43 of Protocol I of 1977 requires that all armed forces, groups or units of a Party to a conflict “are under a command responsible to that Party for the conduct of its subordinates”. That implies subordination.

4. Meyrowitz, in 1967, brought forward a legal argument to affirm the international character of the relationship between the established government and the insurgents and between the State intervening on the side of the established government and the insurgents. He held that due to the American assistance to South Vietnam the centre of the military and political decisions in this war had shifted from Saigon to Washington. Under these circumstances, in his opinion, to construe the relationship between Saigon and the Vietcong and that between the United States and the Vietcong as a civil war was to ignore realities. Still, Meyrowitz did not pursue this reasoning to extremes since he


14 Meyrowitz (note 2), Annuaire français 167, Falk (ed.) p. 531.
correctly held that the Vietcong was not bound by the Geneva Conventions.

In practice, only resort to the first possibility seems likely.

The fourth relationship, between insurgents and a State assisting the established government is also considered to be of a non-international nature. This is explained by the fact that insurgents have no status in international law. In principle, the same possibilities exist for application of international humanitarian law in its entirety as those already mentioned for the relationship between the established government and the insurgents:

1. The parties to the armed conflict may conclude the agreements provided for in Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions or issue specific declarations that they will apply all or part of the other provisions of the Conventions.
2. Like the established government, the intervening State may recognize the insurgents as belligerents and thereby make the laws of war in their entirety applicable in its relations with the insurgents.
3. The insurgents may be regarded as a resistance movement belonging to the State which assists them.

Insofar as the relations between the outside State assisting the established government and the insurgents are concerned it must be emphasized that the outside State would conform with the spirit of the Conventions and Protocol I if it applied the humanitarian law in its entirety, for a State which intervenes on the territory of another State exercises sovereign power over citizens of the other State, even if it does so upon the invitation or with the permission of the established government. This relationship—which was not examined at the Conferences of 1949 and 1977—is therefore to be considered as international to a much higher degree than the relationship between the established government and the insurgents. As has been mentioned, the United States and South Vietnam declared themselves ready in the Vietnam war to apply the Conventions, at least in part, also to the Vietcong.

3. Forcible installation of a new government through the intervention of a foreign State

Special problems arise if one State intervenes in another State without the consent of the government of that State in order to install

---

16 In the Vietnam war the relationship between the Vietcong and the United States was considered as falling into this category.
a new government which, in turn, gives its assent to the presence of the armed forces of the intervening State. Such an intervention is conceivable without a civil war being fought in the State where the intervention takes place.

Nonetheless, as a result of the intervention an armed conflict may break out on the territory of this State. In such a conflict, the two parties opposing one another can be the intervening State and the government installed by it, on one side, and the displaced government, or a new one which has taken its place, or even mere resistance movements, on the other side. For an example we may refer to the German invasion of Norway in 1940 which was accompanied by the installation of the Quisling Government by Germany. We would have to imagine that the invasion did not actually occur in connexion with a major war but as an isolated military encroachment in order to install in the foreign State a government acceptable to the intervening State. In such a case three different situations may arise, each differently affecting the applicability of international humanitarian law.

Let us assume first the situation in which the government had been displaced and the government newly installed had established itself without the occurrence of armed hostilities. In such a case, the rules of belligerent occupation are to be applied as long as the armed forces of the foreign State remain in the territory of the other (Article 2, para. 2, of the Geneva Conventions). Article 47 of the Fourth Geneva Convention states that changes in the government or in the institutions of the occupied State which are introduced as the result of the occupation shall not affect the rights of protected persons. Nevertheless, in such a situation the status of belligerent occupation cannot continue indefinitely. If the new government has successfully installed itself and if it is also predominantly recognized by foreign States, we must assume that, in accordance with the principle of effectiveness and owing to the express or implicit recognition of the situation by other Powers, the conditions for the application of the Geneva Conventions will no longer obtain, even if the armed forces of the foreign State are still present.

In our second hypothesis the previous government has not disappeared but is continuing to offer resistance, perhaps from the bush or a foreign country. Such a government is engaged in an international armed conflict with the intervening State, for it continues to assume the position of a government, though of course without being recognized as such by the intervening State. According to Article 13 of the First

17 It has been argued that such has been the case in Cambodia since 1978.
and Second Geneva Conventions, Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention and Article 43 of Protocol I, the members of the armed forces of a non-recognized government are to be treated as combatants. Between the newly installed government and the previous government there exists a non-international conflict. On the whole, we may say that the position of the old government is the same as that of the established government in a civil war, whereas the position of the newly installed government is like that of insurgents. Of course, the situation may change, if it turns out that the old government no longer has any possibility of obtaining power, and if most of the other States have recognized the new government installed by the intervening State. In such a case the government installed by the intervening State would occupy the position of the established government, whereas the old government would be pushed into the position of insurgents.

Let us consider a third situation lying between the two previously mentioned, i.e. one in which a State has succeeded by means of a surprise move to install a new government in another State without the occurrence of any armed fighting, but gradually resistance movements form and take up the fight against the intervening State and the government it has installed. 18 In such a case, the regulations on belligerent occupation would continue to be applicable insofar as the intervening State comes into contact with the civilian population of the occupied State. The international law status of the resistance movements and any regular armed forces of the occupied State which are taking up the fight will depend on whether they are fighting under the command of a government or an authority which can be ascribed to the occupied State. If, following the example of General de Gaulle in the Second World War, a new government of the occupied State were formed to take up the fight against the occupying Power, and against the government installed by it, this new government, not recognized by the opponent, would have the status of a government within the meaning of Article 13 of the first two Geneva Conventions, Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention and Art. 43 of Protocol I. The conflict between the occupying Power and the armed forces of the new government would, therefore, be an international conflict.

On the other hand, the conflict between the government installed by the occupying Power and the newly formed government would be of a non-international character. If, however, the resistance movements fight without being placed under a political command, they cannot be

18 It has been argued that this has been the case in Afghanistan since 1979.
regarded as the armed forces of the occupied State, since no authority will take responsibility for them. The intervening State and the government installed by it would have to apply to them only the rules on non-international conflicts.

Dietrich Schindler
Professor at Zürich University
Member of the ICRC
The Hiroshima disaster

The text which we print here, entitled "The Hiroshima disaster", was found recently among the papers left by Dr. Marcel Junod, a former Vice-President of the ICRC, who died in 1961. As far as we know, the text has never before been published, though Dr. Junod probably drew on it when writing the last part of his book "Le troisième combattant" (translated into English as "Warrior without Weapons").

Dr. Junod, an ICRC delegate in the Far East at the end of the Second World War, was the first foreign doctor to visit the ruins of Hiroshima after the atomic explosion and to treat some of the victims. His account, apparently written soon after the event, is therefore a valuable first-hand testimony.

Since then, much has been written about Hiroshima and about the atom bomb, possibly better documented, more carefully considered, more elegantly composed. But nothing has better described, in its simple way, the horror of the situation as Dr. Junod saw it.

The personality of the author stamps this text, which we now publish almost forty years after he wrote it. His account has lost none of its force, and vividly conveys the shock, and also the fears for the future which Dr. Junod felt as he looked upon the devastation suffered by Hiroshima.
The Hiroshima disaster

by Marcel Junod

Introduction

Hiroshima, 6 August 1945—Dawn of the atomic age. A Japanese city with 400,000 inhabitants is annihilated in a few seconds. A new chapter of history begins.

The physical impact of the atom bomb was beyond belief, beyond all apprehension, beyond imagination. Its psychological impact was appalling.

The Japanese military authorities were incapable of suppressing the news. In a few hours, a few days, the survivors told the whole country the incredible story of an incandescent bomb dropped by the Americans and devouring everything in its path.

Three days later, on 9 August, it was Nagasaki’s turn to experience the devastating force of this new weapon and the Japanese scientists discovered what it really was. The Emperor summoned the country’s military leaders and told them that surrender was inevitable.

Then came the report that the Russians had attacked Manchuria, on 9 August at dawn, eight days before the date agreed upon at the Potsdam Conference. This was another unexpected blow, but its psychological impact was far less than that of the reduction of two Japanese cities to radioactive rubble.

However, those who held power in Japan before 6 August knew that fourteen years of war with China and three-and-a-half years of fighting throughout the Pacific against the United States, Great Britain and Australia had left Japan in an extremely vulnerable position. Three quarters of its naval forces were destroyed and its air force was greatly diminished (the last Kamikazes—suicide pilots—were flying obsolete
aircraft). Its industrial cities had been razed to the ground and this meant that its war production was incapable of replacing the equipment lost or even of producing the essential supplies to carry on the war.

The streets of Tokyo were heaped with radiators and water pipes removed from buildings on War Ministry orders to mitigate the shortage of iron.

Food rations were drastically reduced; it was impossible to find a needle or a reel of cotton in the shops; a broken glass could not be replaced.

According to Japanese official figures, allied bombing raids had already destroyed or seriously damaged 81 of Japan’s major cities. In Tokyo, Yokohama, Osaka and Kobe, four fifths of the buildings had been destroyed by fire. There were 280,000 civilian dead and 420,000 injured. Two million houses had been bombed or burned down, and nine million civilians were homeless and attempting to get away to relatives in the countryside.

The situation was grave and Japan’s resistance was seriously undermined, especially as the Americans had just established bases on Iwojima and Okinawa, dangerously near the home islands. In spite of that, orders to the soldiers were to resist to the last man to save the Emperor and the flag.

Those who were in Japan at the time knew that a Japanese military victory would probably mean death for all white people found in the territories they were occupying: prisoners, enemy or neutral civilians; and thousands of allied soldiers would be killed in conquering metropolitan Japan. Some diplomatic missions in Japan were so sure that this would happen that they had armed their staff for such an event.

However, the sudden—almost supernatural—appearance of the atom bomb over the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki abruptly changed the course of history; the Emperor, still a god in those days, immediately regained his mystical powers and used them to impose unconditional surrender on his generals. In so doing, he handed over to the enemy vast territories, extending from Singapore to the Kuriles and from the Russian-Manchurian border to Borneo; furthermore, he gave the order for 4 million well-equipped soldiers, the great majority of whom had done no fighting, to lay down their arms.

This shows the extraordinary power this man had over his people, an impression heightened by the perfectly calm and disciplined manner in which the surrender was made.

It seems that the capitulation was successful for two reasons: firstly, General MacArthur agreed to respect the Emperor’s rank and, secondly,
he decided to repatriate all the Japanese outside Metropolitan Japan, without taking any prisoners.

Indeed, to keep the Emperor at the head of the State was the only way to avoid anarchy; furthermore, repatriating the army and allowing all the soldiers from Metropolitan Japan to return home spared them the humiliation of captivity, which they would never had accepted without a fight to the finish, in spite of the Emperor’s orders for a cease-fire.

First Part

At the scene of nuclear devastation

I. How I came to witness the aftermath of the first atom bomb

After leaving Geneva in June 1945 to take up my new post as head of the ICRC delegation in Japan, I arrived in Manchuria on 28 July, having travelled for thousands of miles: Paris, Naples, Athens, Cairo, Teheran, Moscow, Siberia, Chita, Otpor, Manchuria. On 6 August 1945, with no inkling of the tragic events taking place in Hiroshima, I visited the Allied high-ranking prisoners of war held by the Japanese, near Szepinghai (Manchuria), and including Generals Wainwright and Persival, of whom we had heard nothing for more than two years.

On 9 August 1945, several hours after the Russians entered the war against Japan and their planes invaded Manchurian airspace, and on the very day that the Americans dropped the second atom bomb on Nagasaki, I left in a Japanese military plane, at 11.30 a.m., during an alert, from the airfield at Tsing-King, today Chang-Chung, capital of Manchuria. Any encounter with an enemy plane would have been fatal, but luck was on my side and I landed safely the same day at Tokyo.

