

September 1, 1991

URUGUAY

JUDICIARY BARS STEPS TO IDENTIFY CHILD KIDNAPPED DURING MILITARY REGIME

On May 22, 1991, an Uruguayan Civil Appeals Court, in a cynical "Catch 22" ruling, prohibited a formerly "disappeared" mother from taking steps to identify her lost child.¹ The boy, Simón Antonio Riqueló, was taken from his mother, Sara Méndez Lompodio, at the age of 20 days by Uruguayan and Argentine military officers when they kidnapped her in Buenos Aires in July 1976. Like many Uruguayans, Sara Méndez had fled to the relative safety of the Argentine capital when the military overthrew the civilian government in Uruguay in 1973. In 1987, two years after civilian rule was restored in Uruguay, Sara Méndez and Mauricio Gatti, Simón's father, found a boy in Montevideo whom they believed to be Simón. The boy had been adopted by a relative of the military officer in charge of Sara Méndez's kidnapping.

After two years of court battles, the May 1991 ruling precluded as "premature" a blood test to identify the boy, arguing that such a test should occur in the course of a judicial investigation resulting from the plaintiff's demand for nullification of the adoption. Ironically, a criminal court in which Méndez and Gatti had charged the adoptive parents with illegally retaining the boy had already barred blood tests. The criminal court had ruled that the case fell under a 1986 amnesty law for human rights violations committed during the 12 years of military rule and held that such tests could only take place in civil court.

On Monday, September 2, 1991, Méndez will seek a final resolution of the case by presenting a request for nullification of the boy's adoption in a civil court.

Simón's case has become a symbol in Uruguay of the lack of impartiality of the judicial system in the post-dictatorship era in matters concerning crimes committed during the past regime. The executive branch, obliged under the 1986 amnesty law to continue investigations into kidnappings of minors which occurred during the military regime, has also ignored its duty. The case has gained significance in Uruguay because it is virtually the last human rights case in the courts. Victims of abuses and their relatives see the case as the last chance for moral "reparation," or recognition by society of the suffering they have endured.²

¹ Civil courts in Uruguay handle cases concerning the resolution of family, commercial, and other disputes between private parties, including the recovery of damages. Criminal courts have jurisdiction over criminal offenses.

² The Uruguayan Service for Social Rehabilitation (SERSOC), which has assisted over 3,000 victims of human rights

violations, emphasizes in its report *Proyecto General del Servicio de Rehabilitación Social; SERSOC - Uruguay 1991-1992* the importance of "social reparation" in helping those who suffer mental or physical illness as a result of human rights abuses to recuperate from their experiences and reintegrate themselves into society. SERSOC reports that requests for psychiatric assistance have risen sharply in the last year. SERSOC psychologist María del Rosario Arregui, in an interview with Americas Watch, attributed this phenomenon to victims' sense of abandonment as a result of the amnesty law and declining public interest in past violations.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN URUGUAY

Since the restoration of democracy in March 1985, Uruguayan society has wrestled fitfully with the issue of accountability for crimes committed by security forces during the 12 years of military rule. This process has proceeded in three distinct stages.

The first stage involved negotiations between politicians and the military rulers resulting in the so-called Naval Club Pact in which the terms for the transition to democracy were established. Although details of the pact were never made public, it is widely believed that the Armed Forces insisted on retaining considerable power, and extracted a promise from representatives of the Colorado, Broad Front, and Civic Union parties that the executive branch itself would not promote prosecution of the security forces for human rights abuses. Julio María Sanguinetti of the Colorado Party won the elections and kept the promise.

The second stage was the December 1986 passage by the Parliament of Law 15.848, the Law Nullifying the State's Claim to Punish Certain Crimes (*Ley de Caducidad de la Pretensión Punitiva del Estado*). Following the military's refusal to appear before civilian courts in cases initiated by victims of human rights violations, the new law terminated the state's power to prosecute and punish military and police officers responsible for human rights violations during the period of military rule.³

A third period which followed was internationally unprecedented. Human rights advocates led a campaign to gather the signatures of twenty-five percent of the electorate on petitions demanding a referendum on the Ley de Caducidad. The petitions were submitted in December 1987, a year after the law was approved. The government sought to derail the initiative, arguing that repeal of the Ley de Caducidad could prompt the military to seek to return to power in order to avoid human rights trials. Despite these scare tactics and a blatant campaign by the Electoral Court to eliminate enough signatures on technical grounds to call it off, the referendum finally was held on April 16, 1988. The day before the vote, the National Pro-Referendum Commission (NPRC) planned a publicity spot on television in which Sara Méndez spoke of her search for Simón. The government censored its airing, forcing NPRC activists to set up private television sets on street corners around Montevideo to air the video. Although the amnesty was upheld by 58% of the voters nationwide, in Montevideo over 60% rejected it. Given the fact that most observers doubted that the NPRC would be able to obtain the needed signatures, the results were testimony to the extraordinary grassroots network organized over the issue of accountability for human rights abuses.

