

林福寿医生演说稿全文

07/08/10

作者/来源：林福寿医生 <http://barnyardchorus.blogspot.com>
新加坡文献馆译

前言：2009年11月14日，林福寿医生在一个新书发布会上演说，这是他在获释多年后的首次公开谈话。这一天，恰巧是美国总统奥巴马到访新加坡出席亚太经合组织首脑会议。



演说稿全文：

我对这本书所作出的贡献是不多的。因为我的健康欠佳，我的体力局限了我的写作。这些主要是我在1972年期间即被囚禁9年后所发表过的声明书。

我们都知道，我是在1963年2月2日在一场冷藏行动中被逮捕，我是在近20年囚禁之后被释放，是当年遭逮捕众人中的最后一名获释者。这些声明主要是表白我对被囚禁事件的观感立场。

在经过了9年的囚禁后，他们要我发表一篇声明书，首先，要表达支持所谓的新加坡民主体制，其二，要表示放弃从事政治。我告诉他们，这两个要求是相互矛盾的，因为如果确实是有国会民主，我就没有必为要放弃政治活动。他们于是说：‘你必须讲一些悔悟的话，要不然李光耀会很没有面子。’

对我而言，这并非是一个自尊的问题，而是一个原则的问题。

首先，如果一个人是为了要挽救自己的面子而去剥夺其他人的基本权力，那么，这个面子是不值得去挽救的。要知道，最主要的民主权力就是新加坡人的基本宪法权力。任何人的

这一个权力都不能够被剥夺，然后向他勒索去敲诈一份表示悔悟和忏悔的声明书。这整个事件为的是要发表一份悔过声明书，我断然拒绝这个要求。

之后，声明书事件的过后，我又被囚禁了另外的近 10 个年头。因此，总共是 19 年又 8 个月，这远比一个无期徒刑来得更长。无期徒刑犯获得 1/3 减刑后，在囚禁 13 年后获释。但是，我是在没有罪状，没有法庭审讯的情况下却要遭受比无期徒刑犯更长的囚禁。

最近有一些杂七杂八的有关政治拘留人士有权向咨询委员会进行上诉的言论。我要告诉你们我的一些有关这个咨询委员会的经验。

在囚禁了约 1 年过后，在一个下午的 4 点钟，我被召唤到监狱的大门，那儿有一份通告告示我会在隔天出庭会见咨询委员会，他们给了我两张全页的所谓罪状单。我告诉他们我要保留这些罪状单以便我在明天出庭时使用。他们说：‘不行，你不可以保留它，在你读完后我们要把它收回’。

我告诉他们我要把这件事通知我的律师，他们说，‘不可以，你有权力去通知你的律师，但是你现在不可以打电话给他’，我回应说：‘这样的话，我要如何去通知我的律师？’他说：‘这就是法律’。

于是第二天早上我被拷上手铐带往最高法庭出席由三人组成咨询委员会的开庭听审。一名法官，他是 Judge Winslow 以及另外两人。一人是一位叫什么 Elias 的，我猜想他是名律师，以及另一名华人绅士，但我忘了他的名字叫什么。

看看这些所谓的罪状单，上面有着许多空空的留白，我问 Judge Winslow 这些留白有着什么意思？他说：‘唉呀，这些就是罪状，由于这些都是非常敏感的内容，所以只可以让咨询委员会知道，但你不可以知道’。

我说：‘天底下岂有这样的事，不知道自己的罪状又如何去进行辩护？’，我向他请教如何是好，他耸耸肩膀要说话，我于是质问：‘这岂不是在开司法的玩笑’。他回应说：‘这就是法律’。

你看，整个事件就是一场司法闹剧。我的意识是，这真是令人难以置信的，竟然会有人见证了这般的对所谓的司法进行嘲弄。在现实上，把一名高等法院的法官摆上咨询委员会的主席位置，会给予公众一种印象，以为这是一种判决，里头有着公平正义。我于是告诉他，如果我是名高院法官，我是不会为了让人信服这种嘲弄场合而出席。

