

SURVEILLANCE AND MONITORING OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Jose Quiroga, M.D., Maria V. Zunzunegui, Ph.D., Randy B. Reiter, Ph.D., and Ana Deutsch, M.A.

Introduction

Article I of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 established internationally for the first time the concept of equality: "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and right." Article II added "without distinction of any kind." The following twenty-eight articles established ideals and guidelines for interhuman behavior.

It was a difficult task to transfer this statement of principle into reality through treaty provisions. In 1976, three decades after the initial declaration, two international covenants and one optional protocol came into effect. One dealt with civil and political rights and another with economic, social and cultural rights. Most human rights organizations (HROs) and scholars divide human rights: 1) Political Rights, 2) Right to protection of life, security and integrity of the person, and 3) Social and economic rights.

Numerous national and international organizations have oriented their efforts to collect statistical information and measurements about social and economic rights, and a very large amount of data exists by countries on economic indicators, which include growth rate, domestic products, values of imports and exports, trade balance, food productions, distribution, and consumption, employment, wages and salaries, per capita income, purchasing power, education levels, and health information like morbidity and mortality rates, life expectancy, and so on.

Data on political rights and liberties are very incomplete, and those that exist lack comparability across countries. Several researchers and institutions regularly publish indicators and ratings of selected countries(4). Data on violations of the rights to protection of the security and integrity of the person are even more scarce, incomplete and lacking in uniformity across different countries. This is hardly surprising, since such information is collected at the local level under difficult conditions by human rights groups organized to protect or help victims of a repressive government.

The objective of this paper is to examine the use of a registry to collect human rights abuse information at the local level, along with the application of statistics to the quantitative reporting of violations of the right to protect the life, security and integrity of the person. Improving the validity and reliability of the data should contribute to the final goal of having it effectively disseminated and used in actions to eliminate the policies and practices of such abuses.

Limitations of Statistics Measuring Human Rights Violations

Measurements are used in science to indicate whether a given entity is present or absent or its amount. Using numbers, investigators can describe observations, interpret data, test hypothesis, make comparisons. However, the use of quantitative methods in the measurements of human rights violations has some limitations. The testimony of

of a victim of torture who was referred to our program of rehabilitation of victims of torture in Los Angeles, California, can help us to understand these limitations.

RC was a 53 years old merchant in a small city of El Salvador when he was detained with his younger son during a big military operations directed against his home. Immediately he was separated from his son, deprived of food, water, and sleep, and interrogated for five continuous days at the local police station. Later he was transferred with other political prisoners to the central police headquarters in the capital of El Salvador, where he remained for 62 days. His family did not know his whereabouts. He remained blindfolded, isolated from the other prisoners. He continued to be deprived of food, water and sleep, and was subjected to continuous threats to kill him, his son and other members of his family.

He was interrogated almost daily and severely tortured each time. He was frequently punched and kicked, and beaten all over his body with different types of instruments, such as wooden sticks and metallic bars. These beatings produced pains, ecchymosis and hematomas over his body. He was twice asphyxiated until he was unconscious, by use of a plastic bag with an irritant powder applied over his head and tied to his neck.

During the beatings, electric current was frequently applied all over his body and to his mucous membranes. On two occasions the electrode was inserted deep into his urethra. The electric current in this area produced severe pain which irradiated deep in his body to his head. Later voiding was very painful, with prolonged bleeding for several days. On other occasions the electrode was introduced into his rectum. This was also followed by severe pain throughout his body, and constipation and painful bowel movements.

Once a very hot hair dryer was applied over his head for a short time, causing a severe throbbing type of headache. Another time, his hands were tied behind his back and he was hanged until his feet were lifted off the floor. After a few minutes, the pain in his arms was impossible to bear, breathing became difficult and he fell unconscious. For several weeks his arms were completely disabled.

In his testimony, he considered his physical torture as minor compared to his psychological suffering when he was forced on five occasions to witness other political prisoners being tortured to death. The bodies of these victims, still alive and twisting with pain, were systematically mutilated. Their eyes were enucleated. The breasts of the women and the penis of the men were amputated. Iron bars were pushed deep into women's vaginas and big nails were hammered into their heads.