In the post-referendum period, Simón's case has taken on additional significance as virtually the last human rights case from the dictatorship being battled in the Uruguayan courts.⁴

³ See Americas Watch, *Challenging Impunity; The Ley de Caducidad and the Referendum Campaign in Uruguay*, March 1989. Prior to the Ley de Caducidad, a Law of National Pacification facilitated the release of 800 political prisoners in March 1985, but expressly excluded from the amnesty military and police officers responsible for abuses. Later that year, President Sanguinetti introduced two draft amnesty laws for the military which were rejected by Parliament. Because a defeated measure cannot be reconsidered during the same session under Uruguayan law, the Ley de Caducidad simply omitted any mention of the word "amnesty."

⁴ Almost all of the cases involving the reparation of damages for victims of the past regime were recently resolved. The government had offered the plaintiffs in the 16 cases of this kind \$2.5 million to drop their charges. All the plaintiffs accepted the offer except for two Uruguayans who were kidnapped in Brazil. Lilian Celiberti and Universindo Rodríguez were kidnapped by Brazilian and Uruguayan security forces in Puerto Alegre in November 1978. A Brazilian court recognized their right to recover damages for the five years they spent in Uruguayan jails and convicted four members of the Brazilian police force of the kidnapping. They are awaiting a ruling in the case from the Uruguayan court.

THE STORY OF SIMON

Sara Méndez and her companion, Mauricio Gatti, fled Uruguay in 1973 following the military coup. One hundred and thirty-one Uruguayans disappeared and several more were assassinated in Argentina between 1974 and 1982. Because Méndez had been under surveillance, when her son was born on June 22, 1976, she did not give him either of his parents' names but registered him as Simón Antonio Riqueló.

On July 13, 1976, Méndez was kidnapped in Buenos Aires by Argentine and Uruguayan security forces who worked together on a team known as the "Fuerza Conjunta." Simón became one of the 215 children who were either kidnapped with their parents and disappeared in Argentina or who are believed to have been born in captivity.⁵ Méndez's testimony, as well as that of another Uruguayan, Enrique Rodríguez Larreta, before the Argentine Appellate Court in 1987 contributed to the conviction of former Argentine dictator, retired General Jorge Rafael Videla.

The following are excerpts from the testimony Méndez presented in June 1989 to a criminal court in Uruguay:

...It is between 11:00 and 12:00 p.m. on July 13, [1976]. I am at this moment in the home of a companion with whom I was living, Acilú Maceiro. The father of my son, Mauricio Gatti, has gone out and told me that he will not return until quite late. We hear loud banging on the front door...To enter they break windows and open the door with a key left on the inside of the door...Approximately 15 plainclothesmen armed with rifles distribute themselves on the two floors of the house and it is clear immediately who is in charge...The torture begins...The person giving orders asks me if I recognize him. I do not answer and he tells me he is Major Nino Gavazzo of the Uruguayan Armed Forces...When they are about to take us away, I react trying to take my

⁵ As a result of the extraordinary search undertaken by the Argentine organization of grandmothers of disappeared children, the *Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo*, fifty of these children have been located. Twenty-five were returned to their natural families by the Argentine courts or through private agreements. Thirteen remain with their adoptive families by agreement, seven were assassinated, and five cases are still being disputed in Argentine courts. Twelve of the children listed as disappeared in Argentina are Uruguayan. Eight were kidnapped with their parents, three of whom were returned to their families some time later. Four were believed to have been born in captivity, of which only one was later recovered.

son with me. They tell me I cannot take him, that nothing is going to happen to the child, that "this war is not against children," and they take him from my arms. They prepare to transport us. This is the last time I see Simón.

