

# BAHIRATUN

*A monthly newsletter issued by the Bahrain Freedom Movement*

## The 14th Summit of the GCC in Riyadh They Agreed Not to Do Anything

The Riyadh Summit of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) will go in the books of history as one of the most uneventful of the 14 meetings so far. Nothing of substance came out of the three-day annual summit at the Saudi capital, and the contents of the final communiqué were nothing but a repetition of earlier ones. One may think this is due to the non-existence of important issues or lack of interest in them. The reality is that most hot topics were in fact tackled but the outcome could not warrant being exposed. It is now becoming gradually more difficult to discuss the outstanding problems especially those relating to inter-Gulf relations. Feelings are running high due to tribal and territorial differences, and tensions have become the order of the day in the region. However the focal points of these tensions have over the last 15 years shifted but not disappeared.

In the early eighties the fear of Iran and her Islamic Revolution provided a pretext for the rulers of the Gulf to come together. Internal and external forces were at work trying to impose the idea that the stability of the region and the governments of the Gulf states were at risk, and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) was formed as a political alliance to bolster the efforts to prevent the spread of the Islamic revolution reaching the southern side of the Gulf. The United States of America supplemented this alliance by creating the Rapid Deployment Force whose main task was to protect the vital US interests in the region. Two years after the end of the Iraq-Iran war, Iraq invaded Kuwait and occupied its territories. Since then Iraq has become the main threat to the security of the Gulf. Numerous military arrangements were designed and the US took the lead in establishing a strong military presence in the Gulf. The risk to the Gulf security remained and the prospect of stability in the region continued to be an illusion.

Two important factors contributed to this state of affairs. On one hand, the disputes among the tribal Gulf rulers have in the last three years intensified. The Bahrain-Qatar border dispute surfaced again and the matter was put to the International Court of Justice at the Hague whose ruling on procedural issues is expected next month. The relations between Doha and Manama have remained as cool as ever, with no prospect of improvement. The Saudi-Qatari relations became sour last year after Saudi forces attacked a Qatari border post at Al Khafsoo killing two Qatari soldiers. That incident was enough to fuel a protracted dispute which has clouded the relations between Doha and Riyadh until today. The 13th GCC summit

in Abu Dhabi in December 1992 came close to collapse as the Qataris insisted on boycotting the meeting. It was eventually saved by the efforts of several mediators and the Saudis lost a lot of their credibility as they saw their influence in the region crumbling.

On the other hand, internal problems in several GCC states continued as the search for more political openness took new dimensions. Kuwait restored her democratic process and held the first parliamentary elections in October 1992. There was an immense pressure from Riyadh to prevent the return of the elections, but failed to achieve her ambition. She was forced to find her own alternative, and in February 1992 King Fahd announced his intention to form a Consultative (Shura) Council whose members were to be appointed. It took the King two years to open the Council, a sign of hesitation on his part. Last month King Fahd inaugurated his Council amid deepening political crisis resulting from the persecution of intellectuals and academics who had insisted on a serious reform of the regime. Scores of these activists have remained in jail since the crackdown against them six months ago.

Bahrain's government whose actions have been inspired by the Saudi initiatives followed suit. Early last year a Consultative Council started its closed sessions after its 30 members had been chosen by the Amir. However, the Council has failed to attract the attention of even those aligned with the government. The political crisis has not shown any sign of easing and it is not expected to see dramatic changes in the situation. Bahrain has remained one of the worst cases where human rights abuses have never ceased. International organisations have consistently condemned these abuses (see inside) but the Al Khalifa government has turned a blind eye to the countless accusations. It knows that western support for its policies is guaranteed, and sees no need to affect a change in its local policies. The Al Khalifa have all along refused to abide by the country's constitution especially the articles dealing with elections and the right of the citizens to have a free access to their country.