然后，这名 Elias 警告我说这是蔑视法庭的尊严。我对蔑视法庭的说法感到高兴，因为我已经被囚禁在牢房里，这种告诫对我而言是没有什么分别的。

顺便一提，在我的 20 年囚禁生活里，我曾被关押在新加坡各处的全部牢房里，除了归女监狱之外。

结果，那位法官说，‘不必，不必，让这位医生说他想要说的话，这里头并没有蔑视法庭的一回事’。于是我用了 3 个小时的时间逐一的对全部的所谓罪状提出反驳。其中一条罪状是虚构的，我被指控为 8 名华惹诽谤事件的学生之一，我说：‘真实的情况是，我并没有身为这 8 位学生之一的殊荣，事实上，我觉得能够被看成是当中一员就是件值得荣幸之事，但是，我并非 8 人中的一人。当时这 8 名学生在无答辩情况下获得无罪释放，而其辩护律师就是李光耀本人，他不就是如今囚禁我的那一个人？’

他说：‘这就是法律。’

所有的一切都是法律。

你们最近常听到所谓的依法执法。看看现时的内部安全法令，这条法令是在嘲讽依法执法的概念。这条法令是在依法执法的范畴之外。一旦你在内部安全法令下被拘捕，你就完全无法寻求任何法律上的庇护。

我曾两次尝试寻求人身保护令的庇护。其中一回是由于政府的错误让我从技术上取得了胜利 – 他们并没有签署我的拘捕令。这文件原本应该是由部长签署，但却让一名公务员去代签。因此，在这一回里头法庭因为技术性错误而释放我。当我获释时，内政部在女皇镇的监狱门口等候着我。我在获释后的一分钟又再遭到逮捕。这是一个开玩笑的释放。为了这件人身保护令的事，我遭受到惩罚，把我关进所有囚禁中心里最声名狼藉的囚禁所，中央警署的总部。

这个地方根本不适合即便是用来关畜生，更何况是人类。这个地方很阴深，臭气熏天，严重缺乏空气流通，人在里头很难呆过 24 个小时，但是，我却每天 24 个小时的被关押在里边。这个地方到处是爬虫，我有许许多多的爬虫相伴，没有阅读的书籍，其光线阴暗到我无法看见我手上的纹理。于是我们 5 个人进行绝食，我因溃疡出血而被转送医院。那里是有着所谓的人身保护令，可以冒险的去尝试使用它，你会遭受严峻的惩罚。

我第二次尝试人身保护令是当他们要强迫我去从事手工粗活。那时是 1972 年。他们说所有拘留者都必须去干体力劳工，这是改过自新的训练计划之一。我被指派从事木工，那位警监告诉我说，这样做会对身为医生的你有益，你的手会变得更为敏捷。于是，我回应：‘你没有进入一所医学院的资格，而你现在却是在告诉一名医生，什么样的毕业后专业训练会对他有益。你是否太过高估了你自己的能耐？’他说：‘这就是法律，你每天必须获得 8 分钱的酬劳。’于是我们进行了绝食，我们群中的一些人进行了 3 个月的绝食，为的是要挫折他们把我们当成刑事罪犯去进行劳改。我在进行了 3 个星期的绝食行动后，他们进来对我说，‘那好吧，我们免除你的劳改。’

那一群囚禁在明月弯的女性拘留者进行了 130 天的绝食，她们遭受强迫喂食。她们当中有些人被用吸管抽入食道喂奶后引发呕吐。警监下令狱警把一位呕吐后女拘留者抬走，并用她的裤子去拖地。就是用这样的方法去对待拘留者。当然的，这些都遭到报章的隐瞒掩盖，但是这些就是我们的遭遇和经历。

我们都经历过单独囚禁。根据李光耀本人的说法，单独囚禁是一种最恶劣的酷刑。让我向你们读出李光耀所说的有关单独囚禁‘给予一个人的最大惩罚是完全隔绝在地牢里，阴暗，完全没有任何的生命激励因素。这是一个真实的酷刑。’李光耀，2008 年 1 月。

虽然他知道这是一种真实的酷刑，他毫不感到负疚的对所有的拘留者使用这种真实的酷刑，无一幸免。我们都要经历这种真实的酷刑，并非只是一天，两天，而是 6 个月。要知道，在法令下，是有一定的保护即使是对刑事罪犯行使这种酷刑。一个刑事犯一旦违反了监狱的条例会遭受到单独囚禁，但为期不可长于 2 个星期，因为这将会带来严重的精神健康上的损伤。然而，对政治拘留者而言，他们并不受到保护。