This summary is only a pale description, without any dramatic detail, of what we have heard during the several hours of taped testimony in our clinic. And this description was only a partial expression of the most dramatic moments fixed in the victim's memory of his 62 days of continuous suffering in that torture-interrogation

center.

This case will be counted as a single case of torture in a human rights organization report.

The incredible, inhuman cruelty of this experience cannot be adequately conveyed from the real experience, to the testimony of the victim, the transcription and summary of the case report, and finally to its transformation into a single case of torture in a frequency distribution. Thus, many people think that statistics are incompatible with human rights reporting, and that a single case of torture is as morally unacceptable as many cases. In the other extreme some investigators call for the development of complex indicators to assess human rights conditions by countries(5-9).

We firmly believe that a single such case of human rights violation is a unique experience of human suffering deserving universal condemnation. A number will never be adequately able to express its magnitude. Nor can any pattern of human rights violations shown by statistics be sufficient to capture the atmosphere of repression in which the people of that country live.

While each such case is irreducible in its importance, an individual case cannot establish a pattern or a policy, and of course such a case rarely if ever occur alone. Thus a testimony of torture is also one unit of a pattern of violations. Our obligation is to establish the existence of such a pattern, to publish and denounce them, locally if possible, and internationally as well, as a way to expose the perpetrators and prevent further abuses.

We agree with others (10) who think that a report on human rights violations must be a detailed description of the events and the statistics must be given in the annex. We are interested in simple measurements such as frequency distributions, mean, range, percentages, and when the population at risk is known, incidence rates. Complex indexes or indicators that are difficult to interpret may ultimately be useful, but a this stage the emphasis must be on basic, careful descriptive reporting of cases.

Violations of the right to protection of life can be considered as singular examples of sentinel health events: health outcomes which are preventable and for which any case should trigger a public health response to investigate and take appropriate preventive action.(15-16) While individual cases are completely worthy of investigation, such abuses clearly occur in patterns, as parts of political strategies by governments or alternative contending military forces. There are several ways of demonstrating that such abuses are in fact policies rather than individual aberrations. One is the failure of government to eliminate the practice by aggressively finding and prosecuting the perpetrators in every documented case. Another is the demonstration of patterns by numbers and trends over time. It is for this latter reason that in addition to documenting an individual case, it is important to ascertain numbers of cases.

Patterns and policies of such abuses are political strategies arising from particular sets of social conditions. Therefore, reports of human rights abuses should include not only reports and counts of cases, but also an accompanying politi-

cal analysis, based on deep knowledge of the national (and often, international) situation, in order to interpret the numerical data on human rights violations. Where groups collecting the human rights data do not provide such a contextual analysis, the appearance of reports of such cases should spur others to do so.

Surveillance of Human Rights Abuses

Public health surveillance is the gathering, collation and analysis of data on the occurrence of particular health outcomes, and the dissemination of the information to those who need to know (11-12-17). It is usually undertaken in order to guide appropriate actions to prevent or treat the adverse outcome being monitored. Until three decades ago, surveillance had a restricted meaning in Public Health. It was applied to individuals, and to the transmission of the infection. In 1950, the Centers for Disease Control in the United States began to extend the concept from communicable diseases to include non-communicable diseases. More recently (8) it has also been applied to the monitoring of health services. An ultimate goal is an effective international surveillance system, which has been possible through the World Health Organization.

Surveillance can be passive, when the data are obtained through reports initiated by providers or other sources outside the surveillance agency, or active, when efforts are made to go out and identify and verify new cases (13). Active surveillance often yields a more accurate picture of cases, and is the ultimate aim of a human rights surveillance system.

Human Rights Monitoring

Human rights organizations in different parts of the world, including Chile, El Salvador, Argentina, South Africa, among others (14), have begun to incorporate surveillance strategies into their system of monitoring human right violations. Human rights organizations in these countries identify victims of repression to give them and their families medical, legal, economic, social assistance and to document instances of violations of human rights. Human rights organizations collect information in a specific geographical area, where they keep a register of the different types of violations and data about the victim. The local information is centralized later at a national level.

Most human rights organizations systematically collect information and investigate each report to verify it, to avoid duplication and to allow day-to-day analysis of the data. The information is disseminated to different HROs or other interested organizations, to the general public through mass media when it is possible, and at the international level.

