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Appointment at University of Chile Sparks Protests

The University of Chile, the oldest and most prestigious center of learning in Chile, has recently experienced its most serious crisis ever. The government appointment of Jose Luis Federici as rector of the university in August sparked a university-wide protest and demand for his resignation. Federici took the unprecedented action of closing the university during the month of September in reaction to the widespread unrest.

Faculty and student strikes over economic issues in the middle of August were the first signs of dissatisfaction and unrest at the university. The rector at that time, General Roberto Soto Mackenney, resigned as a result. General Augusto Pinochet, the president of Chile, designated Federici as the new rector, the first civilian rector of the University of Chile during 14 years of military rule.

Faculty and students opposed Federici's appointment for two reasons. First, the government did not consult the University Council, a democratically elected body made up of the university deans, academic advisors, and the director of the Institute for International Studies, before it appointed Federici. The Council had prepared its own slate of candidates for the position of rector. This slate did not include Federici, who was an undistinguished faculty member of the Department of Economics. The Council viewed the government appointment as a major step backward in the liberalization process that has characterized the university administration in the last two years. During this time, the rector sought the advice of the Council in many decisions.

New “Rationalization” Policy

The second criticism is the selection of Federici to implement the government policy of “rationalization” of the university system. This plan is designed, among other objectives, to reduce drastically the government's direct fiscal contribution to the university budget, forcing the university to seek and depend on private funding sources. The plan will also direct university research more towards the needs of industry rather than basic research. In addition, substantial cuts in personnel are planned. One of Federici's first announcements as rector was that the 1988 budget for Chile's university system would rise by 8.8% but that the University of Chile would receive no increase (Hoy, No. 529, 7-13 September 1987, p. 14).

Federici, a commercial engineer, seemed particularly suited to carry out the job of drastically restructuring the university. He had previously held several government positions, including Minister of Economics. While head of the national railroad company in 1975, he fired more than 5,000 workers in preparation for the sale of the company to private interests. Later, as head of the national coal company, he dismissed several thousand workers.

Opposition to the appointment of Federici was university-wide, cutting across political and ideological lines. Students, faculty, the University Council, and six of the nine members of the university's Junta Directiva (similar to a board of trustees) called for Federici's removal. The opposition of a majority of the Junta Directiva is particularly significant since the members were all chosen under the previous rector and were approved by Pinochet. In response to student occupation of university buildings and the general opposition to his appointment, Federici closed the university in September and proceeded to fire several deans and 35 professors. The dismissals later rose to over 80 faculty members. Since August, over 150 students have been dismissed.

International Concern Grows

Student protests against the appointment of Federici and the intervention of the government in the affairs of the University of Chile turned violent at the end of September. Police used tear gas and water cannons to break up one demonstration at the university. On another occasion, a student was shot in the head during a demonstration in front of the municipal theater.

A number of scientific and professional societies in the U.S. protested to the Chilean authorities against the dismissal of faculty and students and the closing of the university. Many were concerned that the closing of the university would severely disrupt academic and scientific activity at the university, especially considering the long tradition of collaboration between the U.S. and Chilean scientific communities. The AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, the National Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Medicine, and the American Association of University Professors were among those who sent letters and telegrams of concern.
It is ironic to note that one of the arguments for the appointment of Federici made by Minister of Education Jose Antonio Guzman to Pinochet was that a civilian rector would improve the image of the military regime before the international community. Perhaps due to internal and international pressure, Federici stepped down on 29 October and was replaced by another civilian, Juan de Dios Vial-Larrain, a distinguished philosophy professor at the Catholic University. Federici’s exit and the appointment of Vial-Larrain appear to be positive steps on the part of the government, although the faculty did not win its demand to elect democratically the new rector. Faculty at the University of Chile believe that it is too early to tell what impact Vial-Larrain will have on the university as rector. Vial-Larrain has accepted the resignations of the members of the Junta Directiva and has formed his own group of personal advisors, including several scientists. One critical indicator will be his decision on whether or not to reinstate the dismissed faculty members. If he continues the government’s policy of “rationalization,” it is unlikely that the university community will accept him as a satisfactory alternate.