My Swiss friends were waiting there for me. A bus took us from the airfield to the heart of Tokyo. In the dusk, I could just make out streets on all sides, sections of broken walls, electric wires hanging down pathetically and heaps of rusty scrap iron. Further away, amidst acres of cold ashes, I could see small stone houses here and there, with almost no windows, still standing, miraculously intact. I asked what they were. “Ah”, was the reply, “this is obviously your first visit to Japan and you don’t know. These minute structures of concrete or robust masonry were built by the Japanese after the earthquake in 1923. At that time, Tokyo and Yokohama were completely destroyed, burnt to the ground.
by this natural disaster. The Japanese noticed that only a few stone houses escaped the ensuing fire. When Tokyo was being rebuilt, the wealthiest inhabitants were able to indulge in these structures, in which they placed their most valuable possessions; poorer members of the community had to make do with an ordinary safe in their homes”.

Indeed, as I looked closer, I could see hundreds of these safes sticking up intact in the fields of rubble.

We arrived at our friends’ home after dark. They were lucky to have found accommodation in a house that had escaped the bombing. They looked at me as if I were a ghost. They had been out of touch with Switzerland for four years. Only the radio, listened to in secret, had informed them of the main news. Their first question was: “What are they saying about the atom bomb in Europe?” They forgot that I had left Switzerland two months before and that for fifteen days I had been among the Japanese, who were as silent as the grave. It was my turn to be astonished and to ask questions. For the first time I heard the name of Hiroshima, the words “atom bomb”. Some said that there were possibly 100,000 dead; others retorted 50,000. The bomb was said to have been dropped by parachute, the victims had been burnt to death by rays, etc.

A Japanese working with our delegation, who heard what was being rumoured on all sides, confirmed the news. The people were stunned, demoralized. The stations were teeming with crowds as everyone was leaving the cities; but there was no confusion because the Japanese were naturally disciplined. Furthermore, typhoons and earthquakes had made them used to controlling their fear. Nevertheless, the situation remained serious.

The next day, I met the Swedish diplomats. We all had the same idea. Would this new weapon and the fact that the Russians had entered the conflict put an end to the war?

During the next few days, events moved fast and our feelings proved correct. The general staff were summoned to the Imperial palace. Rumours of an armistice were heard everywhere.

Finally, on 15 August, the Emperor spoke to his people on the radio, for the first time in the history of Japan; he asked them to accept the conditions of the Potsdam Declaration, which called for the unconditional surrender of his country.

I listened myself to the Emperor’s speech on the radio, and I invited our Japanese servants to come into the sitting room to hear it as well. I saw them kneel in front of the wireless set and give several deep and reverential bows whilst listening to His Majesty’s words. Their faces
were expressionless. Even at close quarters, it was difficult to have any idea of what must be going on in their minds and hearts, but I thought I discerned an inexpressible sadness and a feeling of amazement.

Yes, it was the armistice, but nothing was certain. Many Europeans whom I met, who had known the East for a long time, shook their heads and only rejoiced half-heartedly at the news. It would take some time, a few days, possibly a few weeks, before the Americans arrived and nobody could be really sure of what would happen in the interim.

The Japanese, I was told, had an unexpected side to their character and it was best to be prepared for anything. There might be an epidemic of harakiri or total submission, just as there might be a real revolution. All this was not exactly reassuring.

I then thought of the allied prisoners, cut off and stranded in camps in Metropolitan Japan. I hastily called all my fellow delegates together and asked them if they would be prepared to go singly into the main camps to ensure the prisoners' safety and arrange for their release. Everyone agreed without hesitation. However, there were seven main camps, and there were only four of us! We then appealed to two compatriots and a stateless doctor, who made up the required number.

I briefly explained the seriousness of the situation to them; there was a risk involved, but it was our duty to take it. We hoped that the Emperor's orders would be obeyed; but if they were not, all white people in Japan might find themselves in great danger.

I next got in touch with the representatives of the Protective Powers, Switzerland and Sweden, who agreed to join us. In this way, we were able to make up seven teams of three men. I then approached the Japanese government (Foreign Affairs and War Ministry) to obtain the exact numbers of prisoners of war and civilian internees and to find out where the camps were, as well as to secure all facilities and protection for our delegates on their mission. As soon as the Japanese authorities had given their approval, without any major problems, all the delegates left for their destination on 27 August and we were able to report to General MacArthur, by Japanese radio, that we were standing by with a plan for evacuting the prisoners of war.

Before our delegates left, I instructed one of them, who was to inspect the camps in the Hiroshima Prefecture, to go into the city itself and to inform me as quickly and precisely as possible of the extent of the disaster and the conditions he found there.

At the same time, I asked the Japanese Government to provide me with any documentation they had on the situation in Hiroshima and on the known effects of the atom bomb. Reports were duly handed
to me and, on 2 September, I received the following telegram from our delegate in Hiroshima:

"Visited Hiroshima thirtieth. Situation horrifying. 80% of town razed. All hospitals destroyed or severely damaged. Have visited two provisional hospitals: conditions indescribable. Full stop. Bomb effects surprisingly severe. Many victims, apparently recovering, suddenly experience fatal relapse owing to degeneration of white corpuscles and other internal injuries. Deaths occurring now in great numbers. More than 100,000 injured still in provisional hospitals in neighbourhood. Grave shortage material, bandages, medicaments. Full stop. Appeal allied high command asking supplies be parachuted immediately into centre of town. Urgently need large supplies bandages, cotton wool, ointment for burns, sulphamides, blood plasma and transfusion kits. Full stop. Immediate action necessary. Also send medical investigation commission. Report follows. Please acknowledge."

Now that I had this documentary evidence, I got in touch on 3 September with the Supreme Command of the Allied Forces and requested, in the name of the ICRC, immediate aid in food and medical supplies for the Hiroshima victims. I offered to go there myself to organize relief operations, as I was the only doctor among the ICRC delegation in Japan.

Some days later the Supreme Allied Command responded generously to my request and informed me, through one of its high-ranking officers, that it would provide the ICRC delegation with twelve tons of medicines and medical equipment for the proposed relief operation and that the material would be transported in six aircraft. A special commission, made up of about ten American experts, physicists, doctors and a photographer, as well as two Japanese doctors, would also be on board. I was to accompany the commission and be responsible for the distribution and supervision of the relief, which was given into the charge of our delegation in Japan.

On 8 September 1945, we left for the airfield at Atsugi, where I boarded one of the aircraft together with several Americans. The flight was very pleasant. We soon left Mount Fuji behind us to starboard and arrived over the large cities of Osaka and Kobe. For twelve miles, there was nothing but devastation; the sites where the cities had stood were an expanse of rusty iron. Everything seemed to have been devoured by the fire. Here and there, however, there were flimsy buildings, still intact, making grey and black patches against the brick-red.
At twelve o'clock, we flew over Hiroshima. We—my colleagues and myself—peered anxiously through the windows and witnessed a sight totally unlike anything we had ever seen before. The centre of the city was a sort of white patch, flattened and smooth like the palm of a hand. Nothing remained. The slightest trace of houses seemed to have disappeared. The white patch was about 2 kilometres in diameter. Around its edge was a red belt, marking the area where houses had burned, extending quite a long way further, difficult to judge from the airplane, covering almost all the rest of the city. It was an awesome sight.

After having flown over the city several times, our plane landed, with all the others, at Iwakuni airfield, about 20 miles from Hiroshima. We unloaded the medical supplies. Several Japanese officers came to greet us and showed us to a bus which was to take us to the Japanese military headquarters of Hiroshima, moved, after the city was bombed, to a small hill fifteen kilometres to the south.

II. Contacts with the Japanese authorities

The bus started and limped along as best it could. The heat was tropical. The road, which had not been repaired for years, was in a pitiful state and we were constantly thrown out of our seats. The engine groaned and we were not at all surprised when we finally broke down in the middle of a village. We got out of the bus. People standing around on the street crowded together and stared at the American officers, whom they were seeing for the first time. It was a strange feeling. There we were, about a dozen men, all Americans, apart from myself, and unarmed. The Allied troops had not yet occupied the country and we knew that we were entirely at the mercy of these Japanese.

Would the mere order given by General MacArthur to guarantee the safeguard of the Technical Commission and to provide it with all assistance needed to carry out its task be enough to protect us? I visualized one of our towns just subjected to a nuclear attack and tried to imagine the reception that the survivors would have given to a Technical Investigation Commission, sent by the enemy after imposing unconditional surrender. I feared the worst. But there was no incident.

On the contrary, the village children came up to us and the Americans handed out several packets of "candy" and chocolate. In the background, the Japanese parents smiled faintly (sign of embarrassment) and the atmosphere seemed to be relaxed. However, the repairs took time and everyone was in a hurry to see the city. A military truck came along the road and I suggested to the American general that we should requisition
it to continue our journey to the Hiroshima military headquarters. One of our Japanese acted as interpreter and, after a brief discussion, we all climbed into the truck.

After that, we soon arrived at the headquarters of the Japanese army in the Prefecture of Hiroshima, located on a small hill. There were several wooden army huts inside an enclosure, guarded by sentries armed with rifles. The duty officer yelled “Present arms” as we went by, the sentries saluted and we were taken to a Japanese colonel and several officers. Introductions were made; everyone behaved impeccably and shook hands; well-trained orderlies brought tea, biscuits and cigarettes. Maps were unfolded and explanations given as to the work the Commission intended carrying out in the area. During this time, several Americans and Japanese took group photographs. Never at any time was there a feeling of hostility weighing on the party; everything was conducted with perfect manners.

This attitude on the part of the Japanese remained a complete mystery to us. The Japanese people have a secret, unfathomable mentality but, deep down, these officers were obeying their Emperor’s orders. They bowed to the American officers, not because they were the vanquished but because they had ceased fighting and reverted to their natural politeness.

After having made plans to visit Hiroshima the next day, we were taken to the famous island of Miyajima, where the Commission was to stay for a few days. This island is a sanctuary. We could see in the distance the famous hundred-year old portico, showing that an ancient temple stands there. We landed at sunset in a small village of fishermen and holiday makers.

This island owes its fame to the pilgrimage that Japanese warriors used to make there before leaving for the front. They would ask the Buddhist monks to hand them the written reply to their wishes; if the reply was favourable, they kept the paper, and the charm that went with it, pressed tightly to their chest. If the prediction was unfavourable, they pinned it to one of the sacred trees surrounding the temple, hoping that they might thereby win the favour of a reluctant deity.

All the Americans with me were delighted to experience their first evening of Japanese life. We were put up in small hotels in the pine woods. The floor of each bedroom was covered with a tatami, a mat of plaited straw, very soft and pleasant to walk on. Shoes had to be removed before entering. We were all handed kimono to go and take a communal bath in a large pool. Several Americans made the classic mistake of the uninformed and threw themselves, covered with soap, into the water,
to the horror of the Japanese staff. Indeed, the custom in Japan—and it is a lesson to us all—is to wash thoroughly with soap and then rinse it off, before diving into the almost boiling water of the bath.