It is in these circumstances that the 14th GCC summit was convened in Riyadh in the period 20th-22nd December 1993. The inter-Gulf disputes have prevented the leaders from taking firm stands on various issues. The Omani initiative to form a 100,000-strong Gulf army was rejected two years ago in Kuwait and Riyadh summit has called for upgrading of the present "peninsula shield" forces from 10,000 to 30,000. The security agreement which has been on the table for the last thirteen years has

not been ratified and the deputies of the ministers of the interiors of the GCC states have been asked to reformulate the agreement in an acceptable format. The ministers of finance put their proposals to the summit but little result came out; only a call to expedite the economic cooperation and integration among the GCC states, and another to facilitate the inter-Gulf trade. No common passport was approved neither the possibility of allowing the personal ID to replace the national passport in inter-Gulf movement.

The issue of Iraq again surfaced strongly in Riyadh and the call came out to the international community to tighten the grip on Iraq until it has ratified the border demarcation agreement which was recently completed along the lines of the UN resolution 833. The issue of the Kuwaiti POWs in Iraq was briefly mentioned and their release was made a condition for removing any sanctions being applied on Iraq. Perhaps more interestingly, is the fact that Iran has again been mentioned along similar lines with Iraq. The dispute between Iran and the United Arab Emirates about the three islands has become a landmark in the Iran-Gulf relations. Although the emphasis is on a peaceful solution, the UAE president, Zayed bin Sultan, is taking a tough line with Iran. At the same time he is extending his hands to the Iraqi president. It seems this new Gulf policy which equates Iraq and Iran is in response to the US principle which is based on the "dual containment" of both Iraq and Iran.

It is a fact that the GCC has outlived other regional alliances, such as the Arab Cooperation Council, the Maghrib Union, and even the Arab League. This regional grouping has managed to present a unified front through the times of crisis. But it is now showing signs of ageing. Cracks have appeared visibly in the last three years, and it is no secret now that the Saudis are struggling to preserve whatever credibility is left in the alliance. Riyadh knows that one of its strong attributes is her domination of the Gulf region, but her failure to improve her image as a modern state with a reasonable degree of freedom and democracy is becoming an embarrassment. It could be said that the Saudi monarchy has become imprisoned in its own system, and it is unlikely that the situation will improve unless the Gulf states behave in a civilised, progressive and open way. Political participation is the way to achieve this. Whether the present regimes are equipped sufficiently to achieve this is doubtful, but what is certain is that the next few years will be crucial in determining whether totalitarian regimes such as those in the Gulf will be tolerated in the modern world.

## International Commission of Jurists: Judges and Lawyers Are Persecuted in Bahrain

In its annual report "Attacks on Justice" detailing the harassment and persecution of judges and lawyers between June 1992 and June 1993, the Geneva-based International Commission of Jurists included Bahrain for the first time. Pages 38 to 41 covered Bahrain as follows:

Arbitrary arrest and incommunicado detention remain a problem in Bahrain. Provisions of the State Security Act of 1974 governing detention lend themselves to such abuses; according to the Act, persons accused of subversive or anti-government activities can be detained without trial for renewable periods of up to three years. Detainees can only appeal their detention after three months and then every six months thereafter, although there is no legal mandate that detainees even be informed of this right and in fact it is rarely availed. Article 1 of the Act permits detention if there is evidence

"that a person had made statements.. or contacts which are damaging to the.. security of the country, or to the country's religious or national interests, or to its fundamental structure.. or amount to discord, which affects or could affect, relations between the people and the government, or between the various institutions of the state.. or which aim to assist in the commission of acts of sabotage or harmful propaganda, or the dissemination of heretical principle". The Act is used by security forces as a source of intimidation of views and actions of which it disapproves is the use of sanctions against individuals in the form of passport denials, deportation or denial of entry into the country upon return from travelling abroad. Victims of forcible exile are frequently not given reasons for their deportation or an opportunity to challenge the legal bases for it in the courts. During 1992, the Emir issued two limited amnesties allowing for the return of some deportees; however, there are reportedly hundreds of deportees and others forced to stay abroad despite provisions of Article 17 of the Bahraini Constitutions declaring deportation or denial of entry into the country prohibited. Even when citizens are permitted entry, they are often subject to re-deportation. It is estimated that nearly 110 citizens were re-deported last year. The Bahraini Legal

Profession Statute, governing lawyers in matters ranging from qualifications to discipline, does not secure the right of lawyers to freedom of expression on legal matters. Additionally, Law 21 of 1989, the Law of Societies, at Article 18, prohibits any society from involvement in "politics or financial speculation." This provision effectively prevents members of the Bahraini Bar Society from taking part in public discussions on human rights matters; commentary on issues of human rights generally seems to fall under the definition of "political activities." If the Bar Society seeks to hold a public assembly, it must first submit names of speakers and subjects in advance for approval or disapproval. This provision appears to discourage the Society from attempting public discourse on issues related to human rights.