— Janet Gruschow

Greater Attention to Human Rights Visible in the Soviet Union

During the last few months, there have been continued signs of some relaxation in Soviet policy on human rights. Under the terms of decrees passed by the Supreme Soviet in February, the Soviet authorities have continued the early release of some political prisoners. Others have had their sentences reduced under an amnesty passed on June 18, in commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The June amnesty is the first Soviet amnesty that covers some (but by no means all) political offenses. In addition, many more people have received permission to emigrate than during 1986, and there are signs that the Soviet authorities may now be willing to take action against the abuse of psychiatry.

Nevertheless, despite these positive developments, many political prisoners remain in labor camps, psychiatric institutions, or in exile. Early release has not been accompanied by rehabilitation, i.e., by an official acknowledgement that the people concerned had been wrongfully imprisoned. Those who have been freed thus encounter numerous administrative obstacles in their attempts to find employment and residence permits.

Early Releases

At the end of October 1987, the Helsinki Watch Committee in New York estimated that, since the beginning of the year, approximately 235 political prisoners had been granted early release from prison and a further 30 or so had been discharged from psychiatric institutions. Among those who have been freed are 81 scientists. At least 55 scientists remain imprisoned, in exile, or in psychiatric institutions for political reasons. (Given the problems in obtaining reliable information, it is reasonable to assume that the actual number is higher.)

Officially, prisoners selected for early release under the February decrees are required to sign a statement disavowing future illegal anti-state activity. (See Clearinghouse Report, Spring 1987.) In some cases, prisoners who refuse to sign such statements have been denied early release. These prisoners include at least four scientists: philologists Georgiy Badzio and Elena Sannikova, zoologist Mart Niklus, and engineer Josif Zisels.

Many of those who have been released have encountered difficulties in obtaining residence permits (without which it is illegal to reside in a given city) and employment. Helsinki Watch reports that permission to live in Leningrad is currently being granted to ex-political prisoners for a period of one year only. In the Ukraine and other republics, former prisoners have been subjected to administrative surveillance, interrogations, and various forms of intimidation, and some have been denied residence permits in their home towns.

Most of the ex-political prisoners released under the decrees or the amnesty who formerly lived in Moscow have been given permission to return. This is not the case, however, for those who completed their sentence and were released before the February decrees took effect. They are apparently subject to a recent Soviet law (Decree no. 736 of 6 August 1985) which prohibits people who have served terms of prison or exile from obtaining Moscow residence permits, even if they were formerly registered in the city. They are also forbidden to visit Moscow except with special authorization, which is granted only for the most urgent reasons, such as the death of a relative.

Two scientists are among those known to have been refused permission to return to Moscow: biologist Sergei Kovalyov, recently released after serving a ten-year term in labor camp and internal exile, and now living outside Kalinin, where he works as a fireman in a local theater; and mathematician Alexander Bolonkin, who has served three consecutive terms in labor camp and exile (1972-1984) and who has been forced to remain in the town of Ulan-Ude in Buryatiya, where he served his last term of exile.

With one or two exceptions, none of the scientists lately released from prison has been offered work commensurate with his or her qualifications.

The Terms of the Amnesty

Some of those still in prison may be eligible for release, or a reduction in their sentence, under the June amnesty. The amnesty, which is to be implemented over a period of six months, covers people sentenced under Articles 190-1, 190-3 (“organization of, or active participation in, group actions disrupting the peace”), and 142 and 227 (unauthorized religious practices). Some categories of prisoners (for example, war veterans, women with under-age children, pensioners) convicted under these articles are eligible for immediate release. Others are to
have the remainder of their sentence halved (or reduced by one-third if they have been sentenced more than twice).

The amnesty specifically prohibits the release of people sentenced for some of the most common political offenses: Articles 64 (“betrayal of the Motherland,” which includes “flight abroad”); 70 (anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda); 80 (evading conscription); and 83 (illegally leaving the country). However, people sentenced under these articles may have the remainder of their sentences reduced.

It should be noted that the amnesty decree states that “habitual violators of camp regimen” are not eligible for release or a reduction in their sentence, regardless of the article under which they have been sentenced. Thus, the Soviet authorities may keep in prison anyone who has protested against prison conditions or who has committed the most minor infraction of camp regulations, such as lateness for roll-call.