During the evening, as we were talking together, I became friendly with Professor Tzusuki, Professor of Surgery at the Imperial University of Tokyo. He told me the following story himself:

In 1923, Professor Tzusuki, then a young doctor at the Imperial University of Tokyo, was particularly interested in the function of Coolidge tubes, which the Japanese had just bought from the United States to treat cancer. Suddenly he had a strange idea. He took a rabbit from the laboratory and, at 9 o'clock in the evening, taking advantage of the staff's absence, he exposed his rabbit completely to the X-ray lamp, in order to observe the massive effect of these new rays on living organisms. At 9.50, then 10 o'clock, the rabbit showed no signs of discomfort whatsoever. At 11 o'clock, the rabbit was still behaving normally and seemed perfectly alert. A doubt began to enter the young doctor's mind. At midnight, the rabbit gave no visible sign of any reaction. Dr. Tzusuki switched off the apparatus, picked up the rabbit, put it on the carpet of his office and lit a cigarette. He was just musing on this strange experiment, seemingly without results, when suddenly the rabbit went into convulsions and died at his feet. The young doctor could think of no explanation for this mysterious death. Tired and half-asleep, he put the rabbit in the ice-box to examine it later. The next morning, he told the story to his professor, who reprimanded him soundly, reproaching him for the futility of this experiment. He even pointed out that, in some countries, he would have been prosecuted for experimenting on live animals without good reason. However, this did not deter the Japanese doctor. Several days later, he began the autopsy on his rabbit and to his amazement observed hemorrhages and suffusions of blood throughout all the organs: the kidneys, lungs, heart, etc. His scientific curiosity was then stimulated even more. He repeated his experiments. In May 1926, his findings were disclosed at the 27th Annual Congress of the American Radiological Society in Detroit. They were published in the American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy and Nuclear Medicine in New York and entitled: "Experimental Studies on the Biological Action of Hard Roentgen Rays". When his work was presented it caused discussion. Today it is interesting to re-read the thoughts expressed at the time by Dr G. E. Pfahler from Philadelphia. Here below is an account of what he said: "It is naturally almost impossible for us to grasp, in a few minutes, the
significance of the facts revealed in all these experiments. However, as far as I can see, two ideas emerge from these facts: first of all, these experiments are based on the exposure of a whole animal to X-rays and, consequently, the observations made by Dr. Tzusuki concerning effects on the various organs cannot be directly translated into clinical values (as we could apply them in routine clinical work), because we never expose the whole body of an individual. We limit exposure to a part of the body, to an organ or to part of an organ. Secondly, by limiting exposure to part of an organ, the relative effects are obviously less, otherwise we would soon stop using radiotherapy, judging by the effects observed on the various organs’.

 Twenty-five years later, Dr. Masso Tzusuki, who had since become professor at the Imperial University of Tokyo, was the man appointed by the Japanese government, and later by the American authorities, to study the effect of X-rays, not on the body of a rabbit but on thousands of human beings, his own compatriots. His findings were almost identical to the observations he had made long before on the rabbit exposed to the rays of the Coolidge tube.

III. Hiroshima

Hiroshima means “the wide island”. Built on the delta of the river Ota, which rises in the Kamuri mountains, it was the seventh largest city in Japan. At the entrance to the town, the Ota divides up into seven rivers which form a triangle enclosing the city and dividing it into a number of islands connected by many bridges. The sides of this triangle, roughly 12 miles at the base and 6 miles from top to bottom, are bordered by gentle hills 500 metres high, covered with pine forests. The apex is the narrow head of the valley; the indented base spreads to the Inland Sea, where all the mouths of the Ota empty their muddy waters.

In this location, Hiroshima was the major port of that part of Japan. It was the administrative capital of a prefecture with two million inhabitants, one of the richest of Japan. It was also one of the great centres of Japanese culture.

The city was the home of the Mori, an important Japanese family, who ruled over ten cities in the west of Japan. This made it the political centre of the west and it was consequently very lively.

In 1889, Hiroshima was raised to the rank of town, the political map of Japan being at that time divided into towns and villages.

Hiroshima owed part of its fame to the fact that Emperor Meiji had stayed there with his chiefs of staff during the Russo-Japanese war in
1905. Since then, it had remained a garrison town and become one of the main military transport centres, while Kure, which was not far away, had become a naval base.

Hiroshima was also an industrial centre. Its canneries, its clothing and tobacco factories and its oil refineries had, since 1941, been geared to the war industry. And it had always possessed several munitions factories.

Its population of 250,000 lived in small Japanese houses—similar to chalets one or two storeys high, with upturned eaves—built out of light wood or dried mud, often thatched. However, some official buildings, the offices of big companies, banks or administrative bodies, were built in concrete or solid stonework.

Apart from its civilian population, many soldiers were stationed at Hiroshima, the number in July 1945 being estimated at 150,000. These soldiers were mainly concentrated in the town centre, in a large area made up of barracks, an arsenal, administrative buildings, etc.

There was therefore a total population of about 400,000 in Hiroshima but this figure dropped by the end of the war because the authorities, fearing air raids, had already begun evacuating women and children.

The town was situated on the main railway line running the whole length of Japan. It was the terminus of a branch line which ran inland, towards the north, and had several regional lines linked by a network of tramways. Two major roads crossed the city, from east to west and from north to south. It had many parks and public gardens.

Before 6 August 1945, the city had remained virtually free of air attacks, apart from two minor bombing raids: one on 19 March 1945 by some planes from the American fleet and the other on 30 April by a B.29 (Flying Fortress).

On 9 September, early in the morning, the Investigation Commission left the island of Miyajima. We walked along the sea shore from our hotel to the small harbour. The air was clear and soft and the rising tide lapped the columns of the portico. We took the boat to cross once more the strip of sea to the main island, where a bus was waiting. As we set off, I found I was sitting next to two Japanese interpreters: Miss Ito, born in Canada, who spoke perfect English, and a journalist who had spent twenty years in the United States. We were now travelling the last few miles before our destination and so were able gradually to appreciate the effects of the atomic bomb, from the outskirts to the town centre.

The first signs of these effects were visible four miles or so from the bomb's dropping point. The roofs looked denuded, as their tiles had
been blown off by the blast. In places, the grass was bleached, as if dried; the Japanese journalist explained to me that the plants, vegetables and rice up to five or six miles from the bomb's epicentre had lost their green colour immediately after the explosion. They only got their colour back three or four weeks later. However, some plants, obviously more sensitive, had died. At three miles from the bomb's epicentre, some houses had been flattened like cardboard. The roofs were completely caved in; the rafters stuck out all round. This was the familiar sight of cities destroyed by explosive bombs. At two and a half miles, there were only piles of beams and planks, but the stone houses seemed intact. At just over two miles from the town centre, all houses had been gutted by fire. All that remained was the outline of their foundations and heaps of rusty metal. This area looked like the towns of Tokyo, Osaka and Kobe, destroyed by incendiary bombs. At one mile or so everything had been torn apart, blasted and swept away as if by a supernatural power; houses and trees had disappeared.

Often, even the foundations of a building had vanished. Poles carrying electric cables, made out of iron girders, were twisted and bent and trailed on the ground. Circular factory chimneys were still standing, whereas the square ones had all collapsed. The town was abandoned, dead. Only a few Japanese soldiers were to be seen. The survivors had fled, terrified by newspaper reports that there would be a danger of radioactivity in Hiroshima for the next seventy years.

We arrived in the centre of the town, next to what had once been the army headquarters in Hiroshima, and were taken to a small hill, from where we had an unimpeded view of the surroundings. Standing there, we could see the city in ruins all around us, sprawling for miles; there was nothing but silence and desolation. In the foreground, large trees had been smashed like matchsticks and huge stones overturned; beyond these, we could barely make out the remains of military buildings, some of which had had massive concrete foundations. Very close, lotus stems jutted from the surface of a pond; their leaves had been torn off by the wind created by the fireball. Several dead fish floated with their white bellies upward. Further, as far as the eye could see, the city had been flattened; the railings of the nearest bridges had been ripped away. We were standing more or less above the very spot where the bomb had exploded. In the midst of an indescribable pile of broken tiles, rusty sheet iron, chassis of machines, burnt-out cars, derailed trams and buckled lines, a few trees pointed their charred and flayed trunks to the sky. On the banks of the river, boats lay gutted. Here and there, a large stone building was still standing, breaking the monotony of the scene.
We started walking, slowly, through the dead city. Some streets had been cleared but most were still strewn with debris of all kinds. At one point, my interpreter told me: "This was a hospital". Look as I might, I could not discern anything. There was nothing but a low ruined wall extending for a few yards. Patients, nurses and doctors had all perished. Nobody had come out alive.

We stopped in front of a large building, solidly constructed, which had seemed, from a distance, to be intact; however, as soon as we glanced inside, we could see that everything had been burned and destroyed by the explosion.

This was true of most of the buildings. Only the area around the harbour seemed not to have been affected, and that was within a very limited area. All the observers agreed that 90% of the city had been destroyed.

The experts from the American Commission did not remain idle. They placed their detectors almost everywhere amongst the ruins. They were adamant: one month after the explosion of the atom bomb, the place was perfectly safe and there was no longer any danger of radioactivity for human beings.

Whilst they were busy making their observations, I visited the hospitals, all of them temporary and most of them hardly deserving even that description. Almost all of them had been set up in buildings which were three-parts destroyed, and the sick and injured had been collected up and crammed together pell-mell. Below is a description of one of them, which resembled all the others:

"This emergency hospital is in a half-demolished school. There are many holes in the roof. On that day, it was pouring with rain and water was dripping into the patients' rooms. Those who had the strength to move huddled in sheltered corners, while the others lay on some kind of pallets; these were the dying. There are eighty-four sick and injured in this hospital with ten nurses and twenty schoolgirls, who seem to be very little girls, aged from 12 to 15 years, to look after them. There is no water, no sanitary installations, no kitchen. A doctor comes in from outside to visit the sick every day. The medical care is rudimentary; dressings are made of coarse cloth. A few jars of medicine are lying around on a shelf. The injured often have uncovered wounds and thousands of flies settle on them and buzz around. Everything is incredibly filthy. Several patients are suffering from the delayed effects of radioactivity with multiple hemorrhages. They need small blood transfusions at regular intervals; but there are no donors, no doctors to determine the compatibility of the blood groups; consequently, there is no treatment."
I also paid a long visit to the Japanese Red Cross Hospital which had, it was generally agreed, miraculously escaped the holocaust. It was a magnificent stone building, well constructed, standing squarely on its foundations. Indeed, the front door and the hall were completely intact and, from the outside, the building looked almost normal; however, as soon as I arrived on the upper floors, I noticed that not only all the window-panes but also the frames were missing, shattered by the blast of the explosion. All the laboratory equipment had been put out of action. Part of the roof had caved in and the hospital was open to the wind and the rain. One of the Japanese doctors told me that a thousand patients had been taken in on the day of the disaster; six hundred had died almost immediately and had been buried elsewhere, in the immediate vicinity of the hospital. At present, only two hundred remained. There were no blood transfusions because there was no equipment to carry out examinations and the donors had either died or disappeared.

We continued on our rounds and saw the same picture everywhere. Supplies to these hospitals were almost non-existent; it was up to the patients' families to bring them food but, very often, the family no longer existed or had fled. In view of the overall lack of relief, the situation was tragic.

We then visited a temporary military hospital, Ugina hospital, which was set up in a former silk factory, more or less spared from the bombing. As everywhere, the Japanese had kept the best for their soldiers. The hospital had been opened on 26 August and we were there on 10 September. At the beginning, six hundred patients had been taken in; two hundred had been cured, one hundred had died and the rest were still being treated. It was far better organised than the civilian hospitals. Indeed, the Imperial University of Tokyo had sent a team of doctors and laboratory technicians to this hospital from the capital and they had carried out some very interesting work. I have in fact based the following part of my report on their findings. Nevertheless, I wanted to examine each case for myself and I devoted quite a long time to observing some of the patients.

Professor Tsuzuki explained several cases to us. For example, a woman, aged 24 years, had been about half a mile from the centre of the explosion. She had felt nothing for the next few days but had suddenly become very lethargic and tired. Three weeks later, she was admitted to hospital for angina necrotica. The blood test revealed 1,200 leukocytes, 45% hemoglobin and 2,450,000 red blood corpuscles.
Many other similar cases were shown to us. We also saw many burn victims. Most of the time, they were suffering from third-degree burns, localized in one part of the body, often the uncovered parts: the face, hands, arms and sometimes the chest. I shall return to these details later in the text.

I learned that on the day of my visit there were still about thirty thousand injured in the town's fifty temporary hospitals; the others had died, been cured or evacuated.

At the end of the day, I met the director of Public Health and we worked out a plan for distributing the medicines and medical supplies given to me by the Allied High Command.

(To be continued)

Dr. Marcel Junod
Austria ratifies the Protocols

The Republic of Austria deposited with the Swiss Government, on 13 August 1982, a document ratifying Protocols I and II to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the protection of victims of international and non-international armed conflicts and adopted on 8 June 1977.

In accordance with their provisions, the Protocols will take effect for the Republic of Austria on 13 February 1983, i.e. six months after deposit of the instrument of ratification.

