Effort Underway to Clear Scientists Targeted by McCarthyism

In the 1940's and 50's, the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) and Senator Joseph McCarthy targeted numerous academics and members of the scientific community with accusations of communist ties. Among those summoned by the Committee were three former AAAS presidents.

In the case of some of these individuals, HUAC went so far as to cite them for contempt of Congress when they asserted their Constitutional rights in the face of Committee inquiries. Many still carry criminal records for their refusal to cooperate with the Committee.

AAAS has undertaken reviews of HUAC reports and related court cases which show twenty-one scientists and academicians among 173 individuals cited for contempt of Congress. Fifty-eight people served time in prison for their refusal to provide answers to HUAC inquiries. None were ever shown to be guilty of acts other than refusing to answer HUAC's questions. Of those fifty-eight people, twenty-five have had their convictions overturned. Thirty-three convictions remain outstanding, leaving those individuals with a criminal record.

AAAS staff have discussed with Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA) the need to finally withdraw the contempt of Congress citations issued against these individuals, and return to them the funds that they paid to the government in fines. A model for this action is found in the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 which offered an apology and financial compensation to Japanese-Americans who were interned during World War II.

It is especially fitting that AAAS undertake this effort as three former presidents of the AAAS were targeted by HUAC. In 1946, Harlow Shapley was serving as AAAS President-elect when he was summoned before HUAC, and called HUAC's activities "fascist." Two years later, Edward Condon, co-founder of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, with Robert Oppenheimer and Albert Einstein, was summoned. Although neither Shapley nor Condon were cited for contempt of Congress by HUAC, Condon was given an "unfavorable" rating regarding his political ties. He overcame much of the stigma attached to the investigation when his colleagues elected him president of AAAS in 1952.

Perhaps the best known of the AAAS presidents to be attacked under McCarthyism was 1951 president, Kirtley Mather. A well-known and highly respected Harvard geologist, Mather was outspoken on numerous social issues. Mather had been critical of HUAC, and was summoned before the Committee in 1953. In the closed hearing, Mather answered Committee inquiries and was not cited for contempt or labelled. As was the case for many HUAC hearings, the transcript of the hearing in which Mather took part was never made public.

*please see “McCarthyism” on page 2*
denying the public and those summoned the opportunity to scrutinizeHUAC's inquiries and evidence, and publicly confront Committee accusations.

A particularly egregious case of infringement upon the rights of a member of the scientific community is that of H. Chandler Davis. Then a professor of mathematics at the University of Michigan, Davis was summoned before the Committee in 1954, but refused to answer any of their questions on his political activity. The Committee sought Davis' admission to having written a pamphlet, "Operation Mind," which argued that HUAC was illegal. Davis' refusal to cooperate brought him a contempt of Congress citation, a $250 fine, and six months in jail, which he served in 1960. The conviction remains outstanding.

In addition to these sanctions, Davis was a victim of the red-baiting that became widespread on university campuses. After an investigation by a University of Michigan committee, Davis was found guilty of "deviousness, artfulness and indiscretion hardly to be expected of a University colleague," and was dismissed by the University of Michigan Board of Regents. Blacklisted by the American academic community, Davis eventually accepted a position at the University of Toronto. While HUAC was active, many state university systems, including California and New York, began to require loyalty oaths for their faculty. Those who refused were terminated, sending a chilling effect throughout the academic and scientific communities.

AAAS intends to carry out efforts in cooperation with Rep. Edwards and other members of Congress until the names of the affected scientists are cleared.

Sean Auton

Rights Appeals on E-mail Get Results

The last issue of the Report on Science and Human Rights featured a story on the launching of the AAAS Human Rights Action Network (AAASHRAN) which distributes human rights alerts concerning scientists, engineers and health professionals over electronic mail. Since then, the Human Rights Action Network has experienced considerable growth and some notable successes.

There are now 550 individuals in the scientific community subscribing to the network, and approximately 45 alerts have been issued over the past 10 months.

Generally, a new alert is issued each week and includes all the information necessary for subscribers to write appeal letters and take other steps to publicize human rights abuses against their scientific colleagues.

One notable case of a positive outcome following the issuance of action alerts was the Chinese government's April 24 release from prison of physicist and economist Wang Juntao, a leader of the pro-democracy movement and Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1989.