For those who are unlikely to be released, prison conditions remain harsh. In its 1987 annual report, Amnesty International notes that: “Conditions in the prisons and colonies of the corrective labor system...remained consistently poor. Prisoners were kept on monotonous, meager rations with only rudimentary medical care, and had to meet excessively high work targets, often involving heavy physical labor. Failure to meet these targets and other infractions of the rules incurred administrative penalties ranging from cancellation of visits and letters to transfer to harsher conditions.” The Amnesty report covers the year 1986, but there is nothing to indicate that prison conditions have improved recently.

Political Prisoners in Psychiatric Institutions

Some 30 political prisoners have been released this year from psychiatric institutions. Among those freed are five scientists: engineer Vladimir Beletsky, radio physicist Armen Saakyan, psychiatrist Algirdas Stratkevicius, embryologist Vladimir Stryinsky, and engineer Vladimir Titov. At least 16 scientists, engineers, and health professionals remain forcibly detained in psychiatric hospitals.

Over the last few months the Soviet press has voiced considerable criticism of widespread abuse within Soviet psychiatry. (See Clearinghouse Report, Spring 1987.) Although the press has not, to date, referred specifically to the internment of political dissidents, it has been acknowledged that people have been committed to psychiatric institutions without any medical justification. For instance, on July 11 the government daily, Izvestia, published an article which reported that people had been interned in psychiatric institutions simply because they had complained persistently to the local authorities about various injustices they had encountered.

The Soviet authorities are clearly concerned about the image of Soviet psychiatry in the West. Soviet officials told a visiting State Department delegation in October that a number of reforms will be introduced in psychiatric services. Control over special psychiatric hospitals is to be transferred from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Health. In addition, without publicly admitting that abuses have occurred, they are about to review the cases of all those currently confined in psychiatric institutions to check for improper committals. The Soviet authorities also stated that they are preparing amend-
ments to the mental health law that would allow patients to appeal in the courts against forcible interment in psychiatric institutions.

Although such changes in committal procedures would constitute a step forward, they could be of limited significance unless accompanied by changes in the accepted definition of mental illness which currently allows the expression of dissenting political views to be diagnosed as a symptom of mental abnormality. U.S. officials are pressing the Soviet authorities to abandon the notorious theory of “sluggish schizophrenia,” originally formulated by Professor Andrei Snezhnevsky.2 Professor Snezhnevsky’s death last summer may open the way for an official repudiation of his theory. If this were to happen, however, it would not necessarily affect the other diagnoses commonly used to commit dissidents to psychiatric hospitals.

The Soviet psychiatric establishment is lobbying hard to be readmitted to the World Psychiatric Association at the 1989 WPA Convention. As part of this lobbying campaign, a number of psychiatrists in the West have been invited to visit psychiatric hospitals in the Soviet Union. According to Ellen Mercer of the American Psychiatric Association, such invitations have been extended to American psychiatrists, but the Soviet authorities have not responded to the APA’s request to send its own delegation to the Soviet Union.3 Mercer says it appears that the Soviet authorities are trying to by-pass the APA in their efforts to return to the WPA. Until there is clear evidence, however, that the Soviets have abandoned the practice of committing political dissidents to psychiatric institutions, the APA will continue to oppose Soviet readmission to the WPA.

Refuseniks

This year has seen a considerable increase in the number of exit permits issued to Jews, Armenians, and ethnic Germans wishing to emigrate. At the beginning of November, the Vienna-based Inter-Governmental Committee for Migration announced that 6,251 Soviet Jews had been granted exit visas since the beginning of 1987,4 compared with a total of 945 visas issued during the whole of 1986.

In September, apparently as a good-will gesture in advance of Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze’s visit to Washington later in the month, the Soviet authorities announced that they would grant exit permits to fifteen of the longest-term refuseniks, including seven scientists and their families: mathematician Iosif Begun, released from labor camp in February; statistician Viktor Brailovsky and his wife Irina, a mathematician; radio engineers Boris Kun and Arkady Mai; cyberneticist Yevgenia Palanker; and computer programmer Alla Sud. Even more surprising was the Soviet change of heart towards economist Ida Nudel and engineer Vladimir Slepk and his wife, refuseniks for over 16 years who were told in October that they would be allowed to leave for Israel.