The ratification is subject to five reservations (on the subject of articles 57, 58, 75, 85 and 86 of Protocol I and article 6 of Protocol II) and contains a statement that "consistent with article 90 (2) of Protocol I the Republic of Austria recognizes ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the competence of the International Fact-Finding Commission".

This ratification brings to 25 the number of States parties to Protocol I and to 22 the number of those parties to Protocol II.
Africa

Southern Africa

Angola

The ICRC delegate general for Africa, Mr. Jean-Marc Bornet, went on mission to Angola from 7 to 17 July to re-assess the ICRC assistance programme in the centre and south of the country, and especially the danger it involved. The reason for this was that a series of incidents (abductions, mine explosions during the passage of relief convoys, explosions at the Bomba Alta orthopaedic centre) have compelled the ICRC to limit its delegates' movements and have impeded activities on behalf of the displaced civilian population, the victims of events.

At the same time the ICRC persisted in its endeavours on every level, both in the field and from its Geneva headquarters, to obtain the release of one of its nurses, Miss Mary-Josée Burnier, who was kidnapped by an armed band near Katchiungo on 25 May, during an attack on a relief convoy. At a press conference held in Brussels on 18 August, a representative of UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola) announced that his movement had decided to release 14 expatriates in its captivity, including the ICRC nurse.

Miss Burnier was finally released on 18 September and handed over to the South African Red Cross. She was repatriated from Pretoria to Geneva on 20 September.

Activities in the field

In view of the danger prevailing in the Planalto area, the ICRC decided to continue and even develop the system of distributing food
aid from three centres set up at Kuito (Bie province), Bailundo and Katchiungo (townships in the Huambo province). These centres, which are kept supplied with relief goods by the ICRC, are food points where the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages come to receive their monthly rations (maize flour and dried beans) and take them home.

In July, relief supplies totalling 365.5 tonnes were distributed on the Planalto to a population of 67,000 people; in August the volume of assistance was virtually doubled (721.8 tonnes) and the number of beneficiaries likewise increased considerably, reaching a total of about 108,000 people. In addition the ICRC handed over 64 tonnes of powdered milk to various religious organizations in Huambo, which assist needy and displaced persons.

The ICRC delegates also continued their activities at the three special feeding centres in Katchiungo, Bailundo and Kuito, where children suffering from malnutrition are receiving treatment under medical supervision. In July and August, each of these centres was treating an average of 30 cases of severe malnutrition each month.

In the night of 25 to 26 July, explosive charges seriously damaged the buildings of the orthopaedic centre at Bomba Alta (Huambo), which is run jointly by the ICRC and the "Angolan Red Cross". There were fortunately no casualties, but the production of prostheses and crutches had to be suspended until the end of August, for repairs to be completed. This was the second time in five months that the Bomba Alta centre has been attacked in this way; the buildings had already been damaged by a previous explosion in March, affecting the work of the technicians.

In the extreme south of Angola the ICRC delegates based at N’Giva continued their medical assistance, protection and tracing activities, despite the danger which confined their movements to the immediate vicinity of the town. They kept the dispensaries supplied with dressings and medicaments, and arranged for family messages to be forwarded (643 messages exchanged via the sub-delegation at Lubango).

Lastly it was possible on 24 August to resume the ICRC flights to carry relief supplies from Huambo to N’Giva; they had been suspended since 13 July.

Republic of South Africa

In July and August, the ICRC delegation in Pretoria took numerous steps to arrange for the repatriation of Angolan prisoners of war detained in Namibia/South West Africa (see below). In addition, on 5 August, two delegates, one of whom was a doctor, again visited the Soviet
prisoner detained by the South African authorities. ICRC delegates furthermore, in talks on 26 and 27 August with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Law and Order raised various questions concerning protection activities in the country.

Also in connection with protection activities, a delegate based in Pretoria went to Transkei on 12 August to transmit to the authorities an offer of ICRC services to visit the security prisoners there. This offer has not as yet received any reply.

Continuing the programme of assistance for ex-detainees and detainees' families in distress, the Pretoria delegation distributed 834 food parcels in July and August, and also gave financial aid to a number of families to enable them to visit their detained relatives. The cost of this aid in food and cash amounted to approximately 80,000 Swiss francs.

Namibia/South West Africa

Twenty Angolan prisoners of war detained at Mariental camp—including 10 sick or wounded—were repatriated from Windhoek to Luanda on 16 and 17 August on board two ICRC aircraft. They were accompanied by four delegates, including one doctor, who handed them over to the Angolan authorities on arrival in Luanda. This operation was the successful outcome of lengthy negotiations requiring the collaboration, via the Geneva headquarters, of ICRC delegations in South Africa, Namibia and Angola.

The authorities have furthermore agreed, in response to ICRC requests, to allow the security detainees at Mariental to be visited by their families. Ten families were able to visit their relatives in August; their transport was organized by the ICRC.

In addition the delegates based in Windhoek visited three security detainees at Otavi and Oshakati, in northern Namibia, on 1 and 6 July.

East Africa

Ethiopia

The months of July and August were marked by numerous missions by ICRC delegates throughout the country. In the north, Teseney, Ali Ghedir, Adi Keyih, Karen, Barentu, Akordat, Adi Ugri and Adi Kwala were visited from Asmara. The head of the delegation went to Asmara from 10 to 14 August, and had talks there with the provincial authorities and representatives of the local branch of the Ethiopian
Red Cross. A mission also took place in the Gondar province from 6 to 14 July. Surveys were made in the regions of Sidamo, Tigre and Hararge. The purpose of all these missions was to establish, in collaboration with the Ethiopian Red Cross, a programme of assistance for persons displaced by conflicts.

Relief supplies totalling approximately 107 tonnes in July and 85 tonnes in August were distributed, in collaboration with the Ethiopian Red Cross, at the local Red Cross branches in Gondar, Hararge and Bale.

In Asmara (Eritrea), work is proceeding on a rehabilitation centre for civilian disabled, as agreed with the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (see previous Review). The staff have been selected and the centre is currently being equipped and furnished.

Somalia

Following press reports on fighting at the border between Somalia and Ethiopia, the ICRC regional delegate based in Nairobi went to Mogadishu, where he stayed from 18 to 22 July. In order to make a survey of the medical situation at the request of the Ministry of Defence, a doctor was sent out on mission from Geneva. During his stay in Somalia from 22 to 30 July, he visited the wounded receiving treatment at the Martini Military Hospital in Mogadishu, handed over medications and surgical supplies to this hospital, and drew up a list of its further requirements. Medical aid valued at 74,000 Swiss francs was subsequently sent from Nairobi to Mogadishu.

Following up the contacts established, a delegate went to Somalia in mid-August to negotiate the opening of a delegation which would continue the protection of prisoners of war and assess the needs which might arise as a result of the fighting.

Uganda

An offer of services has been conveyed to the Ugandan authorities with a view to resuming ICRC protection activities in places of detention. This offer of services follows a mission to Kampala from 26 July to 5 August, carried out by the ICRC regional delegate based in Nairobi.

Central and West Africa

Chad

The ICRC continued to work from two centres, the capital and Abéché, in July and August. Delegates carried out numerous missions
throughout the country to assess needs for food and medical aid, and distributed medicaments to medical centres and dispensaries.

The areas of Biltine, Oum Hadjer and Am Timam were visited in July; at the same time delegates distributed 124 tonnes of food to some 25,000 people suffering from malnutrition in the provinces of Guéra and Batha.

From 26 to 28 July the ICRC delegate general for Africa was in N'Djamena to examine, with the delegation there, how the ICRC action in Chad could be developed and to set up a programme of activities for the latter half of 1982.

Further survey missions carried out in August in the Biltine area and the south-east of Ennedi province, to Fada, Ati and Mongo where feeding centres have already been established, revealed an alarming aggravation of the food shortage in the country, due both to the conflict situation and to the prolonged drought followed by extremely heavy rains. The famine was particularly acute in the prefectures of Guéra and Ennedi, where deaths have been recorded. The ICRC thereupon made every effort to inform and alert the representatives of the international agencies. It was impossible to organize overland convoys, in view of the bad road conditions due to the rains, but thanks to an appeal launched by UNDRO to the international community, an airlift was set up and has been operating since 31 August.

Despite the difficult transport conditions, 39.4 tonnes of food were distributed to some 10,500 people in August.

Since fighting had occurred in the Sahr region, the ICRC aircraft evacuated the wounded to N'Djamena and supplied the existing medical facilities with medicaments and dressings kits.

With regard to protection, the Chad head of state has given the ICRC permission to visit prisoners. These visits began at Abéché at the end of August.

Zaire

On 2 August, the ICRC received from the Department of Justice a general authorization to visit 32 prisons in seven regions in Zaire, and other places of detention in the same regions if it considers visits there necessary. This authorization confirms and extends the one obtained in late June.

In July, 24 detainees were visited at the Makala Central Prison in Kinshasa. Almost all of them were subsequently transferred to 11 places of detention in various regions in Zaire. The ICRC immediately demanded notification of these transfers and authorization to visit the
detainees in their new prisons; it likewise intervened to obtain permission for their families to visit them. These requests were met.

Between 14 and 18 August, ICRC delegates carried out a series of visits in Shaba; they had access to a total of 1,630 detainees in eight places of detention, five of which were administered by the Ministry of Justice, two by the Zaire armed forces and one by the security services. During these visits they distributed almost 10 tonnes of relief supplies (food, blankets, toiletries, etc.) to a value of 34,000 Swiss francs. A doctor belonging to the Shaba prison administration service accompanied the ICRC delegates to the prisons under the authority of the Ministry of Justice. He examined 353 persons, and seven ICRC kits of medications and dressings were used. Lastly, 121 detainees wrote family messages, most of which were immediately distributed by the local Tracing Agency office in Lumumbashi.

Other visits to places of detention were made in July and August to deliver relief supplies or deal with Tracing Agency inquiries.

Latin America

Mission from Geneva

Mr. André Pasquier, ICRC delegate general for Latin America, went to Argentina and Uruguay in August.

In Argentina he had talks with General Jorge Suarez Nelson, Secretary General of the Army; General Llamil Reston, Minister of the Interior; Dr. J. R. Aguirre Lanari, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Dr. L. Lennon, Minister of Justice; and General C. Cerda, Deputy Minister of the Interior. The Minister of Justice, in the company of senior members of his staff, invited the delegate general and several delegates attached to the delegation in Buenos Aires to a dinner at the Palacio San Martin, the seat of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to mark his government's appreciation for the ICRC's humanitarian action in the Falklands/Malvinas conflict.

During these talks, the ICRC’s activities in connection with the recent conflict in the South Atlantic were reviewed, and the last reports on visits to Argentine prisoners of war were handed over to the government. The military authorities also expressed the wish for the mortal
remains of Argentine soldiers killed in the fighting to be transferred to Argentina, and asked the ICRC to examine ways and means for such an operation.

The delegate general likewise discussed the protective activities which the ICRC is conducting in Argentina for the benefit of security detainees.

Lastly, he suggested that a programme be instituted for the dissemination of knowledge of international humanitarian law among the armed forces.

In Uruguay the main purpose of the delegate general's mission was to reach an agreement with the authorities on the resumption of, and procedure for, visits to security detainees. He had talks with Dr. E. Valdes Otero, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Rear-Admiral Jorge Laborde, chief of the joint general staff, and with the chief of military police. No decision was made during these talks. At the end of August the ICRC had not yet received a reply from the Uruguayan authorities concerning the resumption of its protection activities.

In the course of his mission the delegate general also met the leaders of the Argentine and Uruguayan Red Cross Societies.

Regional delegation in Bogota

In abeyance since October 1981, the ICRC delegation for the Andean countries, Guyana and Surinam—based in Bogota—resumed its activities in July. Mr. Georges Heumann, new regional delegate, took up office on 26 July.

In August he went to Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela to pay courtesy calls on and renew contact with the authorities and the Red Cross Societies of these countries. He also drew attention to the availability of the ICRC for visits to security detainees.

El Salvador

During the months of July and August, 274 security detainees in San Salvador and the provinces were visited for the first time and registered. These visits took place in accordance with the ICRC standard procedure.