In addition to posting an alert, AAAS convened a meeting last October to provide AAAS affiliate organizations an opportunity to meet with Wang's wife, Hou Xiantian. Ms. Hou was building a campaign in the U.S. to encourage support for Wang, and to increase awareness of the severe case of hepatitis from which Wang was suffering in prison. At the meeting, a strategy originally proposed by Ellen Mercer of the American Psychiatric Association was decided on. Working with National Institutes of Health staff and a number of scientific and human rights organizations, a special effort was made to gain Wang's release so that he could receive medical treatment in the U.S. With strong support from the scientific community, this effort proved successful.

Upon his arrival in the U.S., Wang received a thorough medical examination at Columbia Presbyterian Hospital in New York City and was placed on a program of medication. His condition is reported to be much improved, and Wang is now enrolled as a visiting scholar at the Fairbanks Center at Harvard University while continuing to receive treatment for hepatitis.

Another significant case is that of Vil Mirzayanov, a Russian chemist who spent weeks in prison after disclosing in newspaper accounts the Russian government's continued testing of binary nerve gas in violation of two international agreements restricting production and testing of chemical weapons. After a massive campaign by the international scientific community, including two action alerts, the filing of a legal brief, and testimony before the Russian Dumas by AAAS, Mirzayanov was released from prison in March and his case dismissed.

On June 8, a Russian civil court awarded Mirzayanov the equivalent of $12,000 in damages for illegal imprisonment and prosecution. This was the first judicial proceeding in Russia since democratic reforms were instituted to result in a finding that the government had acted improperly.

Although Mirzayanov has been freed and awarded damages, his rights are not yet assured. In June, the Russian Ministry denied him permission to attend two scientific meetings held in Germany. The meetings were convened by the Institute for International Politics and the organization Responsibility for Peace. The grounds given for the denials were that Mirzayanov holds "state secrets," the same reason often used in the past to deny travel visas to prominent Soviet scientists.

This latest action by the Russian government represents a serious violation of international human rights, including the right to "leave any country, including one's own" (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art. 12(2)), as well as rights of expression and association that require an ability to travel and exchange ideas freely.

The Russian government may again be pressed on the issue of Mirzayanov's freedom to travel early next year, as he has been invited to participate in the AAAS Annual Meeting to be held in Atlanta, February 16-21. Mirzayanov has also been nominated for the AAAS Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award, to be presented at that meeting.

Other important cases of human rights abuses against members of scientific professions continue to be posted on the Action Network.

To become a subscriber to the Action Network, send the following message: SUBSCRIBE AAAHRAN youremailname to LISTSERV@GWUVE.GWU.EDU on the Internet.

Morton Sklar
Statistician at the Helm of Amnesty International: An Interview with Mary Gray

Mary Gray, a Professor in the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics, and Computer Science and Information Systems at American University, is currently serving a one-year term as Chair of the Board of Amnesty International, USA.

A statistician with a long history of involvement in human rights and civil rights issues, Professor Gray holds a Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of Kansas, and a J.D. from the Washington College of Law of American University. She is a member of the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility and chair of that committee’s Science and Human Rights subcommittee.

She spoke to Report on Science and Human Rights editor Alexandra Allen about her professional interests, her views on the human rights movement, and the involvement of scientists in human rights work and other social issues.

AA: Let’s start with some of your current research. You’ve done considerable work on the applications of statistics in litigation, primarily in discrimination cases. What observations do you have about the use and misuse of statistics in discrimination cases?

MG: Unfortunately, few judges are trained in statistics, so there’s certainly a lot we can do about training judges.

But more importantly, judges and juries tend to only use statistics to support what they’re already convinced of. It’s very hard to convince them that statistics really mean anything.

The death penalty cases are probably the most blatant example. I spoke at a press conference recently on the Racial Justice Act which would have permitted the use of statistical evidence of racial bias in death penalty cases. I think part of the problem is that some people went in to law because they wanted to avoid numbers, so they don’t want to see them again in the courtroom.

AA: You took on responsibilities last fall as Chair of the Board of Amnesty International USA. What does that role involve?

MG: Being chair of a board means a lot of things. Fundraising is a part of it. Recent issues have been whether I should go on a human rights mission to Rwanda, and what we could do to get writer Taslima Nasreen out of Bangladesh. So it’s the whole spectrum of things a Chairman of a Board gets involved in, both active stuff and administrative stuff. There is also responsibility for public representation of Amnesty.

Professor Mary Gray

AA: Let’s turn to your own background. What influenced your choice of human rights as an area of commitment?