All these scientists had been denied exit visas in the past on the grounds that they had at one time had access to state secrets. The Soviet authorities operate with a very broad (and unpublished) definition of what constitutes a state secret and use the secrecy argument to prevent emigration long after the information in question could be of any use to the West. Gorbachev has stated that the secrecy rules should be revised so as to
allow emigration after five years or, in exceptional cases, ten. To date, however, there is no sign of an overall shift in policy, and applications for emigration continue to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

— Jane Cave

Notes

SPECIAL APPEAL: Four Imprisoned Soviet Scientists

Among the Soviet political prisoners who remain in prison are four scientists sentenced under Article 70-2 to ten years imprisonment under special regime (the harshest category) to be followed by five years internal exile. All four are currently serving their sentence in Perm Labor camp 36-1 in the Ural Mountains. Vitaly Kalynchenko, an engineer, was sentenced in May 1980 for his participation in the work of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. Zoologist Mart Niklus, was sentenced in January 1981 for writing and circulating "anti-Soviet declarations and articles," including the Baltic Appeal of August 1979 in which 45 activists from the three Baltic republics called on the West to repudiate the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Vasyl Ovsienko, a philologist, was arrested in labor camp in 1981 while already serving a three-year sentence handed down in February 1979 (for Ukrainian nationalist and human rights activity) and was sentenced again in August 1981. Enn Tarto, an Estonian philologist, was sentenced in April 1984 for writing and signing open letters and appeals, including the Baltic Appeal.

The four men have already served lengthy terms for political activities (Kalynchenko: 1966-1976; Niklus: 1958-1966; Ovsienko: 1973-1977; Tarto: 1956-1960, 1962-1967). In March 1987, Mart Niklus was transferred to Lefortovo KGB investigation prison in Moscow, where he reportedly refused to sign the document required for his release. In April he was returned to Perm.

Readers are requested to send politely worded letters urging the immediate release of these prisoners to: Ambassador Yuri Kashlev, Department of Humanitarian and Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Smolenskaya-Sennaya Ploshchad 32/34, Moscow 121200, USSR, and to the director of the Perm labor camp: Nachalnik, uch. V-539/36-1, pos: Kuchino Chusovskoi raion, Permkskaya oblast 618236, USSR. (Further information about these cases may be obtained from the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program.)

Clinics, Hospitals Targeted for Attacks in Mozambique

In the continuing strife between the Mozambican National Resistance (MNR) and the Mozambican government, medical personnel, health clinics, and patients in hospitals have been the frequent victims of violence. Moreover, health services have fallen drastically since the early 1980s when government health care policies began to have a positive impact on the population's health.

Mozambique, a former Portuguese colony, won its independence in 1975. The socialist government nationalized the health care system and gave a high priority to primary health care. It created health posts in rural areas, trained primary health care providers, imported a number of foreign health care professionals to augment the 126 physicians who remained in the country after independence, and initiated mass immunization programs. Government figures for the national health budget show that in 1974 health spending was 3.3% of the total budget. In 1976, this spending increased to 9.7%; in 1982, to 11.2%. In 1982, over 1,000 health posts were reportedly in operation.

However, due in large part to the intensification of the war in Mozambique between the government and the MNR (or Renamo, as it is known by its Portuguese initials) since the early 1980s, there has been a great disruption in health care services. Government health spending in 1985 decreased to 8.1% as more government money went to the war effort. The officially stated ratio of physicians per population in 1982 was 1 in 161,000. By 1985, it had dropped to 1 in 443,000. Foreign doctors who worked in the rural areas were targets of attack, and many left as a result. There has also been no increase in the number of doctors trained in Mozambique. At the present time, there are reportedly only 135 Mozambican doctors in the whole country. Foreign physicians in the country raise the total number of doctors to around 350.

Next to military and police bases, health care clinics and posts and the health care providers who staff these posts seem to be principal targets of assault by the MNR. The United Nations Children’s Fund reports that between 1982 and 1987, 484 health centers and posts in Mozambique (42% of the total centers) were destroyed. The Fund estimates that some two million people out of a population of 14 million have been deprived of access to health care as a result. In some districts, immunization programs have completely stopped because of the limited access to the outlying areas, the danger to health workers entering the areas, and because of the problem of transporting vaccines.

The Mozambican government claims that many of the centers which had been destroyed or looted are now in operation again, but there are continuing problems in supplying these outlying
units with medical supplies. Moreover, population groups continually shift due to the war, necessitating the closing of some posts, and many health care workers fear to work in the peripheral units due to the war.