那位李有成，南洋商报的总经理，被单独囚禁，不是一次而是两次，他坚强的挨过了这些真实的酷刑。T T 拉惹，一名律师，他被囚禁两年半，其中两次单独囚禁 6 个月。赛、扎哈利的 17 年囚禁里共经历 4 次的单独囚禁。我们都引以为荣，我们虽然面对千辛万苦的艰难，我们没有退缩。我们站稳我们的立场，我们保住了自己的尊严。

今天，他们呼吁我们要有雅量。宽宏大量是什么意思？只有那些经历过苦难折磨，才可享有道德的权利，道德的地位去展现雅量风范，不是那群犯错者。做错事的人要寻求宽恕，如果他们承认犯错，就要道歉。并不是由酷刑下的受害者去乞求宽恕。我们是那群具有雅量风范的人，我们可以宽宏大量，如果犯错者承认错失，并且寻求宽恕。

1972 年我通过妻子 Beatrice Chen 发表了一份声明书，当然的，报章都压抑了这件事，但学生组织却广泛传阅 – 我说正确的解决方法是在没有条件要求的情况下释放我们。无条件释放。此外，你要对我们的长期囚禁作出赔偿并进行道歉。我说我愿意放弃这最后的两项条件，既赔偿和道歉，因为我不相信像李光耀这样自大傲慢的人会轻易的让步。对于无条件释放的一项 – 我们的立场是坚定的。我坚持了立场，为此而遭受了 20 年的苦难。这就是我为了我们的尊严而付出的代价。

在新加坡，我们有一个现象，那就是政府领袖自认有廉正，这廉正是用全世界最高的薪金去支撑，然而，对政治上的异议者和拘留者而言，政府领袖的廉正却是以全世界最长的监狱囚禁去维持。这两种廉正是不同的，就好象天和地的比较。有什么理由需要别人作出如此的牺牲去维护他的廉正与信仰？政府为什么要以如此的高薪去酬劳自己。这是当今新加坡政治现实里的一个不道德层面。

看吧，无审讯的囚禁是反和平的行为，这是一神暴力行为。他们并非在白天的时候礼貌的投帖拜访。他们在凌晨时分的 4 点钟。这个时段里一般正常的人都在睡眠，但却是政治恐

怖分子与独裁者进行勾当的时机。一旦你被逮捕，你就面对各种名样的精神以至于身体上的酷刑。这并非单独发生在 1963 年的那一批拘留者，这也发生在其他不同时期的拘留者：如 1972 年，甚至于迟至 1987 年。当张素兰和她的那一批所谓的马克思主义拘留者也同样面对精神与内体上的刑罚。当这几位女律师在获释后发表了她们遭受虐待的声明书之后，他们又再遭逮捕並被迫收回他们的指责。

那门子的依法执法会允许起诉的原告者受到被指控的被告政府的惩罚，还被迫收回他们的指控？这不就是一个上下颠倒的司法体系吗？看啊，对着这样的一种情况，律师公会却连一句话也不敢说。之所以变得如此无能是因为律师公会在 1987 年遭到了他们的修理。

现在，傅树介写了一篇有关冷藏行动的好文章，里边，他揭露了好些从英国档案局解密的文件，展示了英国当局如何与李光耀密谋的共同合作在 1963 年大选之前摧毁反对党阵营。合并的整个目的就是在 1963 年大选之前毁灭反对党。

到了今天，那个人民行动党要站立在道德的制高点，要求其他国家讲求人权，甚至于向缅甸要求释放他们的政治拘留者。但是，他们究竟有什么可以站立的道德制高点去提出这种要求？翻开他们的过往记录来看，他们所站立着的座墩里头充满了蠕虫和害虫。让他们先去忏悔自己的不光彩人权记录，之后，你或许才会有道德上的权力去抨击别人缺乏人权。

傅树介也撰写了本书的最后一章[华惹一代]，有关社会主义的未来。你们之中必然有人会置疑，在俱乐部成立 50 年后，社会主义到了现今的年代，还会有什么作为。社会主义运动在世界各地遭受到许多的挫折，甚至于失败，所以有人怀疑这些理论是否还有效用。近期的经济危机，近日的金融风暴都再次的暴露了资本主义的贪腐与不道德行为，人类应该享受一个比由贪婪与贪污支撑着的体系，来得更好的体系。