In April, the ICRC had asked the Salvadorian authorities for systematic notification of each arrest effected for reasons of security; this request had been accepted. The ICRC delegates observed that the notification system was progressively being applied in the provisional places of detention.
The ICRC had also suggested that the armed forces’ “Comisión Auxiliar de Control”, which had been formed at its request on 28 July 1981 to examine various problems observed in the provisional places of detention, should be restructured. This reorganization was carried out, and the first working session took place on 9 July.

ICRC protection activities in the first half of the current year were reviewed in a report which was handed over to Dr. Alvaro Magana, President of the Republic of El Salvador, during talks on 29 July, and to General Garcia, Minister of Defence.

The ICRC also carried out protection activities on behalf of members of the government forces captured by armed opposition forces. With the consent of the Salvadorian authorities the ICRC delegates—including one doctor—visited three groups of prisoners (a total of 59 persons) on 8, 12 and 29 August, whose detention had been notified by the opposition to the ICRC. The prisoners filled in messages for their families. On 31 August, the opposition forces released 40 prisoners into the care of the ICRC delegates, who accompanied them to the town of San Francisco Gotara, where the Salvadorian authorities took charge of them.

In July and August, about 2,400 people asked the tracing offices in San Salvador, Santa Ana and San Miguel for help; 471 inquiries about missing persons were recorded.

ICRC mobile teams continued to provide medical assistance for the displaced persons in the conflict zones. A medical assistance operation was undertaken for the first time in August in an extremely remote part of the Chalatenango department.

In the space of two months more than 750 tonnes of food were distributed to displaced persons in the departments of Morazan, Usulutan, San Vicente and Cabanas, under the supervision of ICRC delegates.

In August, an appeal for 5,330,000 Swiss francs was launched to finance the ICRC’s activities in El Salvador in the second half of 1982.

Argentina

Visits to persons detained for security reasons were resumed on 26 July. This protection programme had been temporarily suspended for about four months, as the regional delegation in Buenos Aires was engaged in numerous activities arising from the conflict in the South Atlantic.

In August, the ICRC delegates visited the two main prisons, “Caseros” and “Rawson”, where there were 339 detainees, and three hospitals where detainees were receiving treatment.
Asia

Regional delegation in New Delhi

The ICRC's regional delegation in New Delhi, which had had reduced activity since 1980, was reactivated in August 1982 with the appointment of a new regional delegate in the person of Mr. Jean-Michel Monod. On 7 August, Mr. Monod set out on a mission which took him from India to Bangladesh and Sri Lanka; he renewed contact with the authorities in those three countries and with the leaders of their National Societies.

In Dacca, the officials who spoke with Mr. Monod asked the ICRC to enquire into the fate of Bangladesh nationals arrested in Lebanon during the Israeli offensive in the last months. In Colombo too, the Sri Lanka authorities expressed their concern over a number of their nationals who had been reported missing during the recent events in Lebanon. Mr. Monod gave them a list of 22 persons of Sri Lanka nationality, who had been registered by ICRC delegates among prisoners held in the camp at Al Ansar.

Afghanistan

As a result of the extensive negotiations held since July 1980, when the ICRC found it impossible to continue its humanitarian activities in Afghanistan, the ICRC was invited by the Afghan authorities to send a delegation to Kabul for discussions on the resumption of its activities in that country.

On 13 August, a team of four delegates (including a doctor), headed by Mr. François Zen Ruffinen, left for Kabul. On the following day, high-level talks were conducted with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Shah Mohammad Dost. After having explained the aims of the ICRC, the delegates were granted authorization to carry out a programme of protection and assistance.

Accordingly, they visited 338 persons, who had been arrested in connection with the events in Afghanistan, and later went to a number of hospitals and other medical establishments, to carry out a survey of the situation and assess medical needs. Following the delegates' survey, a first consignment of medicaments was sent to Kabul.

* * *
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Two more members of the Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan, who had been captured in that country, were transferred to Switzerland by the ICRC. This operation was carried out on 10 August and brings to five the number of Soviet nationals held under Swiss responsibility. This second transfer followed the same procedure as the first one, completed on 28 May 1982. The ICRC negotiated, organized and secured the transit of the Soviet nationals through Pakistan territory and their transfer to Switzerland. They are visited at regular intervals by ICRC delegates.

Pakistan

The ICRC surgical hospital at Peshawar—the capacity of which had been increased from 120 to 140 beds—admitted 120 wounded Afghans in July and 160 in August. In addition, 1,054 out-patients were treated there. Once a fortnight the hospital receives blood supplies, a gift from the German Red Cross in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The ICRC paramedical teams, too, continued their work at the centre for war paraplegics and at the artificial limb workshop, which are both attached to the hospital. At the end of August, there were 35 paraplegics receiving treatment (6 were admitted in July and 16 in August). Since its opening in June 1981, the centre has provided care for 53 paraplegics, a number equal to about 5 per cent of the total number of patients admitted to the Peshawar hospital. Altogether 123 amputees have been equipped with artificial limbs.

In connection with the medical programme for victims of the conflict in Afghanistan, two ICRC delegates (one of them a doctor) visited the border province of Baluchistan to assess the requirements of hospitals taking in Afghan wounded. They found that the situation as regards surgical treatment did not call for any urgent action to be taken and that, consequently, it was not necessary to consider for the moment any ICRC initiative on the lines of that at the ICRC hospital in Peshawar.

Indonesia/East Timor

At the beginning of July, Mr. Pierre Guberan took over from Mr. Cedric Neukomm at the head of the ICRC delegation in Djakarta. From 2 to 8 July, Mr. Guberan was in East Timor and participated, with Indonesian Red Cross representatives, at the third distribution of relief to 3,380 displaced persons (including 457 children below the age of five) on Atauro Island. This operation was part of the six-month assistance programme, set up after ICRC delegates had assessed the
situation, which is carried out with the co-operation of the Indonesian Red Cross. Previous distributions had been made at the end of April and in May-June.

Extra food aid was also provided for the inhabitants of seven villages in Timor, where serious malnutrition problems subsist. Furthermore, a nutrition centre was created at Iliomar, to ensure that about 200 persons, including 140 very young children, suffering from food deficiency were given the proper kinds of food.

In July, the ICRC organized two more operations for the reuniting of 12 inhabitants of East Timor with their relatives in Australia, and 7 with their families in Portugal.

**Thailand**

In July, the ICRC delegate general for Asia, Mr. J. de Courten, while on mission in Bangkok, drew up, with the ICRC delegates stationed in Bangkok, Phnom Penh and Hanoi, a list of the objectives to be met and the budgets for ICRC humanitarian activities in Thailand, Kampuchea and Viet Nam for the six months July to December 1982.

It was decided that the ICRC would give priority to the expansion of its protection activities in the region along the border between Kampuchea and Thailand, provided it received the co-operation of all the governments concerned.

In addition, steps would have to be taken to obtain from the Thai authorities permission for surveys to be carried out to ascertain needs in the border zone to the north-east of Aranyaprathet (regions of Ban Sagnae, Ban Baranae, O-Bock, Chong Chom) where the ICRC has so far been unable to go and where there are several thousand Cambodian refugees. This mission should reveal the extent of the possible needs for medical aid and protection.

In view of the unstable and potentially explosive nature of the situation prevailing in the border area, it was decided to maintain, during these six months, the medical infrastructure set up at the Aranyaprathet sub-delegation. It was also considered essential that the last remaining mobile ICRC medical unit in the area should not be withdrawn. The Bangkok delegation would endeavour, all the same, to hand over responsibility for the two camps at Phnom Chat and Kok Tahan to a voluntary organization specializing in long-term medical and health aid, which would work with UNBRO (United Nations Border Relief Operation). However, the ICRC would continue to organize the transfer of any emergency medical cases from those two villages and would also pursue its protection duties.
In addition, the ICRC would continue its weekly visits to the military prison in Aranyaprathet and its protection tasks (visits and registration of detainees) in the places of detention along the border, in particular at Phnom Chat, Nong Chan and Samet.

For several months, the ICRC has been making numerous attempts to find a solution to the problem of the Vietnamese refugees. About 2,000 refugees are in camp “NW82”, at Nong Samet, and some 300 others are scattered in various other camps. The ICRC approached once again several countries of asylum, in connection with this problem. It suggested that representatives of those countries meet in September for discussions, in which the UNHCR would also join, with a view to formulating proposals to the authorities of Thailand for working out a settlement of a humanitarian problem that is assuming increasingly grave proportions.

Traditional activities

The Thai authorities were expected to give official confirmation of the permission to visit persons detained in centres administered by the Ministry of the Interior. This confirmation not having been received, the series of visits which were to take place at the end of August, according to the plan submitted to the authorities, had to be postponed.

Kampuchea

Negotiation for initiating a protection programme for combatants captured while carrying arms and for persons arrested in connection with the events in Kampuchea is still one of the main objectives of the ICRC. No progress was made during the first half of 1982.

In July and August, medical assistance was provided by the ICRC for 5 hospitals and 13 dispensaries, where war wounded are being cared for. In addition, it is planned to provide, in the next few months, some small-scale medical aid, depending on the needs, for 6 hospitals, where the replacement of the ICRC by other bodies has not yet been assured. However, a mission which was to have gone in mid-August to assess medical needs in four provinces in the west of Kampuchea had to be postponed at the authorities’ demand.

Further relief to orphanages is to be provided soon: a programme has been worked out for 8 orphanages which were visited by ICRC delegates in seven different provinces.

The shuttle flights organized by the ICRC between Bangkok and Phnom Penh, begun in 1979, were discontinued at the beginning of August 1982. Consignments will now be sent once a week on a regular
flight to Ho-Chi-Minh-City. From there to Phnom Penh shipments will be made on a DC-3 aircraft chartered by the ICRC.

Middle East

Lebanon

In July and August, because of the presence of Israeli forces in the country and the blockade of West Beirut, the general situation remained very tense in Lebanon. During this period, the ICRC continued its intense protection and assistance activities in three areas: Beirut, the Bek'a valley and South Lebanon.

Dispatch and distribution of relief

The dispatch of relief continued as in June, with the three logistic bases at Larnaca (Cyprus), Tel Aviv and Damascus. The volume of relief supplies sent to those three bases by regular airlines as well as by an aircraft chartered by the ICRC amounted to 2,296 tons to a value of 19,542,000 Swiss francs. In addition, 3,512 tons were shipped by sea, in eight journeys, to the ports of Jounieh, Tripoli and Haifa (from the latter port, to South Lebanon). Furthermore, 56 lorries in 9 convoys carried 1,127 tons of relief from Damascus to Lebanon.

It was during one of these trips that the “M/S Flora”, put at the disposal of the ICRC by the German Red Cross in the Federal Republic of Germany, was hit by a shell in Jounieh harbour. A member of the crew was killed and five others wounded. The ICRC immediately reminded all parties to the conflict of their obligation to respect the Red Cross emblem.

The ICRC found it difficult to assess the number of people in need of its assistance as it was impossible to make a proper census. In July the number of persons receiving relief throughout Lebanon rose from 110,000 to 171,000, of whom there were about 40,000 in West Beirut, 6,000 in Tripoli and Jounieh, 85,000 in the Bek’a valley and 40,000 in South Lebanon. In the second half of July, there was a substantial influx of displaced persons seeking refuge in the the Bek’a. Family relief parcels containing foodstuffs and kitchen utensils were distributed.

At the end of July, renewed fighting in West Beirut hampered distributions of relief and delayed the passage of convoys from east to west. Negotiations had to be undertaken with each one of the different parties
to the conflict every time a convoy had to pass through. This difficult situation lasted until the tension in the town had eased somewhat after the Palestinian combatants' departure. In one single week, from 18 to 24 August, six ICRC convoys managed to enter West Beirut. As soon as the blockade was lifted, the ICRC started to send large quantities of food for those categories of the population who were most in need of assistance. By 30 August, thirty convoys had unloaded in West Beirut.