The Law of Societies also places the Bar Society under the control of the government by permitting the government full access to its records and funding sources. Lawyers are appointed to the Bar by the Minister of Justice; this Ministry is presided over by the ruling family. An advocate's job is difficult, too, because of unfair trial and court procedures that contravene international standards. Lawyer-client confidentiality is not well respected, and lawyers are routinely denied access to files needed to prepare client cases. A lawyer's role is further frustrated by the admissibility of forced confessions in court, a corollary of widespread practices of torture in detention. The history of the profession in recent years is replete with instances of lawyers subjected to harassment and arbitrary treatment at the hands of the Bahraini Government.

Sheikh Abdul Emir al-Jamri: Judge. Al-Jamri, despite legal restraints on the removal of judges, was suspended several years ago from his duties as a judge of the Religious Court, a part of the Ministry of Justice, due to his vocal opposition to the implementation and enforcement of the State Security Act and the suspension of the National Assembly. In November of 1992, al-Jamri, along with five others, including Dr. Abdul Latif al-Mahmood (see below), sponsored a petition signed by hundreds of

Bahraini notables calling for the restoration of the National Assembly and the Constitution in Bahrain as well as for the release of political prisoners and the return of exiles. Instead, the Emir appointed a thirty member Consultative Council lacking the legislative powers of the National Assembly, with advisory powers only and with members appointed rather than elected by the people. Sheikh al-Jamri was invited twice in March to speak in Manama mosques to present his political views at two seminars; each time, he was harassed by security forces and threatened with arrest. On 27 March 1993, he was threatened with deportation because of his affiliation with al-Mahmoud and because of his own speeches critical of the regime. He has also undergone interrogation at the Ministry of the Interior.

† Jassim Issa Khalid: Lawyer. He was among those denied entry into Bahrain this past year (see above).

† Sheikh Abdul Latif al-Mahmoud: Law professor. His passport was withdrawn from him, and he was suspended from his university position. These measures were taken subsequent to his release from detention. He had been detained upon his return from a conference in Kuwait, at which critical views were expressed of the Gulf Cooperation Council. His religious activities have also been restricted. In November of 1992, al-Mahmoud served as one of six sponsors of a petition calling for restoration of the constitution and the dissolved Parliament. Reports indicate that the Government of Bahrain has since kept close track of his personal contacts with other activists and has sought to curb them (see above).

Ahmed al-Shamlan: Lawyer, He has had his passport confiscated in addition to having his writings banned from appearing in the country's press. This action was taken against him after his return from a seminar in the United Arab Emirates where he spoke on the need for greater human rights protection in the Gulf states. He was informed that he would lose his passport at a meeting with the Bahraini Minister of the Interior, who summoned him when he returned from the seminar.

### Human Rights Monthly Monitor

1. On 16 December, it was announced that several prisoners were released. These were some of those sentenced for fifteen years imprisonment in 1981 and have by now completed most of the sentence periods. The released are: Ali Hasan Awadh (Bilad-al-Qadeem), Anwar Abdul Aziz (Duraz), Jaafar Abdulla Hasan (Bani Jamra), Mohannad Hasan Makki (Demestan), Ibrahim Rajab (Demestan), Abdul Redha Mansoor Abdulla (Bilad-al-Qadeem), Baqir Mohsin Makki (Aali) and Mostafa Mohammed Hasan (Kuwait). The Kuwaiti national was deported to Kuwait directly after his release.