This is a composite description of what is actually done by the HROs, with different degree of development attained by each national organization. This clearly describes a surveillance system, where the registry is an HRO and the registers are the permanent files listing the data of individuals and events.

Most HROs use a passive system of surveillance, with the case report procedure as the best method of data gathering. There are direct and indirect sources of information. Direct sources are the

victims of repressions, a family member or a friend of the victim, or a witness of a human right violation episode. Indirect sources are reports published in the media.

Limitations of Passive Reporting In Human Rights Monitoring

Such a passive system of surveillance is the only feasible method under conditions of severe repression. Still, several criticisms have been raised against HROs by the people who support repressive governments. They characterize the reports as politically motivated, and object to the validity and reliability of the information and the alleged lack of representativeness of the reported victims. On the other hand, human rights activists and opponents of the repressive governments are unsatisfied with the problem of under-reporting and the delays in notification. They note that their critics are themselves politically motivated.

Human rights data have been considered by some scientific journals and international press as soft data, a claim that has been used as a rationale for not publishing information on human rights violations. There are several fundamental arguments against this position. First, we note that it has the real consequence of supporting those perpetrating the abuses in their actions to commit the violations and to prevent their investigation or disclosure. In addition, these abuses should properly be considered as sentinel health events, and the existence--even the probable existence--of any such cases should be rigorously investigated. Representativeness of cases is not an issue, unless one argues that certain groups or individuals are properly subjects of torture and murder. This is the implication of criticisms about the sampling methods for monitoring human rights cases, but is not a position that many people would willingly expose or accept if stated directly.

Violations of the right to protection of life are unique health outcomes because not only are they 100% preventable, but they are also intentional. There is clearly a powerful institutional structure able to perpetrate them and also intent on preventing their investigation. This social context forces us to realize that when it comes to finding and verifying cases, not all numbers are created equal, in the sense that not all are equally easy to come by or document by the sampling and verification standards we wish to apply in scientific studies. But in evaluating the credibility of case reports, we must consider not only the tightness of the ascertainment methods, but also the difficulty of "adequately" observing cases and the costs of falsely dismissing them as against the costs of falsely pursuing them. Pursuit of false positives here would lead to further investigation and negative conclusions, while acceptance of false negatives would lead to acquiescence in systematic torture, murder and repression of whole groups or populations. How we construct our decision rules about our interpretation of this (or indeed, any other) kind of data (i.e., accept or reject the existence of a human rights "effect") is not a statistical decision, but one that is driven by our weighting of the relative and absolute consequences of acting on false or

true findings. This understanding must be forcefully applied to criticisms of human rights reporting.

We are arguing that any evidence of violations of fundamental human rights to protection of life must be taken very seriously by the international community, and that clear evidence of any violations, and particularly of any aggregation of violations, is enough to act; there is no absolute standard of number or rate that must first be "proved." We think there are not scientific, statistical, social or ethical arguments that can stand against this position. Clearly, however, the social forces perpetrating these atrocities and their political supporters are not likely to be swayed by these arguments and can be expected to continue to attack human rights reports on "scientific" as well as other grounds. This makes it especially imperative to do everything possible to improve the quality control of human rights statistics. All of the usual reasons for doing so also apply, of course; the better our data, and the more internationally standardized and accepted it is, the better able we are to use it to understand the real situation of repression across populations, groups, and time.

Data Quality For Human Rights Abuse Reporting

A measurement must reflect the reality of what is observed. This concept is called validity or accuracy and it is generally measured as deviations from a standard of the "true" concept. Repeated observations of the same entities should produce closely congruent measurements for the measurements to be considered reliable. When a measure is valid the investigator has confidence that the variation in the data is not systematic.

Human rights surveillance suffers from the lack of standard definitions and even more from the lack of completeness of information about number and characteristics of cases. We do not know the reality of human rights violations nor their real frequency. Only the government or military force practicing these abuses is in a position to know it, and they do not want this reality to be known. Therefore the information gathered by a registry is only an approximation of reality, and by the nature of the situation very likely an underestimate of it.