Medical aid

The situation on the medical front also called for great efforts. Medical relief supplies (medicaments, material, ambulances and blood) were dispatched, together with food aid. On 1 July, a co-ordinator for medical matters was appointed to supervise medical activities throughout Lebanon. In Beirut, a health adviser kept watch on public health matters, such as water supplies and garbage removal. Emergency centres were set up, in co-operation with the Lebanese Ministry of Health, the Lebanese Red Cross and the "Palestinian Red Crescent". In other parts of the country, medical units lent by National Societies administered dispensaries and, at regular intervals, made a survey of the situation.

A mobile 40-bed field hospital, a gift from the Finnish Red Cross, was shipped from Larnaca to Lebanon at the end of July and set up in West Beirut, in the basement of a hotel. It was opened on 14 August.

In August, 25 doctors and nurses belonging to various National Societies and ten ICRC medical delegates were working in Lebanon, with the assistance of locally recruited personnel. During that month, 3,011 medical kits, containing material specially selected with a view to needs in Lebanon, were dispatched; 38 ambulances arrived in Lebanon and were put at the disposal of the Lebanese Red Cross, the "Palestinian Red Crescent" and the Lebanese Ministry of Health; 1,383 litres of blood were handed over to the Lebanese Red Cross and "Palestinian Red Crescent". From the start of the operation to 30 August the value of the medical equipment and material and medicaments dispatched to, or purchased in Lebanon was estimated at 13,274,000 Swiss francs.

Intense medical activity marked the last week of August, when 167 wounded Palestinian combatants were evacuated from Beirut. This operation was carried out on 26 August together with the Lebanese Red Cross and the "Palestinian Red Crescent". The wounded were carried on board the hospital ship "Flora" which sailed first to Cyprus. A small number of these wounded were taken ashore to a Cyprus hospital, and the rest went to their destination, Athens. Two medical teams, one from the German Red Cross (FRG) and the other from the
“Palestinian Red Crescent” tended the wounded on board the ship. On 6 September, in a similar operation 71 more wounded Palestinian combatants were evacuated from Beirut.

Protection

The protection of the civilian population and of persons taken into custody by the various parties to the conflict was at the centre of ICRC concern during July and August. The ICRC several times contacted the parties to the conflict, at both higher and lower echelons, to remind them of their obligation not to attack hospitals marked with Red Cross or Red Crescent emblems and to spare the civilian population. In particular, the ICRC sent at the beginning of July a special appeal to the parties to the conflict with a specific reference to Beirut civilian population. A further solemn appeal was made at Beirut on 1 August to all the parties to the Geneva Conventions, calling on them to respect and to ensure respect for the Conventions. In view of the bombing of the Lebanese capital, the President of the ICRC sent a message to the Israeli Prime Minister to be brought to his personal attention.

Right from the start of the conflict, the ICRC had requested access to all the combatants taken prisoner. After having seen 18 Palestinians and 50 Syrians, who had all been wounded and captured by the Israeli armed forces, and having also visited an Israeli soldier in the hands of the PLO, the ICRC obtained authorization to visit a camp at Al-Ansar, near Nabatieh (South Lebanon) where able-bodied captured Palestinians were held. The visits began on 18 July; 212 children who were registered at this camp were released that same day, and the ICRC took steps to reunite them with their families in other parts of the country. The registration of prisoners and the visits have been continuing since at a regular rate. By the end of August, 7,000 detainees had been registered at Al-Ansar Camp; of these, 200 persons (other than the 212 children) were released and reunited, through ICRC efforts, with their families. About thirty wounded Palestinians cared for in Israel were also released on 24 August.

Besides the Syrian wounded who had been visited in hospital in June, the ICRC registered on 17 August about 250 able-bodied Syrian prisoners held in a camp in Israel. On 19 August, two paraplegic Syrian prisoners were repatriated by the ICRC.

In Damascus, ICRC delegates registered three Israeli prisoners in August.

An Israeli pilot, captured by the Palestinians in June in the early stages of the offensive, was visited several times until his release on
20 August, together with another prisoner captured two days previously. The ICRC also acted as a neutral intermediary when the mortal remains of nine Israeli soldiers killed in Lebanon (four of them in 1978) were handed over to Israel.

During this period, there was a marked increase in the work of the Central Tracing Agency. A network of tracing offices was set up throughout Lebanon, in Beirut, Saida, Tyre, Chitaura, Ksara, Baalbeck and Hermel, and many additional delegates were appointed to these tasks. In August, six delegates and 25 local staff were employed on exclusively tracing agency activities. By 30 August, 14,485 requests to trace missing persons were being processed; 19,540 family messages had been forwarded to various places in Lebanon (7,240 to the Beirut area, 7,890 to South Lebanon, and 4,410 to the Bekaa valley); and 15,990 family messages had been exchanged between Lebanon and more than eighty countries, with the help of their National Societies.

Increase in personnel

In July and August, the number of delegates was further increased. At the end of June, these were 74 delegates (including 19 members of medical units lent by various National Societies) in Lebanon, Damascus, Larnaca and Tel Aviv; this figure rose to 88 at mid-July and 104 (including 20 lent by National Societies) at the end of July. By the end of August, it had increased to a total of 124 delegates, of whom 44 were members of National Societies.

Missions from Geneva

The progress of all those activities was, of course, followed by the ICRC in Geneva, and support provided for them. The delegate general for the Middle East, Mr. Jean Hoefliger, carried out two extensive missions in the conflict areas, from 1 to 23 July, and again from 12 August to 5 September. The head of the Relief Division, Mr. Ph. Dind, was also in that region from 1 to 7 July; his aim was to assess the extent of assistance for the conflict victims and also to define the field of activity and source of supplies for each of the delegations and sub-delegations concerned. The head of the Operations Department, Mr. Michel Convers, took part in a meeting of Arab National Societies, which had gathered at the end of July in Jiddah to examine the situation in Lebanon.

Two members of the International Committee went on missions concerning the conflict. From 4 to 7 August, the ICRC Vice-President, Mr. H. Huber, was in Israel and met both the Prime Minister, Mr. Begin, and the Minister for Defence, Mr. Sharon. The following week,
Mr. M.-A. Naville visited the various delegations and sub-delegations in Lebanon. He was received by the President of the Lebanese Republic, Mr. Elias Sarkis; later he met Mrs. Issa el-Khoury, President of the Lebanese Red Cross, and Dr. Fathi Arafat, President of the "Palestinian Red Crescent".

At the end of August and beginning of September, Mr. J.-P. Hacké, ICRC director of Operational Activities, and Dr. R. Russbach, chief medical officer, also went on mission to Lebanon, to review the situation with delegation heads and undertake an assessment of likely needs.

**Urgent appeal**

In August, the ICRC launched an urgent appeal for 38 million Swiss francs, required to finance its humanitarian activities in Lebanon for the period from 1 September to 31 December 1982.

**Israel and occupied territories**

The ICRC delegation in Israel continued to discharge its customary tasks despite the additional duties it had to fulfil in connection with the conflict in Lebanon. The delegates visited the prisons as in the past, as well as a number of places of detention under the direct authority of the army.

On 19 August, a delegate went to the Golan area where he saw all the administrative detainees who had been released a short while before. On 22 July, the Druse inhabitants on the Golan, after lengthy discussions with the Israeli authorities ended a strike they had commenced in mid-February.

**Jordan**

ICRC protection activities are being pursued in Jordan. The seventh series of visits to places of detention, which ended on 12 July, had lasted four months: 3,247 detainees, including 36 women, were seen in 17 places of detention.

**Conflict between Iraq and Iran**

During July, the ICRC delegates came up against an increasing number of obstacles to their work, in Iraq as much as in Iran. Consequently, the heads of the two delegations were recalled to Geneva at the end of July, for consultations. In August, concern over the proper observance of the Conventions had not diminished and high-level representations were under consideration.
The delegates in Iraq, nevertheless, carried out their monthly visits to the prisoner-of-war camps in Mosul, Ramadi and Anbar in July and August. In Iran, a visit was made to refugee camps at Ziveh near the border, containing about 12,000 Iraqi Kurds.

**Urgent appeal**

The ICRC appealed urgently for 8,890,000 Swiss francs for its humanitarian activities relating to the conflict between Iraq and Iran. This amount should allow it to continue its activities during the period from 1 July to 31 December 1982 and to cover the deficit (over 1 million Swiss francs) at the end of the previous period.

**Europe**

**Poland**

In July and August, the ICRC delegates in Warsaw continued their visits to places of internment. By the end of August, 13 places had been visited for the third time since the beginning of the action. The number of people interned under the decree of martial law of 12 December 1981, who were seen during this third series of visits, was 1,651. One place of internment was visited four times. The trade union leader, Mr. Walesa, was also seen for the third time, in August, by the ICRC delegates.

A good number of internees were released by the Polish authorities in July. The ICRC was officially informed that there were only seven places of internment still holding internees at the end of August.

It was, therefore, decided to have only one team of visitor delegates, instead of three. The team is composed of four ICRC delegates, one of them a doctor. The Warsaw delegation staff was reduced from 24 to 17 persons on 1 September.

The ICRC and League provided support for the Polish Red Cross summer holiday camps for children with health or social problems. More than 417 tons of food, 145,000 litres of milk, and a quantity of soap were distributed in 78 camps containing 32,330 children. Members of the Youth Branches of the Nordic, German (FRG) and Italian Red Cross Societies helped to organize educational and games activities in those camps.

* * *
The ICRC delegate general for Europe, accompanied by a representative of the League of Red Cross Societies, was in Poland from 25 to 28 August. Their objective was to review the situation, together with the Polish authorities and Red Cross leaders, and to decide on the scope of future activities and on the number of joint League-ICRC personnel that would be required.

As regards the ICRC more particularly, this mission enabled it to keep open its relations with the Polish authorities on questions relating to the protection of the internees and the possible extension of protection activities to persons arrested and sentenced under martial law.
Visits of ICRC President to National Societies

Australia and New Zealand

After the International Red Cross Conference in Manila, the President of the ICRC, at the long-standing invitation of the Australian and New Zealand Red Cross Societies, was in Australia from 15 to 20 November and in New Zealand from 20 to 24 November. He was accompanied by Mr. A. Modoux, head of the Press and Information Division, and Mr. M. Martin, of the National Societies Division.

In Australia the President of the ICRC was received by the Governor-General and had talks in Canberra with representatives of the Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs and of the Australian Bureau of Assistance and Development. In addition, he visited the Victoria and New South Wales divisions of the Australian Red Cross. He addressed the annual general meeting of the NSW division on the ICRC and its activities.

In New Zealand the delegation was received by the Governor-General and the mayors of Wellington and Auckland. The President conferred with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and several senior officials of that ministry. During a visit to the Red Cross he took part in a national seminar in Wellington on the dissemination of knowledge of international humanitarian law. He also visited the Auckland section of the National Society.

In both countries the President was interviewed by the press, radio and television.

Canada and the United States

The President of the ICRC, Mr. Alexandre Hay, accompanied by Mr. J.-P. Hocké, Director for Operational Activities, and Mr. M. Verhey, delegate for international organizations, visited the Canadian Red Cross from 4 to 9 March 1982. On 5 March, he was greeted at the Can-
ian Red Cross headquarters in Toronto; on the following days he visited the Red Cross office and the blood bank in Ottawa, and later the National Society office at Montreal. During the same period, the President of the ICRC had an interview with the Prime Minister and was welcomed by the Canadian House of Commons.

Conversation, both at the Red Cross and with senior government officials, covered current events, in particular the work of the ICRC in present conflicts, the dissemination of international humanitarian law and of the Principles of the Red Cross, and the ratification of the Geneva Protocols of 8 June 1977.

The ICRC President then visited the United States to take part in a seminar on international humanitarian law organized, with the support of the ICRC, by the American National Red Cross and the Washington College of Law of the American University. The seminar was held to commemorate the centenary of the accession of the United States to the 1864 Geneva Convention. At the opening ceremony, held at the State Department on 11 March, speeches were made by Mr. Walter Stoessel of the State Department, the President of the ICRC, Mr. Alexandre Hay, and by Mr. J. Holland, Chairman of the American Red Cross.