近来你们经常听到有人说当你年青时你是个理想主义者，当你年长后你是个现实主义者。这些都是胡说八道的垃圾废话，是那些要不是已经失去理想，就是那些已经把理想出卖了的自私自利者。一个人不应该让他自己的理想与信仰消失掉。不论何种情况，他应该更坚持的去巩固自己的信念。如果这和年龄有关，这只是在表达方式上，对这些理想和信仰有了更多的演绎方式，毕竟他们有经历过青春年少时的种种体会。一个生命如果没有了信念，没有了理想主义，那只是一个毫无意义的生存，而我相信你们中的许多人会同意，一个人的生命意义要远比这种情况来得更精彩。

谢谢。

原文来源：<http://barnyardchorus.blogspot.com/2010/07/transcript-of-dr-lim-hock-siew-speech.html>

Ex-political prisoner speaks out in Singapore

Posted on Youtube, 15 November, 2009.

By Singapore Rebel (Martyn See).

Video description: Dr Lim Hock Siew is Singapore's second longest-held political prisoner.

From the video:

[A founding member of the ruling People's Action Party, Lim was accused of being a communist and was arrested without trial in 1963, and had his detention prolonged by the then Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew until his release in 1982.]

[On 14th of Nov 2009, Lim made his first post-detention speech in Singapore during a book launch.]

[The day coincided with the arrival of US President Barack Obama in Singapore for the APEC Summit.]

My contribution to this book is very modest. Because of my ill-health, I've not been able to write too much. It comprises mainly of a statement which I made when I was in prison in 1972, after 9 years of incarceration.

As you know, I was detained in Coldstore Operation in February the 2nd 1963, and I was the last one to come out from the batch of detainees almost 20 years later. Now this statement mainly stated my stand on my detention.

After 9 years of incarceration, they wanted me to issue a statement to firstly support the so-called democratic system of Singapore, and secondly to renounce politics. I told them that these two demands are self-contradictory, because if there is parliamentary democracy, then I don't have to give up politics. So they said, "You must say something to show repentance other wise Lee Kuan Yew will lose face."

For me this not a question of pride, it's a question of principle.

In the first place, if a person has to save his face by depriving somebody else of his fundamental rights, then that's not a face that's worth saving. So the, the main democratic right is a fundamental constitutional right of the people of Singapore. And no one should be deprived of their right, and held ransom to extort statements of repentance and contrition. So the whole thing bogged down to having to issue a statement of repentance, which I refused.

Subsequently, I was detained for another almost 10 years, after that statement was issued. So a total of 19 years and eight months, longer than a life sentence. Life sentences will be released after 13 years, after the initial one-third remission, but for no charge, no trial, I was detained for longer than life sentences.

A lot of hullabaloo have been said recently on the right of political detainees to appeal to an Advisory Board. I want to tell you about my experience in this Advisory Board.

After about one year of detention, I was asked to the prison main gate at about 4pm, and a statement of notice to say that I had to appear before the Advisory Board the next day, and I was given a two fool-scrap paper of so-called charge sheets. I said I wanted to keep these sheets of paper so I could prepare for my next morning's appearance. They said, "No, you cannot keep it. Just read it and we'll take it back."

I said I want to inform my lawyer about this. They said, "No, you have the right to inform your lawyer, but you cannot telephone him now." I said, "In that case, how do I contact my lawyer?" He said, "That's the law."

So the next morning I was called to the High Court in handcuffs and all that to appear before an Advisory Board comprising three persons. A judge called Judge Winslow and two other persons. One is a certain Elias, I think he's a lawyer, and the other one a Chinese gentleman whose name I cannot remember.

So, on these so-called charge sheets, there were a lot of blank spaces. I asked Judge Winslow what do these blank spaces mean? He said, "Oh, these are charges which are so sensitive that they can be shown only to the Advisory Board but not to you."

I said, "How the hell can anybody defend himself against a charge that's not even revealed to him?" I asked him for advice, he just said [shrugs shoulder]. I said, "Is this a mockery of justice or what?" He said, "This is the law."

You see, the whole thing is a judicial farce. I mean, it's incredible that anyone has to face this kind of mockery, this kind of so-called justice, and the fact that a High court judge is being put as the chairman of this Advisory Board gives the public an illusion that there is judgement, there is justice. And I told him that if I were a High court judge, I would not lend credence to this mockery by my presence.