To improve validity we need to identify those factors that influence the collection of data and modify them: A) Government Factors (Obstruction): Secrecy of human rights abuses, intimidation of victims and their families, obstruction of any effort to corroborate allegations, intimidation of journalists and restrictions on the publication of human right violations. B) Victim - Family - Witness Factors: Fear or apathy about reporting, distrust or hostility towards HROs. C) Human Rights Organization Factors: HROs are concentrated in capital or larger cities; the periphery of larger cities, towns and rural areas are not well covered by the monitoring system. There are also differences, particularly across countries, in the way reports are investigated, categorized, and reported.

These factors all contribute to underestimating the real count, and to underreporting cases from some groups or areas relative to others. Limited geographic coverage and the system of referral

that brings people to the registry differentially make the data unrepresentative of the reality of the country. Overreporting is also possible, if those giving information falsify it for political reasons or for possible rewards.

Validity can be improved by increasing the detection of victims by introducing some modification in the system.

Very little can be done against government obstruction by HROs alone. The political opposition to a repressive government must generate pressure to permit publication of human rights violations and to force the judicial system to be independent enough to investigate cases of abuse denounced to the courts.

Victim's and families fear and distrust can be partially overcome if the human rights monitoring office is under the umbrella of a respected and somewhat protected organization (e.g., the church, international organizations) and offers confidentiality.

Coverage can be improved by extending the network of monitoring groups to small towns and rural areas and by evolving from a passive to an active method of surveillance, seeking information among groups at high risk of repression and giving them legal, medical and social support. The validity of the report can also be improved by using multiple sources of information and by independently corroborating testimony wherever possible. This may counter any attempts at undermining the HRO's credibility by planting false witnesses. Training and experience of interviewers, who must be aware of the type of repression happening in the country, can also help to prevent reporting spurious cases.

Publicity of cases may have a salutary effect on all these areas, by increasing awareness of and access to the HRO in the population, permitting increased resources and opportunity to develop and disseminate information and provide services, and providing protection for informants who may be less likely to be put at risk if their cases are and can be made subject to national and international scrutiny.

Reliability can be improved by using first hand informants who must give their testimony personally at a human rights monitoring office. The best informant is the victim. His report and supporting documentation can be compared with the information provided by governments. The informant must give a detailed testimony that, when possible, should be taped during the interview; the transcript should be signed. The adoption of a standard reporting protocol has been suggested (14). By protocol we mean "a minimum set of data to be collected along the procedures to collect them." This standardization of data gathering makes possible a more complete report and would facilitate international comparisons. Variables to be measured must be selected and operational definitions for each of them agreed on. During the personal interview, reliability can be explored by asking again about particular facts from the testimony or from different sessions, possibly with different interviewers blindly eliciting the same information from a given individual, with later assessment of the degree of agreement.

Case Study of A Human Rights Surveillance System: Chile

Chile provides a valuable case study of an on-going human rights surveillance system. In spite of international standards, official acceptance of human rights covenants by sovereign countries, and their commitment to social and economic equality by their own Constitution, 30% of the countries of the world systematically violate the right to life, security and integrity of their citizens (1-2). The general inability of the contemporary world to deal with these severe violations stresses the weakness of the actual United Nations Organization. Many governments which have been chronic violators have been able to survive, in spite of international criticism, because they are allied with and receive the support of one of the two superpowers. Such alliances have often led to a marked muting of human rights criticisms and/or selective application of different standards of human rights to these countries. This can involve either qualitative standards (i.e., they're doing all right because there are not as many political murderers now as last year) or quantitative ones (i.e., political or religious liberties become more important than the right to protection of life itself). Chile is an example of a country whose government, has been supported by a superpower while practicing widespread, long term violations of the right to protection of life. In this setting human rights organizations have developed.

Since 1979, the Chilean Commission on Human Rights has been publishing descriptive monthly reports with statistical data on human rights violations. The Commission has classified the violation of the right to protect the life, security and integrity of the person by severity, considering the amount of pain and harm that is inflicted to the victim from harassment and intimidation, arbitrary political detention, torture, disappearance, and political killing. With these data, in addition, we can study the frequency of occurrence of these violations, the extent of the abuse, counts of the number of individuals who have been harmed, and secular trends which may suggest possible changes in the repressive behavior of the government.

In spite of the limitation of the method of surveillance, the experience of Chile has shown itself to be extraordinarily sensitive in detecting changes in the pattern of repression. The usefulness of the method can be illustrated by using data of the Chilean Commission of Human Rights to analyze changes in the repressive conduct of the Chilean military dictatorship.