Mr. Hay was accompanied by Mr. D. Schindler, a member of the International Committee, Mr. J. Moreillon, director of General Affairs, and Mr. H. P. Gasser, chief of the ICRC Legal Division, all three of whom spoke at the seminar, and also by Mr. F. Schmidt, delegate general for Europe and North America, and Mr. M. Veuthey, delegate for international organizations.

About a hundred persons, university professors, government and military lawyers, and advanced law students, took part in the seminar, consisting in lectures and debates on selected questions concerning humanitarian law and its relationship to human rights. The success of this seminar and the interest shown by participants satisfied the American National Red Cross and the Washington College of Law that they should hold a second seminar in 1983.

As well as attending the seminar, the President of the ICRC naturally visited the headquarters of the American National Red Cross where he met its President, Mr. G. Elsey, and senior officials. He also had numerous meetings with representatives of the United States Government.

In New York, the President of the ICRC was welcomed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, and various other high-ranking officers of the United Nations Secretariat and of UNICEF.
France

On 2 March, the President of the ICRC visited the French Red Cross and the Ministry for External Affairs in Paris. He first met Mr. J.-M. Soutou, President of the National Red Cross Society and later called on Mr. Cheysson, the French Foreign Minister. Senior government officers who were present at the meeting with Mr. Cheysson included Mrs. Questiaux, Minister for National Solidarity, and Mr. Gutman, General Secretary to the Ministry for External Affairs.

Discussions centred on certain problems involving, more particularly, the ICRC's work in various parts of the world. ICRC action in its struggle against torture was also discussed.

All the speakers showed great interest in the ICRC’s different activities and said they would be prepared to support it. Mr. Cheysson expressed the wish of establishing regular contact with officers of the ICRC Operations Department and promised financial aid, in particular for the organization of seminars on the dissemination of humanitarian law.

Saudi Arabia

The President of the ICRC, accompanied by Mr. J.-P. Hocké, ICRC director for Operational Activities, and Mr. S. Nessi, head of the Financing Division, visited Saudi Arabia from 27 to 31 March. He had talks with the President of the Saudi Arabian Red Crescent, Dr. Abdul Azziz Mudarris, and the Minister for Health, Dr. Hussein Abdul Razak el Jazairi, and later, with Prince Saud el Faisal, Minister for Foreign Affairs. It was not possible for the ICRC President to meet King Khaled or Crown Prince Fahd.

Poland

The President of the ICRC was in Poland on mission from 21 to 25 June, at the invitation of the Polish Red Cross. He was accompanied by Mr. F. Schmidt, ICRC delegate general for Europe, and by Miss M. Mercier of the ICRC Information Division.

In Warsaw, Mr. Hay had a series of talks with officers of the Polish Red Cross on joint activities being now carried out in the country. The ICRC President then visited the towns of Lodz and Plock; the region around Plock had suffered severe flooding in January, necessitating at the time the launching of a special appeal for assistance. Visits were made to the local branches of the Polish Red Cross and to the municipal authorities in these places, and also to the Lodz handi-
capped children's home. Mr. Hay visited, too, the Bialoleka prison near Warsaw where internees are held. He was authorized to go into all the sections of the prisons where there were internees.

The most important talks took place with government representatives: General Jaruzelski, the Prime Minister, Mr. Czyrek, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Szelachowski, Minister for Health, and with various other senior officials. The conversations centred on the two aspects of ICRC activity in Poland: protection of persons under detention and assistance to the many categories of persons in need. The ICRC President also raised the question of Poland's ratification of the June 1977 Protocols.

The ICRC President had furthermore, an interview with a representative of the Polish Church, Monsignor Miziolek, the bishop designated by the Primate of Poland to deal with the internee problem.

Finally, the President held several working sessions with the ICRC delegation in Warsaw to consider the various aspects of its work and seek how it would develop in the coming months.

Ireland

Mr. Alexandre Hay, accompanied by Mr. Y. Sandoz, head of the Principles and Law Department, visited Dublin on 1 and 2 July, in response to an invitation from the President of the Parliamentary Assembly (or Consultative Assembly) of the Council of Europe.

The object of his mission was to give an account of the Protocols to the Standing Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly which was to adopt a report on this subject, as well as a recommendation, for presentation to the Committee of Ministers, advocating accession to, and dissemination of the Protocols.

Mr. Hay spoke on the Protocols and spent about an hour answering questions by the parliamentarians, mainly on the ICRC's current operations. Both Mr. Hay's speech and his replies to questions were given an excellent reception. The report and the recommendation were adopted unanimously.

A courtesy visit was paid to the Irish Red Cross, where Mr. Hay met its Chairman Mrs. Carrie Acheson, and Mr. Barry O'Hagan, Secretary General. In the course of a cordial meeting, current affairs, in particular ICRC activities in Lebanon and in other countries throughout the world, and problems concerning other topics of common interest were discussed. A gift of 10,000 Irish pounds was handed to the President of the ICRC for its activities in Lebanon.
### MISCELLANEOUS

**STATES PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOLS OF 8 JUNE 1977**

*List as at 30 June 1982*

The following is a chronological list of States parties to the Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, adopted on 8 June 1977.

The names of the States are abbreviated and the serial numbers are simply for ease of reference.

The date given in the second column is the date of registration by the depositary State (Switzerland) of the instrument sent by the State becoming a party to the Protocols. This registration date determines, according to the provisions of the Protocols, the date the Protocols come into force—i.e. six months later—for the State concerned.

The letter in the following column indicates the type of instrument received by the depositary State: R—ratification; A—accession.

The last column, entitled “Remark”, shows whether a State has become a party solely to Protocol I, whether it made reservations or special declarations and also (by the abbreviation “Int. Commission”) whether a State has accepted the jurisdiction of the International Fact-Finding Commission provided for in Article 90 (2) of Protocol I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Date of Registration</td>
<td>Type of Act</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 1978</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 1978</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of entry into force of the Protocols: 7 December 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Registration</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 November 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Registration</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 April 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1979</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 1979</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reservation Int. Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Registration</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 March 1980</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 April 1980</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 1980</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 1980</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reservation and declarations Int. Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September 1980</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1980</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Registration</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 October 1981</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prot. I only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 December 1981</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Int. Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Registration</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 January 1982</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February 1982</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reservations Int. Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 1982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1982</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Prot. I only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June 1982</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reservation Int. Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 30 June, 1982 24 States were Parties to Protocol I and 21 States to Protocol II.
Session of the Medico-Legal Commission of Monaco

The ninth session of the Medico-Legal Commission was held at Monaco, from 12 to 15 May 1982. As customary, the ICRC was represented by an observer, Mr. Y. Sandoz, Deputy Director and Head of the Principles and Law Department of the ICRC. Mr. Jean Pictet, a member of the ICRC, who was elected a member of the Medico-Legal Commission, was also present.

There were two items on the agenda: “Data processing and transformations in the medical profession and in medical ethics” and “International organizations and internal conflicts”.

The ICRC was directly concerned with the second topic which was the subject of a report by Professor Christian Dominiec and Professor Patrnogic. In the discussions that followed the reports, many questions were posed on the role and the work of the ICRC.

At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Medico-Legal Commission passed a resolution, calling on governments to support international humanitarian law and encourage the ICRC in its role of protection in the event of armed conflict.

RESOLUTION I

OF THE MEDICO-LEGAL COMMISSION OF MONACO

The Medico-Legal Commission,...

Deeply concerned over the fact that fundamental humanitarian rules are not always fully respected in non-international armed conflicts and in internal troubles,

Recognizing the necessity and urgency of ensuring more effective protection and assistance to the victims of such conflicts,

Believing that it is the duty of governments to accept offers of service made by the International Committee of the Red Cross,

Urges governments to accept the offers of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the event of internal conflict or any other circumstances of internal trouble or tension and to grant it the facilities enabling it to carry out its humanitarian activities,

Encourages the International Committee of the Red Cross, or any other impartial humanitarian body, to pursue its activities in aid of victims of armed conflicts and international troubles,

Invites States which have not yet done so to ratify as soon as possible, or to accede to, Protocol II of 10 June 1977 additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, relating to the protection of victims of non-international armed conflicts.
Round Table in San Remo

The International Institute of Humanitarian Law held its eighth Round Table on the current problems of international humanitarian law and Red Cross Symposium from 8 to 11 September, attended by about a hundred lawyers, diplomats and representatives of National Red Cross Societies. The ICRC was represented by its President Mr. Alexandre Hay, by Committee members Mr. M. Aubert and Mr. D. Schindler, and by several staff members.

The first day's work was concerned with "The United Nations forces and international humanitarian law: applicability and instruction". The second day of the Round Table was devoted to the subject "Journalists in armed conflicts: their role, responsibility and protection on dangerous professional missions". The third day was reserved for the "Protection of refugees in armed conflicts and internal disturbances". On the fourth day an ICRC report was given on "Follow-up action on the resolutions adopted by the Twenty-fourth International Red Cross Conference" (in Manila in November 1981).

After the Round Table, the Council of the Institute held its annual assembly. Note was taken of the year's activities; these are developing satisfactorily, particularly the courses on the law of war. The Council decided to hold another Round Table in 1983 and organize courses on the refugees law for the first time this winter, under the sponsorship of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

Congress on penal military law

The International Society of Penal Military Law and Law of War held its 9th International Congress from 2 to 6 September 1982 in Lausanne, Switzerland.

On its agenda were several problems arising from recent developments in the law of war. Each State has to give guidelines to its armed forces. It must first of all incorporate the new international norms into its own legal system and subsequently give the explanations and orders necessary for their application.

It appeared particularly appropriate to consider the following points: better protection, under the new international law, of the civilian population against the dangers resulting from hostilities; widening of the categories of combatants entitled to prisoner-of-war status in case of capture, which raises problems of responsibility and interpretation; training of legal advisers to the armed forces, whose status and responsi-
bility must be clearly defined; and adaptation of national legal systems and of directives to military commands with a view to averting breaches of the new law.

Some two hundred specialists from over thirty States on all continents took part in the 9th Congress, such as senior officers (judge advocates and combatants), professors of law, civil servants, etc. The ICRC was also represented.

As customary, the International Society of Penal Military Law and Law of War will be publishing the proceedings of the 9th Congress.

Inter-American Seminar in Costa Rica

An Inter-American Seminar on State Security, Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law, organized jointly by the ICRC and the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights, met at San José de Costa Rica from 27 September to 1 October 1982. More than one hundred people from academic, military or political circles from some twenty-five countries, or members of inter-American human rights organizations and of the ICRC, took part in the seven working sessions.

The following subjects were discussed at the seminar: legal and material conditions of detention; guerrilla warfare; terrorism; basic human guarantees; mechanisms to enforce law and the dissemination of law. The aim of the seminar was to provoke serious discussion on the relationship between the demands of State security, human rights and international humanitarian law, and each subject had to be examined and discussed with regard to the requirements of these three factors.

Despite the diversity of nationalities, professions and political allegiances of the participants, the meeting was very successful: politicization, which is too often observed in meetings at this level, was nearly always avoided, which meant that the atmosphere was very conducive to dialogue. Although delicate subjects had been introduced, such as guerrilla warfare and terrorism, references to specifically Latin American problems were absent from the majority of interventions, thus deliberately leaving room for constructive discussion on such contentious subjects.

The ICRC's presence probably had a lot to do with the success of the seminar: its candour, its scrupulous respect for a neutral attitude, its interventions always linked to its humanitarian activities first of all showed the deep meaning of its activity and its raison d'être, and then the way to a fruitful discussion.
THE LAWS OF ARMED CONFLICTS

This book, edited by D. Schindler, a member of the ICRC, and J. Toman, deputy director of the Henry-Dunant Institute, is a corpus of all international conventions relating to the law of armed conflicts, traditionally known as the law of war (jus in bello).

This collection includes the texts of all the conventions currently in force, several conventions that are no longer in force but still of historical interest and the texts of other conventions which are not or not yet applied. It does not contain any texts of solely national interest, except for the Lieber Instructions of 1863, which mark the beginning of a codification of the law of armed conflicts.