A village hospital in Homoine, in the province of Inhambane in southern Mozambique, was a specific target of a massacre which the government blames on the MNR. On 18 July 1987, hundreds of MNR troops reportedly entered the town, initially focusing their attack on the police station. They soon occupied the hospital and turned on the hospital patients and civilian population that took refuge there. Witnesses claimed that the troops killed 50 to 60 patients and health workers in the hospital. In addition, many who attempted to flee to the hospital for safety were cut down. The wards were then stripped of everything: blankets, instruments, and supplies. The official Mozambican News Agency said that 408 people were killed in the massacre. Other witnesses estimated figures this high as well. The MNR denies any responsibility.

Earlier this summer, on 13 May 1987, the MNR captured an American nurse, Kindra Bryan, and six others who were working with the relief agency, Youth With a Mission. The MNR claimed they were trying to ensure the safety of the relief workers. The seven were finally released and recovered in Malawi on 18 August.

It should be noted that both the government of Mozambique and the MNR have been accused of human rights violations, including arbitrary arrest and detention, torture, mutilations, and the killing of civilians. The government reportedly has attempted to curb the rights abuses and to address the economic problems caused by its initial policy of centralization. But the ten-year war between the MNR and the Mozambique government, with no end in sight, will continue to create life-threatening situations for health care providers in the rural areas and affect financing and provision of health care to the general population.

— Kari Hannibal

Notes

2. The MNR (Renamo) was created after Mozambican independence by the Ian Smith government of then-Rhodesia with the participation of Mozambicans and Portuguese opposed to the socialist Mozambique government’s domestic and foreign policies. After the Smith government gave way to an independent Zimbabwe in 1980, the MNR lost its outside support. With assistance from South Africa, the MNR was revived to destabilize the socialist government of Mozambique.

Colombian University Community Terrorized by Wave of Violence

Since the end of 1986, nearly 20 faculty members and students at the University of Antioquia in Medellin, Colombia, have been killed in a wave of violence targeted at the university community. More recently, in August, three prominent members of the Faculty of Medicine were murdered. Responsibility for the deaths has been attributed to right-wing paramilitary squads.

Dr. Pedro Luis Valencia, a professor of Public Health and a lecturer at the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Antioquia, was gunned down in his home in the early hours of 14 August 1987. The murder occurred despite the fact that the government had given Dr. Valencia police protection after he received death threats. A group of heavily armed men knocked at his door and when no one responded, they broke down the door with a jeep. The men shot Dr. Valencia to death in front of his wife and children. Dr. Valencia was an elected senator for the left-wing Union Patriota party. He was the third lecturer at the university to be assassinated in a 20-day period, during which five students were also killed.

Dr. Hector Abad Gomez and Dr. Leonardo Betancur Taborda were shot and killed by machine-gun fire in Medellin on 25 August 1987 when they were about to enter the offices of ADIDA, the Antioquia Teachers’ Association. The two men went to ADIDA to pay their respects to Luis Felipe Velez-Herrera, the president of the association, who had been killed earlier that day. Dr. Abad Gomez, 65, was a professor of the Faculty of Medicine and a director of the School of Public Health at the University of Antioquia. He received a master’s degree in Public Health from the University of Minnesota in 1948 and was a medical officer of the Pan American Health Organization in Washington, D.C. as well as a consultant to the World Health Organization.

Dr. Abad Gomez was well-known for his work in defense of human rights. He was president of the Human Rights Committee of Antioquia, the regional office of the national committee for the Defense of Human Rights. He also played an important role in the peace process initiated by former Colombian president Belisario Betancur by assisting in negotiations for a cease-fire between the government and the Popular Army of Liberation (EPL) in Medellin. Dr. Abad Gomez was a member of the Ideological Committee of the Liberal Party in Antioquia, the present ruling party in Colombia.

Dr. Leonardo Betancur Taborda, 41, was the director of the Department of Preventive Medicine at the University of Antioquia. He was also a director of the University of Antioquia Professors’ Association. Dr. Betancur was a member of the Liberal Party and Firmes, a leftist organization. In 1979, the military authorities detained Dr. Betancur at the national prison of Bellavista, accusing him of being an auxiliary to the guerrillas.
The wave of assassinations continued at the University of Antioquia in September when Jose Manuel Callejas Zapata, a statistics professor at the university's public health school, was killed in a street in Medellin. The wife of another professor at the university, Cesar Munoz Arroyave, was wounded when gunmen fired at the front door of their home.