Categories of Human Right Violations
In Chile

Chile was the longest standing democracy in Latin America until a bloody military coup overthrew the elected socialist government of Salvador Allende on September 11, 1973. Since then parliament, political parties, worker unions, and free press have been suppressed. The right to protection of life, security and integrity of the person has been systematically violated. Opposition has been eliminated through intimidation, arbitrary detention, torture and political killings. These violations are clearly evident from TABLE #1.

The failure of the economical model impose by

the military dictatorship, associated with the international depression of 1980, produced, in Chile, a more severe depression with a decrease of the gross domestic product of 14.4% in 1982. The payment of interest on the international debt was 49.5% of the value of exports. The official unemployment rate was 22% and there was a decrease of consumption per capita of about 20% (3-7). These factors increased the gap between poor and rich. After 13 years of dictatorship the poor are poorer and the rich are richer. The impoverishment of large sectors of the population led to a raise in protest against the dictatorship and an increase in public demonstrations. The political opposition to the government was very passive until May 1983 when the first national protest and strike was called. Later, almost every month until May 1984, one or two days of protest were successfully accomplished. The government reacted with increased repression, which explains the increases in the incidents of all kinds of human rights violations to a maximum between 1983 to 1984.

Harrassment and Intimidation

The Chilean dictatorship has used different methods of intimidation to threaten opponents, such as pursuit, surveillance of homes, breaking into houses with destruction of furniture and personal belongings, anonymous telephone calls and/or letters with threats to individuals and their families, offensive lies and so on.

The victims cover a wide spectrum of the opposition, from workers, students, professionals, and union leaders to human rights activists. Those mainly responsible are unknown plain-clothed individuals, police, secret police, and recently, rightist/terrorist groups. Compared with other forms of repression, intimidation is a very effective method and it has a low political cost because there is less evidence and it is the most underreported of all human rights abuses. Since 1979, when a registry was put into operation, the level of incidents of intimidation have increased notoriously until 1983. Since then the incidents have remained at a high level, with a small decrease in 1985. The monthly range is wide: 2-12 cases in a low year (1979), up to 16-374 in 1983. Eighty percent of all cases denounced have happened in the last 4 years.

Arbitrary Detention

The principal characteristic of detention in Chile is its arbitrariness. The constitution approved by the military junta in 1980 established that "no one can be arrested without proper order given by a public official in accordance with the law." These constitutional rights have been suspended by a state of emergency dictated by the government since 1973. Typically, in Chile, detentions and abductions are done without legal warrant, without identification of the captor, and with unnecessary violence.

Since 1983 the majority of those detained are young from the low economic status part of the population, and not political militant. The arrests are done by government officials such as police, or by other groups without legal right to do so, e.g. the National Intelligence Central, and military and/or plain-clothes officials.

TABLE #3 basically shows a clear change in the pattern of the detention. Individual and mass

arrests have been practiced systematically since the military coup. Collective arrests which were practised in the first few years of dictatorship, reappeared again in 1984 with other forms of abduction that were practically unknown until 1986. The incidence of all detention has increased, reaching the maximum in 1983 or 1984. Individual detention increased 6 times while mass arrest increased 11.3 times. These changes have reduced the importance of individual detention from 24.3% in 1979 to 2.7% in 1986.

Individual Detention

Individual detention is an important group of detention to be monitored. Each case represents a person who has been carefully selected by the government after a prolonged period of observation which includes pursuit and surveillance of his/her home and work. In general these detentions are oriented to disrupt opposition groups and social organizations, as students, workers, professional unions, and political parties.

TABLE #4 shows that individual detention has increased from a monthly average of 27 in 1979 to 163 in 1984. During the summer, January to February, we observed the lowest number of individual detentions. It began to increase in March, when the students came back to classes, reaching the maximum in August, September, October, the date of the anniversary of overthrow of the President Salvador Allende government. The big increase in the last 4 months of 1986 is due to the tension subsequent to the attempted assassination of Pinochet, and the discovery of an arsenal in the north of Chile.

Mass Detention

Mass detention in Chile basically occurs during public protest and its increment in frequency correlates closely with these events.