We are taken to a place later recognized as Automotores Orletti, with a large group that has been kidnapped...After around 10 days in Orletti, I am transported clandestinely to Uruguay together with approximately 20 more Uruguayans. I continue to be a prisoner in clandestine jails run by the armed forces, which later are recognized as centers of detention for other political prisoners. During the almost four months of detention in these conditions, we are permitted for a few hours at a time to go without blindfolds. That is how I meet the military officer known as "Number 301," Major José Nino Gavazzo's superior, who visits us on several occasions in both jails. During the period of detention I repeatedly question them on the whereabouts of my son, but I never receive an answer. I should mention that the officer called "301" appeared in the house on the beach Shangrila, where we had been taken in order to carry out a false detention of a group of prisoners, of which I was one. At this time, I and Elba Rama [another prisoner] had a long conversation with "301"; we were not blindfolded since we had been transferred in the early hours of the morning, so that neighbors would not be able to watch. Before being transferred to Punta Rieles [the women's penitentiary], just as with the others, soldiers went to our families' homes in Montevideo to ask for bedclothes to take to the jail. At this time I ask the officer that is going to go to my house to ask my family if Simón is with them. When they return, they tell me that my family responded that they had no information on the whereabouts of the boy. A few hours later I have a meeting with Major Gavazzo and officer "301." I am not blindfolded. They tell me that possibly my family did not dare say anything about Simón because they may have had to bring him illegally into the country. But they assure me that if Simón had not been found they would let me know when they come to visit me in the penitentiary. They say they will look for him, and Gavazzo says the "officer," referring to "301," will personally get in touch with Buenos Aires to check the situation. They ask me to give them the information on my date of detention, et cetera, and assure me that Gavazzo himself will get the information to me within a week.

During my four and a half years in prison, my requests for a meeting with Major Gavazzo were never answered and only as a result of the testimony of soldier Barboza did I learn the name of officer "301." His name is Juan Antonio Rodríguez Buratti and he is a colonel⁶... Some time later I was able to obtain a photograph of Colonel Juan Antonio Rodríguez Buratti, and I can state with certainty that I recognize him as officer "301."⁷

Following her release in 1981, Méndez contacted the Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo and, with their assistance, undertook a ceaseless search for Simón, first in Argentina, and later in Uruguay. Democracy returned to Uruguay in 1985, but it was not until 1987 that Méndez found the boy she believes to be Simón.

Méndez and Gatti, who escaped to Europe after Méndez's kidnapping and did not return to Uruguay until the end of the military government, were informed in December 1986 that a boy the same age as Simón and physically similar to her baby had been adopted by a couple in Montevideo approximately a

⁶ Former soldier Julio César Barboza testified before the Uruguayan judiciary that Rodríguez, a lieutenant colonel known as "301", was the chief of Department No. 3, which was in charge of kidnappings in Argentina. (Before retirement, Rodríguez was promoted to colonel.)

⁷ Méndez not only recognized Rodríguez as officer "301" herself, but was later able to offer the court seven former prisoners of clandestine jails who also recognized his photograph.

month after the kidnapping in Buenos Aires. His name was Carlos Gerardo Vázquez. They were also told that at the time of the Buenos Aires kidnapping the adoptive mother, Zully Mary Morales de Vázquez, was the first cousin of the woman married to Colonel Rodríguez Buratti. The source, whose identity has been kept secret by Méndez and Gatti, was revealed in *Brecha* in May of 1991 to have been a member of the Vázquez family, and in fact to have lived with the couple.

In September 1987, with the mediation of Robert Rosella, the principal of the school attended by the boy, Méndez and Gatti met with Zully Mary Morales de Vázquez and Juan Carlos Vázquez, the adoptive parents, to explain the situation to them. The couple told them that the baby was found in a basket in the street with a note saying, "Take good care of me, Alejandro." They also said that the information had been published in the press at the time. Méndez and Gatti then asked the couple to allow Gerardo to take the blood tests to establish whether or not the boy was Simón. The couple refused. The adoptive mother shouted at Méndez that she would never let her take her child away, and the dialogue ended abruptly.