This gesture falls short of what the Bahraini people expect. For one, all political prisoners were ill-treated, tortured and some killed, to extract confessions for admission in courts presided by members of the ruling family. Not a single political prisoner received a fair trial in the history of Bahrain. There are now 22 polit-

ical prisoners in Jaw Prison No. 1 and ten political prisoners in Jaw Prison No. 2, a total of 32 people.

2. In the last week of September, the security forces detained Mr Ali Saleh Al-Jallawi. The latter participated in a public gathering in Mo'min Mosque (Manama). On 26 September, he disappeared with the dawn raiders. His family could only see him for one hour after two months detention. Neither the detained nor the family knew any charges. A lawyer was appointed by the family. The lawyer was unable to extract any information from any official as to the fate of Al-Jallawi. It is worth noting that Al-Jallawi was arrested together with Seyyid Dhia Al-Mousawi. Al-Mousawi was released on the National Day (without charges), while Al-Jallawi awaits an unknown future.

3. On 30 December 1993, one of the people in charge of "Ma'tam Hajji Abbas" (a religious gathering place) was summoned by the Interior Ministry for interrogation. After several hours of

questioning, he was ordered to inform other members of the committee responsible for running the place, that the authorities is imposing a ban on any celebration or gathering for what ever the reason may be. Any activity must be submitted to the Interior Ministry for prior approval.

4. On the same day, a group of Special Branch officers raided a small mosque in Manama (Masjid Bin Dhaif). The gathered people were interrogated on the spot. The interrogation officer, a Yemeni by the name Moqbil, ordered the closure of the mosque directly after completing the prayers!

5. The Bahrain Embassy in London held a reception on Wednesday, December 15, to celebrate the "National Day". The guests started arriving at the Dorchester to witness a group of Baharini families: men, women and children, raising banners calling for an end to their exile. These families have sought refuge in the UK after being refused entry to their country.

## Amnesty International Forcible Exile Contravenes International Conventions



On Bahrain's National Day, 16 December 1993, Amnesty International issued its first major statement on forcible exile of Bahraini nationals by their government. The following is the text of that statement:

### BAHRAIN:

Banned from Bahrain: forcible exile of Bahraini nationals

#### 1. BACKGROUND

Amnesty International opposes forcible exile when it is imposed as a formal measure by governments against nationals of their own country.

Amnesty International has received countless reports of the forcible exile of Bahraini nationals from Bahrain since the early 1980s. At that time, in the wake of an alleged coup attempt, members of the majority Shi'a community suspected of having links with Iran were forcibly expelled to Iran. Former political detainees and even entire families have testified that they were rounded up, stripped of their Bahraini passports or identity papers and forced to board small boats bound for Iran, even though they had no knowledge of that country or its language. Sometimes, those expelled were even supplied by the Bahraini authorities with false documents stating that they were born in Iran and were Iranian citizens.

In one harrowing case, the wife of a political prisoner described to Amnesty International how she had resisted forcible exile with other members of her family, including her 11-month-old child. Although she was eight months pregnant, she was forced to board a fishing craft together with more than 20 other families and former political prisoners, their hands still handcuffed. All were told to surrender Bahraini passports and birth certificates and were given new documents stating that they were born in Iran. She gave birth shortly after the four-day crossing to Iran.

Following the dissolution of Bahrain's short-lived parliament in 1975, and in the early 1980s, a number of Bahraini nationals decided to leave the country. Some were escaping to avoid imprisonment and torture, while others who were relatives of political prisoners fled the country to avoid other forms of harassment. Some left the country to study or work abroad. A number of them then engaged in political opposition activities from Iran, Syria and former Eastern bloc countries, for organizations such as the Islamic Front for the Liberation of Bahrain, the Bahrain Liberation Front and the Popular Front of Bahrain. (Their are no legal political parties in Bahrain.)

In recent years, however, with some improvements in the human rights situation in Bahrain, and the changing political climate, many Bahraini nationals have attempted to return to their country after years of voluntary exile outside the country. Those who have tried to return include the wives and families of a number of political prisoners who had originally fled the country to escape harassment. Many were held for days or even up to a week at Bahrain's international airport upon their return, before being forcibly expelled from Bahrain. A number of these families have now

been permitted to return, but usually after more than one unsuccessful attempt.