TABLE #5 shows that mass arrests were 14 times higher in 1983 and 11 times higher in 1986 than in 1979, and also increased in the month of September.

Of 14,436 detained in 1983, 8,915 (61.7%) occurred during public demonstrations against the government. The increment in 1986 during May, June, and July coincided with the preparation of a national strike in July and the increment in September coincided with the attempted assassination of President Pinochet.

Torture and Severe Mistreatment

Since the military coup torture in Chile has been applied systematically to a high proportion of individuals arrested by the secret police. When public demonstrations began in 1983 the police became extremely brutal, practicing methods of repression such as beatings, electric shocks in police mobile units, attacks by trained dogs, burning with acid and flames, including one publicized case of a youth who was burned to death, and so on, which has made it difficult to separate torture while under detention from these severe mistreatments on the street or in police vehicles or station. Because of that TABLE #6 lists together both torture and mistreatment that have occurred since 1984. The TABLE #6 shows that torture and mistreatment increased 12.6 times from 1979 to 1983, and has remained at a high level (approximately 1000 cases annually). The lowest incidents are during the summer months

(December to March). The incident began to increase after March reaching the highest level in September.

Political Killings

Since the military coup several types of political killings have been experienced by the opposition to the government. TABLE #7 shows that the most frequent types (69%) have been unnecessary violence and abuse of power, when the police or army used an excess of force during public demonstrations of the opposition. On other occasions the government has explained the deaths as consequences of an armed conflict between its opponents and government officials, when the facts have proven the contrary (23.4%). Killing during torture is underreported. But we consider that most of the 2500 people who disappeared in Chile since the military coup died during torture.

Summary executions as consequence of a legal or administrative process are very rare. The government prefers all the other methods of arbitrary killing. Other forms such as homicide, death by death squad or by unidentified persons, are less frequent. TABLE #8 show that since 1973, every year, and almost every month, there have been reports of political killings in Chile. The incidents have increased 6.8 times from 1979 to 1983. Of the 385 political killings reported since 1979, 77% have occurred since 1983. TABLE #8 also shows that during September of every year, there has been a high number of political killings in Chile. September is the traditional month of protest against military dictatorship.

Conclusions:

By international standards, a government and its officials are responsible to secure the right to protection of life, security and integrity of the people living within the boundaries of that country. In spite of international covenants, a third of the governments in the world, violate the human rights of their citizens.

Human rights organizations in different parts of the world have been using surveillance in their system of monitoring human rights violations. Validity and reliability of the data vary from one country to another as consequences of the magnitude of governments obstruction to their work, the intensity of the fear in the population and the accessibility to the monitoring centers.

In spite of these problems which contributes to underestimating the real count, the surveillance of human rights violations has been very successful in demonstrating: - The existence of human rights abuses, documenting what was regarded as common knowledge in the populations of that country. - Different categories of offenses based on the amount of harm and pain inflicted on the victim. - The frequency of occurrence of each category of abuse. - The extension of the violations, shown by the number of people harmed, and - Duration and changes of abuses over time, by studying secular trends by months and years.

REFERENCES

- 1) Amnesty International: Report on Torture. Farrar Straus and Giroux Inc, New York. 1975.
- 2) Amnesty International: Torture in the Eighties. Amnesty International Publications, 1984.
- 3) Arellano J.P.: La Situacion Social en Chile.

Notas Tecnicas. CIEPLAN. Chile, Febrero 1987, Pag. 1-24.

4) Bollen K.A.: Political Rights and Political Liberties in Nations: An Evaluation of Human Rights Measures 1950 to 1984. Human Rights Quarterly. 1986; 8: 567-591.

5) Banks D.L.: The Analysis of Human Rights Data Over Time. Human Rights Quarterly. 1986; 8: 654-680.

6) Comision Chilena de Derechos Humanos. Informe Anual 1983. Informe Mensual Diciembre 1984 y el Desarrollo 1985 y 1986.

7) Comision Economica para America Latina y el Caribe. CEPAL: Balance Preliminar de la Economia Latino Americana 1986. Notas sobre la Economia y el Desarrollo 1986; 438/439: 1-36.

8) Doll R.: Surveillance and Monitoring. Int. J. Epidemiol. 1974; 3: 305-314.