THE CRIMINAL COURT TRIAL

On June 15, 1989, Méndez and Gatti, represented by the Uruguayan Institute for Social and Legal Studies (IELSUR) lawyer Alejandro Artucio, presented evidence before Judge Dardo Preza of Criminal Court Number Five. They requested that the crimes of "stealing or retaining a minor" (*sustracción o retención de un menor*) and "denial of civil status of a child born out of wedlock" (*supresión del estado civil de hijo natural*) be fully investigated, and they made a special request to the judge to order blood tests to confirm the identity of the child. They indicated that the boy had known for some time that he was adopted and, that as a result, the psychological impact of the tests on him would be greatly reduced.

The evidence presented was the following:

* Simón was born June 22, 1976; Carlos Gerardo was registered as having been born June 25, 1976.

* Physically, Gerardo has the same characteristics as those of Simón's parents and Simón at the time of his disappearance: blond, and light skinned.

* Colonel Juan Antonio Rodríguez Buratti was Colonel José Nino Gavazzo's superior in the group that kidnapped Méndez and took Simón from her. His ex-wife, Rosalia, is a first cousin of Zully Mary Morales de Vázquez, Gerardo's adoptive mother. Numerous witnesses can confirm the identity of Colonel Rodríguez and his participation in the kidnapping operation in Buenos Aires.

* The adoptive parents have provided contradictory versions of how and when they found the boy.

* The adoptive parents have refused to permit blood tests which would confirm, positively or negatively, whether Gerardo is Simón.⁸

Judge Preza launched an extensive investigation that provided further evidence that the boy could be Simón. However, after having requested the opinion of the state prosecutor, Miguel Langón Cuñarro, on the case in August 1989, Preza was promoted to another court, and a new judge, Tabaré Sosa, was

⁸ This test is routine in any paternity case, i.e. a single mother trying to force a man to take legal responsibility for his baby. Uruguayan civil courts often consider a refusal on the part of the suspected father to undergo tests to be a presumption of paternity.

appointed to Méndez and Gatti's case. In October a series of witnesses were called to testify in an attempt to clarify the manner in which the boy was adopted. The Vázquez couple informed the court that another couple had found the child and turned it over to the police, that the baby was taken to the Casa Cuna, a dependency of the government's Children's Council (since renamed the National Institute of Minors), and that a judge, aware of the couple's desire to adopt a child, called them and turned the boy over to them. When questioned on their relationship with Colonel Rodríguez Buratti, Mr. Vázquez admitted that the military officer frequented their home and confirmed the family relationship. The couple that claimed to have found the baby was called to testify and confirmed the testimony of the adoptive parents. Neighbors of the couple were also summoned. Some recalled the episode, but others, including some whose names appeared on a police document as witnesses, did not. The head of the Children's Council at the time of the adoption also testified that he had examined the baby and noted in a report at the time that the case was "unusual, because from the state of the child it appears that he had a family that cared for him well until he was abandoned."

Apparently the new judge, after examining the evidence, had reason to suspect the child was in fact Simón, since on November 16, she sent the results of the investigation to the executive branch to determine whether the case should be considered within the limits of the Ley de Caducidad and whether the executive branch had carried out an investigation of its own.⁹

On December 29, 1989, the executive branch responded in a document signed by President Julio María Sanguinetti and Defense Minister Hugo Medina. They claimed that the events reported in Méndez and Gatti's case fell into the category of crimes covered in Article 1 of the Ley de Caducidad and therefore, should not be pursued any further.¹⁰ They also argued that because the original crimes had taken place in Argentina, and were under investigation by a criminal court there, Uruguayan suspects would remain outside the jurisdiction of the Uruguayan penal system.

⁹ Article 4 of the Ley de Caducidad requires the executive to investigate the whereabouts of persons who disappeared during the past military regime.

¹⁰ The Ley de Caducidad reads as follows:

Article 1. It is recognized that, as a consequence of the logic of the events stemming from the agreement between the political parties and the Armed Forces signed in August 1984, and in order to complete the transition to a full constitutional order, the State relinquishes the exercise of penal actions with respect to crimes committed until March 1, 1985, by military and police officials either for political reasons or in fulfillment of their functions and in obeying orders from superiors during the *de facto* period.

Article 2. *The above article does not cover:*

- a) judicial proceedings in which indictments have been issued at the time this law goes into effect;
- b) *crimes that may have been committed for personal economic gain or to benefit a third party.* [emphasis added]

Article 3. For the purposes contemplated in the above articles, the court in pending cases will request the executive branch to submit, within a period of thirty days of receiving such request, an opinion as to whether or not it considers the case to fall within the scope of Article 1 of this law.