Then this Elias threatened me with contempt of court. I was very happy when he with contempt of court, because after all I was already in prison, so threatening me with contempt of court and all that makes no difference to me.

By the way, in my 20 years in prison, I was detained in practically all the prisons in Singapore, except of course the female prison.

In the end, the judge said, "No, no, let the doctor have his say, there's no question of contempt of court." So I gave a three-hour statement to debunk all the so-called charges. One of the charges was in fact a false charge: I was charged for being one of the right Fajar students who were charged for sedition. I said, "As a matter of fact, I didn't have the privilege to be one of the eight. In fact, I would be flattered to be one of the eight, and that I was not one of the eight. So why

should I be imprisoned for allegedly being one of the eight, when these eight were acquitted without being called, and acquitted and defended by Lee Kuan Yew himself, who is now detaining me?”

He said, “This is the law.”

Everything is the law.

So recently you have heard all this so-called rule of law. Now there is detention without trial by ISA [Internal Security Act], a law which makes a mockery of the concept of rule of law. It is a law that is outside the rule of law. Once you are detained under the ISA, you have no legal defence whatsoever.

I tried the habeas corpus twice. On one occasion I succeeded on the technical error on the side of the government—they did not sign my detention order. It was supposed to be signed by a minister, but it was delegated to a civil servant. So on that account the court has to release me on a technical point. So when I was released, there was the Special Branch waiting for me outside Queenstown Prison. I was re-arrested one minute later. It was a mock release. And for that habeas corpus, I was punished and sent to the most hideous of all detention centres, the Central Police Station head office.

That was a place that is not fit to keep animals let alone human beings. The place was so dark, so stinky and so ill-ventilated that you cannot stand inside for more than 24 hours, but I was locked in there for 24 hours a day. And the whole place was infested with bugs. I had a lot of bugs for company. No reading material and the light was so dim that I could hardly see the crease of my hand. So immediately the five of us went on hunger strike, and my ulcer bled and I had to be transferred to hospital. That was the so-called habeas corpus right there you have. Try it at your risk, or be severely punished.

The second time I went for habeas corpus case was when they tried to force me to do manual labour. That was in 1972. They said all detainees should do manual labour as a programme of rehabilitation. I was supposed to do carpentry. So this superintendent told me that it was good for you as a doctor, you try to become more dexterous with your hand. So I said, “You do not have the qualifications to enter a medical college, and here you are telling a doctor what is good for post-graduate education. Are you over-reaching yourself?” He said, “This is the law. You have to be paid 8 cents a day.” So we all went on hunger strike, and some of us went on hunger strike for three months in order to frustrate their attempt to make us labourers like criminals. I went on hunger strike for three weeks before they came in and said, “Okay, we exempt you from that.”

And the women detainees in Moon Crescent Centre went on hunger strike for 130 days, and they were forced-fed. Some of them vomited after being fed milk by the tube inserted forcefully into their oesophagus. One girl vomited and the superintendent forced for wardens to carry her and wiped the floor with her pants. This is the kind of treatment meted to detainees. All these of course suppressed by the press, but this is the thing we all had to go through.

Now all of us had to go through detention in solitary confinement. Solitary confinement according to Lee Kuan Yew himself is a very bad form of torture. I will read to you what Lee Kuan Yew said of solitary confinement: “The biggest punishment a man can receive is total isolation in a dungeon, black and complete withdrawal of all stimuli. That is real torture.” Lee Kuan Yew, January 2008.

Although he knows it is real torture, he had no compunction in meting out this real torture to all detainees without exception. Some of us had to undergo this real torture, not for one day, two days, but for six months. Now under the law, there is a protection for even criminal prisoners from this kind of torture. A criminal prisoner when found guilty of infringing prison rules will be sentenced to solitary confinement for not more than two weeks, because of the obvious mental health effects. But for political detainees, there is no protection.

And Lee Eu Seng, the general manager of Nanyang Zhao Pao, was put into solitary confinement not once but twice, and it is to his credit he withstood that kind of real torture. TT Rajah, a lawyer who was detained for two and half years, was put under solitary confinement for six months. Twice. Said Zahari was put into solitary confinement four times in his long 17 years of detention. It is to our credit that we did not back down despite our difficult ordeal. We stood our ground and held on to our integrity.