9) Dominguez J. I.: Assessing Human Rights Conditions, in Enhancing Global Human Rights. McGraw-Hill Book Company Series: Council on Foreign Relations 1980's Project. 1979: 19-116.

10) Goldstein R.J.: The Limitations of Using Quantitative Data in Studying Human Rights Abuses. Human Rights Quarterly. 1986; 8: 607-627.

11) Langmuir A.D.: Evolution of the Concept of Surveillance in the United States. Proc. Roy. Soc. Med. 1971; 64: 681-684.

12) Langmuir A.D.: William Farr: Founder of Modern Concept of Surveillance. Int. J. Epidemiol. 1976; 5: 13-18.

13) Marier R. The Reporting of Communicable Diseases. Am. J. Epidemiol. 1977; 105: 587-590.

14) Reiter R.B., Zunzunegui M. V., Quiroga J.: Guidelines for Field Reporting of Basic Human Rights Violations. Human Rights Quarterly. 1986; 8: 628-653.

15) Rutstein D.D., Berenberg W., Chalmers T.C., Child C.G., Fishman A. P., Perrin E. B.: Measuring the Quality of Medical Care. A Clinical Method. N. Eng. J. Med. 1976; 294: 582-588.

16) Rutstein D.D., Mullan R.J., Frazier T.M., Halperin W.E., Melius M.M., Sestito J.P.: Sentinel Health Events (Occupational): A Basis for Physician Recognition and Public Health Surveillance. Am. J. Public Health. 1983; 73: 1054-1062.

17) Thacker S.D., Choi K., Brachman P.S.: The Surveillance of Infectious Diseases. JAMA. 1983; 249: 1181-1185.

TABLE 1
CATEGORIES OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
Intimidation & Harrassment	92	118	140	245	794	549	390	559	2887
Detention	1325	1129	911	1789	15077	39429	8901	33665	102226
Torture & Mistreatment	143	91	68	123	434	1810	907	1013	4589
Killing	14	17	33	24	96	79	64	58	385

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985
1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 2
HARRASSMENT/INTIMIDATION BY MONTH & YEAR: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
January	10	2	21	4	16	23	19	20	115
February	9	3	5	2	22	38	47	23	149
March	2	12	7	28	43	83	27	19	221
April	5	12	13	26	23	69	29	44	221
May	6	10	20	21	22	80	30	63	252
June	7	7	6	14	36	38	26	35	169
July	7	7	19	17	83	28	55	108	324
August	8	17	5	14	374	34	75	26	553
September	6	9	8	26	72	42	31	65	259
October	8	5	6	15	47	23	17	98	219
November	12	21	23	4	32	88	26	53	259
December	12	13	7	5	24	3	8	5	77
Unknown				69					69
TOTAL	92	118	140	245	794	549	390	559	2887
MEAN/MONTH	7.7	9.8	11.7	20.4	66.2	45.8	32.5	46.6	
% OF TOTAL	3.2	4.1	4.8	8.5	27.5	19	13.5	19.4	

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985
1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 3
CATEGORIES OF POLITICAL DETENTION: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total	% Of Total
Individual	323	678	648	306	641	1960	739	921	6216	6.1
Mass Arrest	1002	451	263	1483	14436	6895	7063	11304	42897	42
Collective						30574	1099	21307	52980	51.8
Abduction								76	76	0.1
Abuse of Power								57	57	0.1
TOTAL	1325	1129	911	1789	15077	39429	8901	33665	102226	
MEAN/MONTH	110	94	76	149	1256	3286	742	2805		
% OF TOTAL	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.8	14.7	38.6	8.7	32.9		

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985
1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 4
INDIVIDUAL DETENTIONS BY MONTH AND YEAR: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
January	25	17	61	35	26	25	46	30	265
February	7	5	53	20	20	28	53	49	235
March	29	25	115	44	65	136	53	45	512
April	17	68	61	38	59	173	102	60	578
May	28	126	50	22	42	109	68	59	504
June	28	17	35	31	55	105	31	63	365
July	25	113	46	22	78	229	52	72	637
August	43	56	27	20	56	163	73	70	508
September	45	109	33	31	84	47	129	170	648
October	25	39	31	13	60	530	80	111	889
November	16	78	96	14	62	276	22	126	690
December	35	25	40	16	34	139	30	66	385