If the executive branch considers the law to be applicable, the court will dismiss the case. If, on the other hand, the executive branch does not consider the case to fall under this law, the court will order proceedings to continue.

From the time this law is promulgated until the date the court receives a response from the executive branch, all pretrial proceedings in cases described in the first paragraph of this article will be suspended.

Article 4. Notwithstanding the above, the court will remit to the executive branch all testimony offered until the date this law is approved, regarding persons allegedly detained in military or police operations who later disappeared, *including minors allegedly kidnapped under similar circumstances.*

The executive will immediately order the investigation of such incidents.

Within a 120-day period from the date of receipt of the judicial communication of the denunciation, the executive branch will inform the plaintiffs of the results of these investigations and place at their disposal all information gathered. [Unofficial translation, emphasis added]

Americas Watch has opposed the Ley de Caducidad as a violation of international covenants to which Uruguay is a party and as an evasion of the government's duty to hold accountable those who commit gross abuses of human rights.¹¹ This criticism notwithstanding, we believe the executive branch is wrong in applying the Ley de Caducidad in this case. (We further note that review of the case under the Ley de Caducidad appears to be an implicit admission that Gerardo is indeed Simón.) The Ley de Caducidad applies only to crimes committed by military and police forces. This investigation did not seek to prove the culpability of Colonel Rodríguez Buratti in the kidnapping of Simón and Méndez, but rather to settle the identity of Gerardo and to decide if any improprieties had occurred by civilians with respect to the adoption proceedings. At the same time, it could be argued that under Article 2(b) of the Ley de Caducidad, Colonel Rodríguez had committed a crime for the benefit of a third party which ought not to be covered by the amnesty. Further, during debate in Parliament preceding passage of the law, legislators in favor insisted that it would not be applied to the cases of disappeared children.

Lastly, Article 4 of the law obliges the executive to continue investigations into the whereabouts of the disappeared and inform the relatives of the conclusions. The executive branch endowed this responsibility in the case of disappeared children to the National Institute for Minors, a dependency of the Ministry of Culture. Méndez and Gatti met with representatives of the institute in 1987, but say that the entity restricted its investigation to searching its records when required to do so by the court. No effort was made to establish the real identity of Gerardo, and Méndez has received no information from either the Colorado government or the new Blanco government.

In February 1990, Judge Sosa ruled that the investigation should be dropped (*archivado*). He separated the case into two parts, the first concerning the kidnapping in Buenos Aires and the second, the adoption of the boy in Montevideo. He applied the Ley de Caducidad to the first. On the matter of the adoption, he argued that on the one hand, Méndez and Gatti had not proven that they were the parents of Simón, and on the other, he had found no evidence of wrongdoing in the adoption proceedings. As a result, he asserted that there were no grounds upon which he could force the Vázquez couple to permit blood tests. Furthermore, insisting on the separation of the crimes under consideration, he believed that, even if blood tests were carried out and they proved that the boy was Simón, he would still consider the Vázquez couple innocent.

The artificial division of the crimes in the judge's ruling allows him to overlook the obvious criminal implications of a positive identification of Gerardo as Simón. Confirmation of the boy's identity would oblige the court to take a closer look at the circumstances of the adoption and the apparent cover-up. Implicated in that cover-up would be not only the Vázquez couple, but the couple that supposedly turned the baby over to the police, the police officials, and members of the Children's Council involved in the adoption in 1976.

The judge's investigation was incomplete and included no effort to confirm the identity of the child. Not only were blood tests avoided but a key witness, Colonel Rodríguez Buratti, was never questioned, despite the fact that his relationship with the adoptive family had been confirmed. Signs of a cover-up, such as the refusal of the Vázquez family to permit blood tests, were ignored. No significance was given to the fact that there was no police investigation into the origins of this abandoned baby, who a doctor described as unlike other abandoned babies. No steps were taken by the court to discover why the Vázquez couple had obtained the baby directly through the judge, rather than having to sign up and wait for an

¹¹ See June 4, 1987 letter to Uruguayan President Julio Sanguinetti from Aryeh Neier in Americas Watch, *Challenging Impunity*, p.63.

available child through the Children's Council as most couples do.