Throughout 1993 returning Bahraini nationals have been questioned on arrival at the airport about their past political activities or publications they have written, before being returned to the country of their former residence on the first available flight. No reasons are given. They are given no opportunity to challenge the decision to expel them, or even to know the grounds for the measures being taken. They are denied any opportunity to appeal against the decision to expel them, or to challenge its legality through the courts. Those who return to Bahrain after long periods abroad are often issued with new Bahraini passports - valid for one year only - before being expelled from the country. In some cases, the passports are valid only for two or three countries, such as Syria, the United Arab Emirates or Saudi Arabia. These passports appear to be issued solely for the purpose of facilitating their expulsion from Bahrain and entry to another country.

#### 2. THE VICTIMS

Among the scores of Bahraini nationals attempting to return to Bahrain in 1993 was Dr 'Abd al-'Aziz Rashid al-Rashid, a medical doctor, who has been the subject of repeated measures to forcible exile him from Bahrain. His first unsuccessful attempt to return to his country was on 6 October 1991, when he was held and interrogated for four days before his expulsion. He subsequently returned to Bahrain on 12 November 1993 and was expelled the following day to Syria via Kuwait. On his arrival in Kuwait, however, the authorities refused to allow him entry as he had no valid travel documents - his Bahraini passport had expired - and returned him to Bahrain the same day, 13 November. At Bahrain's international airport Dr al-Rashid was refused entry once again, and expelled to Syria. The Syrian authorities also refused him entry and returned him to Bahrain, apparently on 14 November. He remained confined at the airport until 18 November, when he was again expelled to Syria. On 19 November Dr al-Rashid was once more returned to Bahrain. He remained at the international airport for a further 24 hours where he was issued with a new Bahraini passport, valid for one year, before being put on a flight to the United Arab Emirates on 20 November.

Ahmed Hussein Akbar 'Abbas was forcibly exiled from Bahrain in 1982 when he was stripped of his Bahraini papers and forcibly expelled to Iran. On his return to Bahrain in September 1993 with his Lebanese wife and four children he was reportedly interrogated and beaten being forcibly expelled to Lebanon, where he was also refused entry and sent back to Bahrain. He was sent once again to Lebanon where he was given temporary residence.

Al-Sayyid Hashem al-Moussawi, a former political prisoner tried in 1988, was forcibly exiled to Syria on completion of his five-year sentence in April 1993. On his release he was taken to the airport, where he was reportedly issued with a new Bahraini passport valid for one year.

Badr 'Abd al-Malik Mohammed, a writer

resident in Cyprus for several years, returned to Bahrain on 9 August 1993. He was returned to Cyprus the following day, after questioning and having been given a new one-year passport. Badr 'Abd al-Malik had been imprisoned in Bahrain on a number of occasions in the 1960s and 1970s on account of his political beliefs and activities, and was reportedly subject to forcible exile from Bahrain for one year in 1969.

So far as Amnesty International is aware, none of the people involved had voluntarily given up their Bahraini citizenship and acquired a new nationality.

#### 3. THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE

Amnesty International has repeatedly raised its concerns regarding the practice of forcible exile with the competent authorities in Bahrain, but although some individuals have been allowed to return and settle in their country again, often after more than one attempt, many more continue to be denied that right.

The Government has responded to some of Amnesty International's communications regarding victims of forcible exile, stating that those who returned to Bahrain were not in possession of valid travel documents and were therefore forbidden entry "in accordance with normal international practice". However, this fails to take into account that states are obliged to re-admit their own nationals. The fact that the Bahraini authorities routinely issue new Bahraini passports to those returning with expired or invalid passports demonstrated beyond doubt that the nationality of the individuals attempting to return is not in question. In practice, the passports appear to be issued with the sole purpose of facilitating their forcible exile.