TOTAL	323	678	648	306	641	1960	739	921	6216
MEAN/MONTH	26.9	56.5	54	25.5	53.4	163.3	61.6	76.8	
% OF TOTAL	5.2	10.9	10.4	4.9	10.3	31.5	11.9	14.8	

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights 1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984 1985 Annual Report 1985 1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 5
MASS DETENTIONS BY MONTH AND YEAR: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
January	50			89	2	65	84	37	327
February				30	129	141	56	139	495
March	30	144		398	309	971	155	577	2584
April	63				68	146	564	2244	3085
May	469	57	239	130	836	738	171	1671	4311
June		150			1502	398	134	2039	4223
July		7	15	63	1442	156	556	1915	4154
August		19		60	2603	275	767	331	4055
September	260	15		152	2416	1914	1614	1324	7695
October		36	9	229	1083	1140	1270	354	4121
November	130			8	605	723	1547	650	3663
December		23		324	3441	228	145	23	4184

Total	1002	451	263	1483	14436	6895	7063	11304	42897
MEAN/MONTH	83.5	37.6	21.9	123.6	1203	574.6	588.6	942	
% OF TOTAL	2.3	1.1	0.6	3.5	33.7	16.1	16.5	26.4	

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights 1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984 1985 Annual Report 1985 1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 6
TORTURE & SEVERE MISTREATMENT CASES BY MONTH AND YEAR: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
January	14	7		12	9	32	35	56	165
February	4	5	2	2	13	44	77	38	185
March	19	9	10	8	23	354	30	63	516
April	6	10	2	19	2	37	51	116	243
May	5	7	11	14	16	217	41	127	438
June	4	4	2	10	17	106	39	77	259
July	3	12	6	2	14	77	84	197	395
August	17	14	3	6	134	186	83	54	497
September	4	10	10	13	109	350	164	180	840
October	9	3	2	5	37	218	104	57	435
November	25	10	13	3	47	153	154	39	444
December	33		7	6	13	36	45	9	149
Unknown				23					

TOTAL	143	91	68	123	434	1810	907	1013	4589
MEAN/MONTH	11.9	7.6	5.7	10.3	36.2	150.8	75.6	84.4	
% OF TOTAL	3.1	2	1.5	2.7	9.5	39.4	19.8	22.1	

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983 1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985 1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 7
CATEGORIES OF POLITICAL KILLING: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total	% Of Total
Summary										
Execution						1			1	0.3
Presumptive										
Armed Conflict	7	4	23	3	14	22	9	8	90	23.4
By Torture						2	2	1	5	1.3
Homicide			2	1	3	1	5	4	16	4.2
By Abuse										
Of Power	4	9	8	19	6	11	13	30	100	26
Unnecessary										
Violence	3	4		1	70	36	31	3	148	38.4
Other					3	6	4	12	25	6.5
TOTAL	14	17	33	24	96	79	64	58	385	100
MEAN/MONTH	1	1	3	2	8	7	5	5		
% OF TOTAL	3.6	4.4	8.6	6.2	24.9	20.5	16.6	15.1		

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985
1986 Annual Report 1986

TABLE 8
POLITICAL KILLINGS BY MONTH AND YEAR: CHILE, 1979-1986

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Total
January		2	2	4	1	3	7	3	22
February		1		3	2	3	2	1	12
March	1	2			1	16	7	4	31
April	1	2	1	4	5	2	4	5	24
May	2		3	2	2	9	2	2	22
June	3	1	2		4	2	4	5	21
July		3	2	2	4	4	2	14	31
August	4		2	2	31	12	4	3	58
September		1	8	2	27	14	13	13	78
October		1	2		6	9	9	2	29
November	3	2	7	4	3	2	9	3	33
December		2	4	1	10	3	1	3	24
TOTAL	14	17	33	24	96	79	64	58	385
MEAN/MONTH	1.2	1.4	2.8	2	8	6.6	5.3	4.8	
% OF TOTAL	3.6	4.4	8.6	6.2	24.9	20.5	16.6	15.1	

Source: Chilean Commission of Human Rights
1979-1983 Annual Report 1983
1984 Monthly Report December 1984
1985 Annual Report 1985
1986 Annual Report 1986