Violence is a daily occurrence in Colombia. Although accurate figures cannot be determined, estimates of the number of victims of political violence during 1986 range from 1,600 to 11,000 and the rate is rising. The source of this violence is disputed, however. Many, including Amnesty International, believe that the assassinations take place with the cooperation or the acquiescence of the military, reminiscent of the "dirty war" in Argentina. According to this view, the goal is to eliminate the political left in Colombia. Nearly 500 members of the Union Patriotica, a leftist coalition associated with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), have been killed in the last two years. Other sources of Colombia's violence include street crime, killings associated with drug trafficking, and guerrilla activities.

In an attempt to halt the rising tide of violence in Medellin, the government of President Virgilio Barco Vargas has prohibited licenses for firearms there and appointed 90 special judges to investigate violent crimes. The government has increased the number of police and military troops in Medellin and elsewhere, and sent special representatives from the attorney general's office to investigate the murders (Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 September 1987).

The AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility has written to President Barco urging his government to conduct an independent inquiry into the deaths of Drs. Valencia, Abad, and Betancur and to make the results of the inquiry public.

— J.G.

## Argentine President Honors Work of American Genetacist

While visiting the University of California-Berkeley in June 1987, Argentine President Raul Alfonsin praised the work of UC Berkeley genetist Mary-Claire King. Under the auspices of the AAAS, King has assisted a genetics laboratory in Buenos Aires to develop methods now used in Argentina to reunite kidnapped children with their families. At a lunch given in his honor, Alfonsin thanked King for the research she has conducted which has allowed scientists to prove the relation of grandchildren to grandparents when the parents are no longer alive. The University of California-Berkeley presented Alfonsin with the Berkeley medal, the highest honor given at the university.

The Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo, a human rights organization in Argentina, have documented 196 cases of infants and children kidnapped from their parents or born in the detention camps during the years of military rule in Argentina — 1976 to 1983. The children were sometimes adopted by strangers or raised in the homes of military personnel. Forty-one of the kidnapped children have been found. But often proof of relation must be shown before the courts allow a child to be returned to his/her true relatives.

Mary-Claire King and Dr. Ana Maria Di Lonardo, director of the Immunology Laboratory at the Hospital Durand in Buenos Aires, developed an Index of Grandpaternity which allows scientists, through an analysis of certain genetic data obtained from blood samples, to calculate the probability that children are related to their biological grandparents. The Hospital Durand has established a National Bank of Genetic Data which now includes blood samples and other information on almost 400 persons in 75 families still searching for their missing grandchildren. Participation in the bank is voluntary.

Scientists look at the human leukocyte antigens, or HLA markers, which are highly variable from individual to individual and useful in determining biological relations. Proof of relation can be determined to 99.9% accuracy. Biological relations can also be excluded using this method of analysis. With the help of this data bank, it will be possible for the children who were kidnapped in Argentina to learn their true identities even when the grandparents or other relatives are no longer living.

— K.H.

## Releases

On 9 September 1987, the Chilean Supreme Court granted Dr. Juan Macaya Martinez release on bail. The Supreme Court decision overturned an earlier decision of the special military prosecutor, Col. Fernando Torres, to deny his release from prison. Dr. Macaya was released on 10 September on a bail of approximately $150.00. His request for release on bail had been denied on five previous occasions.

Dr. Macaya was arrested on 3 June 1986 and charged under the Arms Control Law with assisting an armed opposition group. He had given medical assistance to a man with a gunshot wound in May 1986. It was later found that the wounded man was involved in an incident in which a policeman was shot; but Dr. Macaya maintains that he was unaware of this. When he found that the man was allegedly involved in the incident, he notified the authorities and was later arrested for carrying out his professional responsibilities.