The book further provides the final acts and resolutions adopted by the intergovernmental conferences that drew up the conventions reproduced in the book and the resolutions of intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations quoting provisions of the law of war.

Each convention or resolution is preceded by a short introduction summing up its historical background, mentioning also its date of entry into force, the authentic language(s) of its original drafting and the source (official or not) from which the text in the book has been drawn.

After each convention is a list, up to 30 April 1978, of signatures, ratifications, accessions or declarations of succession, and a full reproduction of reservations made by States on becoming parties to the treaty.

Gathered in relatively summary form in this single book is a wealth of information and precise documents that will be extremely useful to all readers interested in international law relating to armed conflicts.

E. BELLO: AFRICAN CUSTOMARY HUMANITARIAN LAW

Humanitarian principles are common to the human beings of all nations; they are to be found everywhere, deeply embedded in the conscience of man, once the particularities arising from culture and external circumstances have been removed. E. Bello's study is a further demonstration of the truth of this statement.

His book, which unfortunately exists only in English, is divided into three main parts. The description of armed conflicts in pre-colonial Africa, with the modes of combat, the lawful measures permitted against civilians or civil objects, and the means of putting an end to conflicts, is followed by a comparative analysis of existing norms in African customary law and those prescribed by the international conventions of humanitarian law. The last part of the work, which constitutes the conclusion to the comparative study preceding it, is dedicated to a subject which is of particular interest to the author: the establishment of an African institute of international humanitarian law, to further the dissemination of knowledge of this law in Africa by the National Societies of the Red Cross. The index and a good bibliography complete this concise and fascinating work. The reader, upon closing it, would like to read much more on the same subject and would like to find similar studies on the humanitarian principles of other cultures.

THE ICRC IN INDOCHINA, 1946-54

Engaged in Indochina in one of the first great decolonization conflicts, the ICRC had to cope with a situation which was in many ways new to it. The Indochina war, in which an expeditionary force was pitted against guerrillas in civilian clothing, dragged on over seven years (from 1946 to 1954), until it gradually reached such a state of "decay" that it was scarcely possible to apply humanitarian law any longer.

Faced with the attitude of the French who tried to limit it to a partial rôle and the Vietnamese who refused to comply with its requests and

---


then refused to discuss with it, the ICRC was confronted in Indochina with a delicate, arduous and often thankless task. It was only at the price of unremitting tenacity that significant results were obtained.

Mr. Berger's small book is a quick but dense summary of the ICRC's operations on a terrain and at a time which were both extremely difficult, but also very exciting. The ICRC found itself at grips with obscure hostile forces whose attitude perhaps served as an example and made for unfavourable reactions in other parts of the world and at other times, even right up to the present. These perspectives add to the interest of this short study which is easy to follow thanks to a map, chronological tables and photographs.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

It gives us pleasure to report the recent publication, under the auspices of the Libyan Arab Red Crescent, 1 of a Brief summary of international humanitarian law, in Arabic.

It is a small sized book (approximately 14 x 19 cm), of 30 pages by Mohammed Hamed Al-Asbali. The preface is dated 1 April 1980. In these few pages the author, in a short historical chapter, provides information on the origin and nature of international humanitarian law. He then gives a quick explanation of its principles. Although extremely simplified, this work may constitute a useful introduction to a complicated subject.

It is certain that in such small space not much can be said about international humanitarian law, which, after its recent developments in 1977, consists of almost six hundred articles. We hope this Brief summary will induce its readers to seek more information on the subject.

---

1 Libyan Arab Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>Afghan Red Crescent, Puli Ariam, Kabul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST REPUBLIC</td>
<td>Algiers Red Crescent Society, 15 bis, Boulevards Mohamed V, Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF ALBANIA</td>
<td>Albanian Red Crescent Society, Rruga e Barrikadave, Tirana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>Argentine Red Cross, H. Yrigoyen 2068, 1089 Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>Australian Red Cross, 206, Clarence Street, East Melbourne 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>Austrian Red Cross, 3, Gussmann-Strasse, 1079 Vienna 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHAMAS</td>
<td>Bahamas Red Cross Society, P.O. Box N 91, Nassau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHRAIN</td>
<td>Bahrain Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 882, Manama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>Bangladesh Red Cross Society, 34, Bangabandhu Avenue, Dacca 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>Bolivian Red Cross, Avenida Sim6n Bolivar, 1511, La Paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td>Belgian Red Cross, 98 Chaussée de Viesgut, 1020 Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMA (Socialist Republic of)</td>
<td>Burma Red Cross, 42 Strand Road, Red Cross Building, Bangor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURUNDI</td>
<td>Burundi Red Cross Society, rue du Marché 3, P.O. Box 324, Bujumbura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMEROON</td>
<td>Cameroon Red Cross Society, rue Henry-Dunant, P.O. Box 631, Yaoundé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>Canadian Red Cross, 93 Wellesley Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5V 1H8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td>Central African Red Cross, B.P. 1428, Bangui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa Maria 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 2465-V, Santiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA (People's Republic)</td>
<td>Chinese Red Cross — Red Cross Society of China, 35, Kamikur, Huting, Peking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>Colombian Red Cross, Carrera 7a, 34-66, Apartado nacional 1110, Bogotá D.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONGO, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF</td>
<td>Cross-Rougeb, plaque de la Paix, Brazzaville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>Costa Rican Red Cross, Calle 14, Avenida 8, Apartado 1025, San José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>Cuban Red Cross, Calle 23 201 esq. N. Vadoado, Havana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>Czechoslovak Red Cross, Trnasoska 18, 11804 Prague I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>Danish Red Cross, Dag Hammarskjöld Allé 28, Postbox 2600, 2100 København Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td>Dominican Red Cross, Apartado Postal 1293, Santo Domingo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECUADOR</td>
<td>Ecuadorian Red Cross, Calle de 7a y Avenida Colombia, 118, Quito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT (Arab Republic of)</td>
<td>Egyptian Red Crescent Society, 29, El-Galaa Street, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGIPT</td>
<td>Nigerian Red Crescent, 29, Calle Poniente, Centro de Gobierno, San Salvador, Apartado Postal 2672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>Ethiopian Red Cross, Ras Desta Damlaw Avenue, Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIJI</td>
<td>Fiji Red Cross Society, 193 Rodwell Road, B.P. Box 569, Suva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>Finnish Red Cross, Tehtaani 1 A, FI-10141 Helsinki 1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>French Red Cross, 17 rue Quentin Bouchart, F-75354 Paris Box 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBIA</td>
<td>The Gambia Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 472, Banjul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF</td>
<td>German Red Cross in the Federal Republic of Germany, Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 71, 3000, Berlin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>Ghana Red Cross, National Headquarters, Ministries Annex A3, P.O. Box 835, Accra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>Hellenic Red Cross, rue Lycavittou 1, Athens 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>Guatemalan Red Cross, 3ª Calle E-40, Zona 1, Ciudad de Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>Guyana Red Cross, P.O. Box 351, Eve Leary, Georgetown,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>Iraqi Red Crescent, Al-Mansour, Baghdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>Irish Red Cross, 16 Merrion Square, Dublin 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Italian Red Cross, 12 via Toscana, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAICA</td>
<td>Jamaica Red Cross Society, 76 Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN (People's Republic)</td>
<td>Japanese Red Cross, 6-1 Shibuya-Daimon 1-1, Tokyo 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>Jordan National Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 10 001, Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>Kenya Red Cross Society, St. John's Case, P.O. Box 4012, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF</td>
<td>Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pyeongyang,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA, REPUBLIC OF</td>
<td>The Republic of Korea, National Red Cross, 12-10 Nam San-Dong, Seoul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUWAIT</td>
<td>Kuwait Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 1530, Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC</td>
<td>Lao Red Cross, P.B. 650, Vientiane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>Lebanese Red Cross, rue Spears, Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESOTHO</td>
<td>Lesotho Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 366, Maseru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIBERIA — Liberian National Red Cross, National Headquarter, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, Monrovia.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA — Libyan Arab Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, Sana’a.

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 3080, Chichiri, Blantyre 79.

MALAYSIA — Malaysian Red Cross Society, JKR 2335, Jalan Tun Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 11-02.

MALI — Mali Red Cross, B.P. 280, Bamako.

MAURITANIA — Mauritian Red Cross Society, B.P. 344, Avenue Gamal Abdel Nasser, Nouakchott.

MAURITIUS — Mauritius Red Cross, Site Thibes Street, Curepipe.

MEXICO — Mexican Red Cross, Avenida Ejercito Nacional no 1032, Mexico 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 Cross, B.P. 189, Rabat.

NEPAL — Nepal Red Cross Society, Kathmandu, P.B. 217, Kathmandu.

NETHERLANDS — Netherland Red Cross, P.O. Box 2427, 2500 CK The Hague.

NEW ZEALAND — New Zealand Red Cross, Red Cross House, 4 Hill Street, Wellington 1. (P.O. Box 12-140, Wellington North.)

NICARAGUA — Nicaraguan Red Cross, D.N. Apartado 3279, Managua.

NIGER — Red Cross Society of Niger, B.P. 386, Niamey.

NIGERIA — Nigerian Red Cross Society, Eko Aketa Close, off St. Gregory Rd., P.O. Box 764, Lagos.

NORWAY — Norwegian Red Cross, Drammensveien 20, Oslo 2, Mail add.: Postboks 2338, Postboks 2338, Oslo 2.

PAKISTAN — Pakistan Red Cross Society, National Headquarters, 169, Sarwar Road, Rawalpindi.

PAPOA 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, Jirón Chacay 881, 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 J.

QATAR — Qatar Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 5490, Doha.

ROMANIA — Red Cross of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Strada Biterica Anzei 29, Bucharest.

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, 5A Liverpool Street, P.O.B. 427, Freetown.

SINGAPORE — Singapore Red Cross Society, 15 Penang Lane, Singapore 9293.

SOMALIA (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC) — Somali Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 937, Mogadishu.

SOUTH AFRICA — South African Red Cross, 77, de Villiers Street, P.O.B. 726, Johannesburg 2000.

SPAIN — Spanish Red Cross, Eduardo Dato 16, Madrid 10.

SRI LANKA (DIRECTORATE OF RELIEF) — Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, 106 Dhammapala Mawatha, Colombo 2.

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, Rainimatter, 15, B.P. 2699, 9001 Bern.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC — Syrian Red Cross, Bd Mahdi Ben Baraka, Damascus.

TANZANIA — Tanzanian Red Cross Society, Upungu Road, P.O.B. 1133, Dar es Salaam.

THAILAND — Thai Red Cross Society, Pratibha Building, Chalalmondorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok.

TOGO — Togolese Red Cross Society, 51 rue Boko Sega, P.O. Box 655, Lomé.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO — Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society, National Headquarters, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, Port of Spain, Trinidad.

TUNISIA — Tunisian Red Cross, 107 Lynch Street, P.O. Box 226, Port Area, P.O. Box 226, Monrovia.

TURKEY — Turkish Red Cross, Yenihisar, Ankara.

UGANDA — Uganda Red Cross, Nabunya Road, P.O. Box 494, Kampala.

UNITED KINGDOM — British Red Cross, 9 Grosvenor Crescent, London, SW1Z 7EL.

UPPER VOLTA — Upper Volta Red Cross, P.O.B. 2000, Ouagadougou.

URUGUAY — Uruguayan Red Cross, Avenida 8 de Octubre 2990, Montevideo.

USA — American National Red Cross, 17th and D Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

U.S.R. — Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 106 Dahmmapala Mawatha, Colombo 2.

VENEZUELA — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello No 4, Apart. 5183, Caracas.

VIET NAM, SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF — Red Cross of Viet Nam, 68 rue Bl-Trién, Hanoi.

YEMEN (Arab Republic) — Yemen Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 1471, San'a.

YUGOSLAVIA — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, Belgrade.

ZAFIRE — Red Cross of the Repub- lic of Zaire, 41 av. de la Justice, P.B. 1712, Kinshasa.

ZAMBIA — Zambia Red Cross, P.O. Box R.W.1, 2837 Brentwood Drive, Lusaka.