THE CIVIL COURT CASE

On May 25, 1990, IELSUR lawyer Alejandro Artucio took the case to civil court. He presented the evidence gathered in the criminal court investigation and requested blood tests to confirm the boy's identity. In June, Judge Susana Toscano ordered the blood tests as a "preliminary measure." The adoptive parents appealed the decision, and the judge, rejecting the grounds of the appeal, again ordered the tests. The Vázquez couple then filed a complaint before the Family Appeals Tribunal, which on "procedural grounds" was accepted, forcing the lower court to remit the case to the Tribunal.

In April 1991, the press published reports that the child had been interviewed by the Tribunal's three judges and expressed his desire not to have the blood tests done. If in fact the Tribunal's objection to Judge Toscano's ruling was, as they claimed, simply on procedural grounds, such an interview would seem to have been out of place.

On April 11th, Simón's father, Mauricio Gatti, died of a heart attack.

In May, Americas Watch requested in writing and by telephone a meeting with the Tribunal's president, Víctor Rodríguez de Vecchi. We obtained no response.

On May 22, 1991, the long awaited ruling was handed down, signed by the president of the Tribunal and its two other members, Eduardo Lombardo and Juan Carlos Allo Sarubo. The lower court's decision to order the blood tests was revoked on the grounds that it would constitute a premature measure (*prueba anticipada*). The test, the Tribunal asserted, should take place in the course of a court action that questions the legality of the adoption.

On September 2, 1991, Méndez plans to try again, presenting a request for nullification of the adoption in civil courts. Ironically, Méndez has expressed on innumerable occasions that her intention has never been to force Simón to leave the family in which he was reared. Yet the courts, in refusing to permit tests to confirm the boy's identity, have forced her to demand nullification of the adoption as the only means of discovering the truth.

AMERICAS WATCH'S CONCERNS

Americas Watch has a longstanding position with regard to the need for truth and justice following periods of massive human rights violations in all countries.¹² As such, Americas Watch views the family's right to know the truth as imperative. Recent international legislation has also expanded upon this right for children. In 1989, the United Nations approved the Convention on the Rights of Children, which in Article 8 of its text reads:

1. States Parties undertake to respect the right of the child to preserve his or her identity, including nationality, name and family relations as recognized by law without unlawful interference.
2. Where a child is illegally deprived of some or all of the elements of his or her identity, States Parties shall provide appropriate assistance and protection, with a view to speedily re-establishing his or her identity.

Of the three mothers known to have been kidnapped with their children in Argentina who have "reappeared" and undertaken a search for their missing children, only Méndez's efforts have been frustrated. The other two mothers, both Argentines, were able to locate and regain custody of their children in Argentina. Méndez and the boy she believes to be Simón live within a few miles of each other in Montevideo. However, 15 years after the crime was committed and four years after locating him, Méndez has been cut off at every attempt to confirm her suspicion that Gerardo Vázquez is her son.

This is the only case of a child who disappeared during the years of political repression in Uruguay and Argentina that the Uruguayan executive and judiciary have had to confront. Gerardo may or may not be Simón, but one thing is clear: the actions taken so far by both branches of government have only served to obfuscate the truth and perpetuate the injustice.

*For more information, contact Anne Manuel at (202) 371-6592
or Polly Pittman in Buenos Aires at (011-541) 259-1568.*

* * *

Americas Watch is a non-governmental organization that was established in 1981 to monitor and promote observance of free expression and other internationally recognized human rights practices in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Chair is Peter Bell; Vice-chairs, Stephen Kass and Marina Kaufman. Its Executive Director is Juan E. Méndez; Associate Directors, Cynthia Arnson and Anne Manuel; Director of San Salvador Office, David Holiday; Representative in Santiago, Cynthia Brown; Representative in Buenos Aires, Patricia Pittman; Research Associate, Mary Jane Camejo; Associates, Clifford C. Rohde and Patricia Sinay.

Americas Watch in part of Human Rights Watch, an organization that also consists of Africa Watch, Asia Watch, Helsinki Watch, and Middle East Watch. The Chair of Human Rights Watch is Robert L. Bernstein; Vice-Chair, Adrian DeWind. Aryeh Neier is Executive Director; Deputy Director, Kenneth Roth; Washington Director, Holly J. Burkhalter; California Director, Ellen Lutz.

¹² See "Human Rights Watch Special Issue: Accountability for Past Human Rights Abuses; An Overview of the Issue and Human Rights Watch Policy" No. 4, December 1989.