In Algeria, psychiatrist Said Sadi was released from prison on 26 April 1987, several months prior to the completion of his three-year sentence. Dr. Sadi, a founding member of the Algerian League of Human Rights, was convicted in December 1985 for distributing illegal tracts and belonging to an unauthorized organization.
AAAS News

Human Rights Symposium at 1988 AAAS Annual Meeting

The AAAS is holding its 1988 annual meeting in Boston from 11 to 15 February. At this meeting, the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility is sponsoring a symposium on health services provided for victims of torture and other human rights-related trauma. The speakers will discuss the orientations of programs in the United States, Canada, and England, and resource materials available to health professionals and community workers. For more information, please call us at (202) 326-6790.

Health Services for the Treatment of Torture and Trauma Survivors

Sunday, 14 February 1988, 8:30 - 11:30 a.m., Hynes Convention Center at the Prudential Center, Rm. 203

The Problem of Torture and the Response of the Health Professions
Dr. Elena O. Nightingale, Chair, AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility

The Social World Destroyed: The Psychiatric Care of the Refugee Trauma Survivor
Dr. Richard F. Mollica, Clinical Director, Indochinese Psychiatry Clinic, Boston

Caring for Exiled Survivors of Human Rights-Related Trauma
Genevieve Cowgill, Executive Director, Survivors International, Toronto

Efforts to Document Human Rights-Related Trauma
Dr. Glenn R. Randall, Medical Group of Encino, CA

The Medical Foundation: National and International Rehabilitation Efforts
Helen Bamber, Director, Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture, London

Anatoly Koryagin Speaks at AAAS

On October 13, the AAAS hosted a meeting with Soviet psychiatrist Anatoly Koryagin. Koryagin answered questions about the political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union and the ways in which Western governments and organizations can put pressure on the Soviet authorities to end human rights abuses.

Koryagin estimated that 100 or so political prisoners are currently held in psychiatric institutions, the majority of them in special psychiatric hospitals controlled by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Psychiatrists who work in these hospitals have been selected by the KGB and can thus be relied upon to provide the diagnosis needed for the forcible internment of dissidents.

Whether a particular individual is sentenced to labor camp or interned in a psychiatric institution depends, said Koryagin, on the KGB’s assessment of a number of factors: previous psychiatric treatment, the degree to which the person is well known, whether family members will campaign on his behalf, and the presence of psychological factors which can be aggravated while in the hospital. Once interned, dissidents are subjected to injections of neuroleptic drugs, many of which have long-lasting debilitating effects. While receiving this “treatment,” they are under constant pressure to renounce the political or religious convictions for which they were interned.

Asked about the possible impact of reforms currently being introduced in the Soviet Union, Koryagin stated that the Soviet leadership is interested in reform only to the extent necessary to improve economic efficiency and obtain economic and technological assistance from the West. The Soviet desire to improve relations with the West offers the latter increased opportunities to press the Soviet authorities for an end to human rights abuses. Pressure exerted by governments and by organizations such as the AAAS and the APA was instrumental in bringing about the release this year of a number of political prisoners, including Koryagin, from labor camps and psychiatric institutions. Such pressure must be maintained in the future.

On the issue of whether to establish formal contacts between professional organizations in the West and their Soviet counterparts, Koryagin declared himself opposed to such contacts. He pointed out that all professional organizations in the Soviet Union are controlled by the state. Western scientists and others should be aware that the people they meet through formal contacts have been screened by the KGB and are frequently required to report to the KGB on the substance of their contacts with Westerners. Koryagin had harsh criticism for the recent agreement between the American Bar Association and the Soviet Lawyers’ Association. Soviet lawyers have for years taken an active part in the repression of innocent people and are themselves “criminals,” he said. Scientists and others should concentrate on establishing a strong network of contacts with individual Soviet colleagues. When formal contacts are pursued, they should be used to raise questions about Soviet colleagues persecuted for their political views.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

National Association of Medical Examiners

At the meeting of the National Association of Medical Examiners in San Francisco in September 1987, the organization adopted a resolution condemning the participation of health personnel in torture. NAME also formed a committee on human rights. Excerpts from the text of the NAME resolution are provided below.

*Resolved* that the National Association of Medical Examiners states its unequivocal opposition to the use of physical and psychological torture, to any participation of physicians in torture and to the false certification of death in an attempt to obscure same; and be it further

*Resolved* that the National Association of Medical Examiners will use its resources and influence actively to protest, worldwide, torture; to protect from reprisals those who resist the practice of torture; and to foster the development of methods of detection and documentation of torture.
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