The Government's response also fails to take into consideration that many Bahraini nationals failed to renew their passports while abroad either because they were required to return to Bahrain at a time when they felt they would be at risk of arrest, torture and imprisonment or other forms of harassment, or because the Bahrain Embassy to which they had forwarded the passport for renewal refused either to return or renew their passport.

Forcible exile contravenes international human rights standards, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All UN member states are obliged to implement the Declaration's guarantees, which provide that:

Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. (Article 13 (2))

The practice of forcible exile is also expressly proscribed under Article 17 (c) of Bahrain's own Constitution, which provides that it is forbidden to expel Bahraini citizens from the country or prevent them from returning to Bahrain. Amnesty International is calling on the Government of Bahrain to respect these provisions and issue a public declaration that all Bahraini nationals are entitled to return to Bahrain.

## Henderson: Tortured the Mau Mau Activists Before the Bahrainis

# The Kenyan Connection

A lot has been said about Ian Henderson. His name has symbolised repression and atrocities since his appointment as Bahrain's intelligence chief in 1966. He remains a mysterious individual, though, Bahrain's opposition consider him, more or less, enemy number 1. Bahrainis know that Henderson was engaged in suppressing the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya, that he was expelled from there in 1964 after Kenya's independence and that Britain installed him as head of Bahrain's intelligence after quelling the workers and students uprising of 1965.

More about Henderson's personality has been highlighted by the newly published book "Mau Mau and Kenya" by Wunyabari O. Maloba (Indiana University Press, 1993, ISBN 0-253-33664-3). Maloba explains the background to the Mau Mau revolt starting from the period before British colonial rule when the Kikuyu people were involved in a southward expansion owning and utilising the land. British settlers started occupying land starting from 1900 after building the Uganda railway. The latter represented Britain's commitment to securing a firm foothold in East African including the part that became to be called Kenya after 1920. Because Kenya and Uganda lacked minerals, the railway could be profitable only if it stimulated agricultural production. To this end the British (then controlling Kenya as protectorate) considered encouraging the Indians (then under the British rule) to colonize the land. Another British proposal was put to the Jews to migrate to Kenya and establish a Jewish state. However, the Zionist Congress voted to reject the proposal. The latter came after resistance from white settlers who argued that only Christians, and not Jews, were ideally suited to bring the benefits of Western civilization to Africans.

Africans would in the circumstances have to be controlled and disciplined. In the years ahead, up to 1923 and beyond, the white settlers agitated for self-rule in one form or another, and especially for severe legislation in dealing with Africans, such as the "Land Alienation Act" and "Land Ordinance" leasing the land to settlers for 99 and 999 years consequently. Land scarcity in Kikuyuland inevitably led to over-utilization of land, which aggravated the agricultural and economic problems. An emotional issue around which many African protests revolved was competition intensity for land possession and utilization. The development of African nationalism up to 1939 was a series of protests against colonial policies. Many of those who protested and formed protest organizations were aware of the physical power of the state. Their objectives remained, therefore, modest requests for reform within the colonial system.

Chapter 3 of Maloba book is titled "Years of Collision", and it is from here onwards, Ian Henderson is mentioned in relation to suppression of the uprising. Henderson even wrote a book about his adventures titled "Man Hunt in Kenya" (published in New York: Doubleday, 1958). Maloba referred to Henderson's book which he found to emphasize Henderson's side of the story than provide a reflection of the facts.

In 1950, an important meeting of the influential Kenyan African Union (KAU) and trade union leaders recognised the immense potential for an oath as an instrument for achieving unity and concerted action. In 1952, it was decided to expand oath-taking campaign to as many people as possible to create a mass organisation. In his capacity as intelligence officer, Henderson embarked on recruiting Africans as informers. KAU found a member of the central committee to be a spy. The taxi driver, J. N. Mungai, who had been transporting KAU leaders confessed that: from 1944, he was helping Ian Henderson of CID with information to him concerning KAU leaders, which led to the arrest and deportation of Markham Singh. Henderson gave this spy Shs. 100 in order to meet Mau Mau oath fee. Some 400 Africans were arrested by Henderson group with the help of African informers.