MG: I had always been interested in discrimination issues ever since my very first job where they told me I didn’t need to be promoted to Associate Professor because my husband could support me.

AA: This was at California State University, Hayward?

MG: Yes. I eventually got the President of the University fired and I got my promotion. So I grew up believing that in fact you could fight city hall, to put it in a trite phrase. So to move from discrimination issues into human rights was really sort of a natural thing.

I had belonged to Amnesty and written letters for a long time, but my first real encounter with human rights was getting a mathematician out of prison in Uruguay about 8 or 10 years ago. It was a successful venture and it led me to believe that individuals really could make a difference.

AA: What did you do in that case?

MG: I represented the American Mathematical Society in a delegation to Uruguay. Other members of the delegation were from France, Brazil, and Mexico.

We talked to a lot of people and by the time we left the country the government said they would release him in a month, and sure enough they did.

AA: You’re a scientist who decided to become a lawyer. What went into that?

MG: That’s pretty easy. I was at American University and I got my first pension plan statement and noticed that the projected payouts were different for a man than for a woman with the same accumulation of money. I thought surely it must be a mistake, and of course it wasn’t.

They kept explaining to me that I really didn’t understand statistics, and women live longer than men, and so on. I said if you can guarantee me I’ll live longer, maybe I would go along with this.

I got in touch with lawyers who were litigating this and began to help write amicus briefs and prepare court testimony. I decided to go to law school and ended up finishing law school and being able to write an amicus brief for the Supreme Court case that finally declared that that was illegal.

Going to law school was really a result of the pension plan.

AA: In what ways have you continued your involvement in the legal profession?

MG: Currently, I’m working on some cases involving sex equity in athletics through the National Women’s Law Center.

That’s all pro bono, I don’t do any legal work for pay. The law is not my major profession, I have a good job, and there are many people who can’t afford to pay for legal help, I can’t do a lot of it, but at least I can do a little bit.

On the Human Rights Movement

AA: In the last couple of years, and particularly around the World Conference last year, a lot of attention has been given to the inclusion of economic,
people in Rwanda is just not quite the same as killing people in Russia.

We need to make clear that people are people, and everybody has rights no matter the color of their skin. It sounds trite, but people forget. You have to keep telling them that.

AA: You’ve published quite a bit about women’s rights as human rights. Taking a slightly different tack, what are your observations about women’s experiences as human rights advocates, researchers, and leaders?

MG: Well, I was involved in the anti-war movement in the Viet Nam years, and in some ways its the same now as it was then. The women should lick the envelopes and the men should do the important jobs. There is a glass ceiling. I would be ignoring the obvious to say that there’s not. But there is some progress. At Amnesty, we now have an African male (from Senegal) heading the organization internationally in London.

There are very few women heading human rights organizations, and that will change eventually. Unfortunately, there are men and women who don’t want to take orders from women.

Scientists, Human Rights, and Public Service

AA: How do you see the level of interest in human rights issues among scientific professionals?

MG: I think it varies among different professional societies. Some, the American Statistical Association (ASA) being one example, have maintained a strong interest over a period of many years. In others I think we’re seeing the same

---

Scientists’ Rights Threatened in Eastern Europe

Although much of the apparatus of repression is being removed by reform governments in Central and Eastern Europe, new human rights problems are emerging with special implications for the scientific and academic communities. After communism was overthrown, several Central and Eastern European nations, notably Bulgaria, Germany, and the former Czechoslovakia, adopted “decommunization” or “illustation” laws that disqualify former high-level communists and secret police collaborators from positions of authority in government and key institutions, such as universities and scientific research academies.

Bulgaria’s decommunization law is specifically targeted to scientific institutions, including the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the principal universities. It has barred a substantial number of researchers and professors from policy-making posts, such as board memberships and deparmental chairs, although they have not been dismissed from their regular employment.

The decommunization laws adopted in Germany and the Czech Republic are even more comprehensive, covering a wider group of individuals, and applying the harsher penalty of dismissal from employment. In the state of East Saxony
in eastern Germany, more than 10,000 teachers and university professors have been dismissed from their jobs.

In June, Morton Sklar of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program visited Bulgaria and Germany to conduct preliminary research on decommunization laws and their impact on the scientific and academic communities. Local groups in both nations are helping AAAS to identify those adversely affected by the dismissal policies, and to gather information on the procedures used to carry out the dismissals. A follow-up mission to compile and review these findings on-site is planned in October.