Today, they are asking us to be magnanimous. What does magnanimity mean? Only those who have suffered have the moral right, the moral standing to be magnanimous, not the culprit. The culprit can seek forgiveness, if they admit their mistakes and apologise for it. Not for the victims of this torture to seek forgiveness. We are the ones who have to be magnanimous, and we are prepared to be magnanimous provided the culprits admit their mistakes and seek our forgiveness.

In my statement which I released to the press in 1972, through my wife Beatrice Chen, and which was of course suppressed by the newspapers, but was distributed a lot to all student organisations—I said the proper way to settle our case is that you must release us without conditions. Unconditional release. Moreover, you must compensate us for our long detention and also apologise. I said I’m prepared to forgo these two last conditions of having to compensate us and also having to apologise to us because I don’t believe an arrogant man like Lee Kuan Yew would concede easily. On that question of release unconditionally—that we stand firm, I stood firm and had to suffer for two decades. That is the price that we had to pay for our integrity.

In Singapore, we have a situation where the government leaders said they have integrity that has to be sustained by the highest pay in the world, but yet they demand from political opponents and detainees an integrity that has to be sustained by the longest imprisonment in the world. This kind of two types of integrity, to compare them is to compare heaven and earth. Why should anybody has to sacrifice so much just to sustain his integrity and his beliefs? And the government have to reward themselves with so much high pay. This is the immorality of the political situation in Singapore today.

Now, detention without trial is not a peaceful action. It is an act of violence. They come to see you not in the daylight with an invitation card. They come in the morning, 4am. That is the time when decent people sleep, and when political terrorists and tyrants strike. And when you are detained, you are subjected to all kinds of mental and even physical torture. This is not only unique for the 1963 batch, it was also practised in many other batches of detention: 1972, and as late as 1987. When Teo Soh Lung and her group of so-called marxist detainees were subjected to mental and physical torture. ... And women lawyers can be subjected to torture. But when these women lawyers came out and issued a statement to describe how they have been tortured, they were again detained and compelled to withdraw their accusation.

What type of rule of law is that when the accuser can be punished by the accused against the government, and compelled to withdraw their accusation? Is it not a rule of law justice turned upside down? Now this is a situation where even the Law Society dare not utter a word of protest. They are so impotent after what they had done to the Law Society in 1987.

Now, Poo Soo Kai has written a very good article on Operation Coldstore. In it, he has revealed a lot of declassified British archive documents, showing how the British and Lee Kuan Yew conspired and collaborated to crush the opposition before the 1963 General Elections. The whole aim of this merger was to crush the opposition before the 1963 elections.

And today, the PAP is standing on high moral ground, demanding human rights in other countries, even demanding the realisation of political detainees in Myanmar. But precisely on what moral ground are they standing to have this demand? In examining their past records, they are standing on a pedestal that is leaking with worms and vermin, Let them repent first their own dismal record of human rights and then you may have the moral right to cast aspersions on other people's lack of human rights.

Poh Soo Kai has also written the last chapter of this book [The Fajar Generation], about the future of Socialism. Many of you may ponder what is the relevance of Socialism in this era. after 50 years when the club was formed, Socialist movements all over the world has suffered a lot of setbacks and even defeats, and some wonder whether we are still relevant. The recent economic crisis, the recent financial crisis, has once again exploded the corruption and immorality of the capitalist system, and feel that human beings should deserve something better than a system that is generated by greed and by corruption.

Now some of you may have heard that when you are young you are idealistic, when you're old you are realistic. Now this is the kind of rubbish that is used by those who have either lost their ideals or have sold their ideals for self-interests. Each should not wither one's ideals or convictions. If anything, it should only consolidate and make it more resolute. If age has anything to do with it, it is only by way of expression and application of these ideals and convictions having the benefit of a youthful experience. And a life without convictions, without idealism, is a mere meaningless existence, and I'm sure most of you will agree that as human beings, we are worthy of a life much more meaningful than just that.

Thank you.

[Dr Lim Hock Siew is currently 78 years and is a retired physician.

[He remains a staunch socialist.]

[Lee Kuan Yew remains in political office, and now holds the title of Minister Mentor.]