During 1952, African nationalist movement acquired a lot of ammunition and the first groups of fighters were despatched to Aberdare Mountains and to Mount Kenya. Waruhiu Itote, known as General China, went to Mount Kenya. Since 1953, there was a noticeable expansion of the Special Branch under the direction of British intelligence officials. Perpetual harassment and infiltration by trained spies and informers weakened the Mau Mau adherents. Then there were the dreaded screening teams (Hooded African informers) who parade randomly arrested Africans and point out Mau Mau activists. However, the turning point for Britain was the arrest in January 1954 of General China.

General China was interrogated by Ian Henderson for 68 hours. Henderson was born in Kenya and spoke Kikuyu language fluently. China broke down and gave Henderson detailed insight into Mau Mau organisation. Henderson managed to convince General China to arrange for peace talks between the government and the forces which used to be under China's command. This attempt failed to cause the mass surrender sought by Henderson. During the lull (3 months) Henderson's group gathered more information and arrested more than a thousand in Nairobi (Mau Mau reserves) in three days.

After 1955, the most effective method used by the government against Mau Mau was the "pseudo-gangs" composed of ex-African guerrillas, again under the supervision of Henderson. These were sent to the forest (without white supervision) and managed to kill their former comrades. These were released from capital punishment in return for going back against their people. Mau Mau casualties increased considerably in 1955, when two thousand guerrillas were still active in the mountains. The policy of food denial was tightened by requiring that cattle be kept in guarded enclosures during the night and prohibiting the peasant cultivation of food crops within three miles of the forest. Shortage of ammunition and lack of food considerably reduced the fighting capacity of the guerrillas, who were now hunted down deep in the forest. By 1956, British forces stated that

11,503 Mau Mau guerrillas were killed, 1,035 wounded, 1,550 captured in action, 26,625 arrested and 2,714 surrendered. Only 63 white were killed. Five hundred guerrillas remained fighting under Dedan Kimathi. Henderson made it known that the pressure will not be relaxed until the capture of Kimathi. On 21 October 1956, Henderson captured Kimathi and the British offensive came to an end.

Not surprising that when Kenya gained its independence, the then (October 1964) Kenyan Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. Oginga Odinga, declared Mr. Ian Henderson (with four other British security officers) as illegal immigrants and ordered them to leave Kenya within 24 hours. Soon afterwards, Britain (then controlling Bahrain) despatched Henderson in 1966 to restructure the intelligence network following the uprising of 1965 (in Bahrain). Henderson lost no time in implementing his skills and expertise to suppress Bahrainis. All interrogation methods used to break down General China and other Mau Mau leaders were used. There is very close comparison to the methods used in interrogation and suppression, such as letting the imprisoned believe that security forces know every thing, the extensive use of African informers by threatening them with long term jails or execution if they didn't cooperate, calling for peace with senior figures while arresting followers, use of screening teams and pseudo-gangs. (refer to Voice of Bahrain, May 1993, Issue No. 17 for more information on Henderson).

## PM: AGAINST NATIONAL DAY?

The Prime Minister, Sheikh Khalifa bin Salman Al-Khalifa has been spending his annual holiday in London. He met Douglas Hogg of the British Office. It is not known whether Mr Hogg bothered to bring to the attention of Bahrain's PM the concern of the exiled families or the increasing violation of human rights by British citizens in Bahrain.

It is worth mentioning that the PM has been spending all his annual holidays in London while the "National Day" is being celebrated with high profile. The story goes back to 1981, when a quarrel erupted between the PM and his brother, the Amir, on the issue of who would rule in case the Amir died or abdicated. The PM wanted to be the heir apparent or at least makes sure that his son becomes prime minister in case Hamad (son of the Amir) is declared Amir. The problem was worsened by the fact that the Amir had to leave for a short period during December to attend the GCC summits. This arrangement started to surface in 1981. If the Amir leaves the country, the heir apparent takes over. Hence, Khalifa leaves the country during the high-profile celebrations to avoid having Hamad as his boss while the Amir is attending the GCC summit. An exception to this is December 1990, when the Amir was off-sick and Khalifa headed Bahrain's delegation to the GCC summit in Qatar.