AAAS' concerns regarding decommunization laws, in addition to the fact that scientists and teachers have been singled out, are twofold. First, past political opinions and associations should not be used as a basis for employment restrictions or other penalties, irrespective of the political affiliation involved. Second, judgements regarding the legality of past actions should be made on an individual basis, with adequate due process and fair hearing protections — not through blanket prohibitions that affect all members of an identified group.

One case being reviewed by AAAS and the American Physical Society concerns Dr. Dietrich Demus, a German physicist whose work on liquid crystals has been highly regarded around the world. In 1991, Demus was nominated to lead a new research group established at Germany's University of Halle. However, the Ministry of Science and Research of the State of Sachsen-Anhalt dismissed Demus from the post on the ground that years earlier Demus had provided information to the Stazi (secret police organization in the former East Germany) as a so-called "unofficial" collaborator.

Demus contended that his contacts with the Stazi were typical and expected for all scientific researchers of his level during Communist rule, and that he had not informed his colleagues but in fact had insulated them from investigation. Letters from several former colleagues supported his claims. Nevertheless, Demus was dismissed, apparently without an opportunity to present his case before an impartial body.

It is well accepted that societies emerging from totalitarian regimes that have committed serious human rights abuses are fully entitled to identify and punish those who have committed violations, and prevent them from continuing to participate in the governance of the country. Through its investigation, AAAS aims to ensure that efforts to punish past actions and introduce democratic reforms do not make use of repressive methods similar to those being condemned.

A report by AAAS analyzing the impact of decommunization laws in Central and Eastern Europe is expected by the middle of next year.

Morton Sklar

Human Rights and Life Sciences Examined

AAAS recently organized a response from several professional societies and research centers to a United Nations inquiry on the subject of human rights and the life sciences. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights, in a March 1993 resolution, invited governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to "inform the Secretary General of activities being carried out to ensure that the life sciences develop in a manner respectful of human rights..."

AAAS was specifically asked to respond to this request in a November 1993 letter from U.N. Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, Ibrahima Fall, to AAAS Science and Human Rights Program Director, Audrey Chapman.

The U.N. resolution alluded to the "rapid development of the life sciences and the dangers that certain practices may pose to the integrity and dignity of the individual." Also referenced was the right articulated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights to "enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications."

AAAS responded to the U.N. request in collaboration with the American College of Physicians, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Society, American Nurses Association, and the Howard University College of Medicine. The groups undertook a survey of 300 professional associations and scientific groups and convened a consultation last March.

At the consultation, Dan Brock, a professor at Brown University and a representative of the American Association for Bioethics, noted that while the guidelines currently used in the U.S. to resolve bioethical issues do not explicitly employ a human rights framework, they do contain implicit commitments to human rights principles. Participants in the consultation affirmed the universality of human rights standards and their applicability to the life and health sciences in all countries, including the U.S.

The survey and consultation brought to light numerous publications and conferences, professional codes and training programs, human rights monitoring activities, and legal initiatives related to human rights and the life sciences. Nonetheless, participants in the consultation concluded that much remained to be done to ensure that the life sciences develop in a manner consistent with human rights standards which give emphasis to protecting and promoting individual dignity and worth.

In April, AAAS and the collaborating organizations submitted a report to the U.N. In it they recommended that the U.N. Human Rights Commission appoint Special Rapporteurs to investigate three rapidly developing scientific fields and construct mechanisms to monitor human rights observance. The fields recommended for investigation were: 1) human subjects research; 2) reproductive research and technology; 3) genetic research and technology. It was also recommended that the United Nations establish an international bioethics/human rights commission to monitor advances in the life and health sciences, and to evaluate the scientific developments in the light of established human rights norms.

For a copy of the report to the United Nations, contact the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program.
Computer Applications To Document Human Rights Abuses

Human rights groups are increasingly using computer databases to manage information on abuses and perform analyses that are not possible on a case-by-case basis.

Experienced teams in various countries are exploring database design strategies to capture the myriad of relations between items of data representing violations. Ongoing investigations by Truth Commissions in countries with a history of violations lend additional importance to the establishment of workable databases.

To develop a standard format for human rights databases, the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program hosted a workshop from July 25-29 on "Database Design for Documenting Human Rights Violations." Because computer systems used by human rights advocates range from personal computers to mainframes, workshop participants addressed database design standards for a wide variety of circumstances.

Copies of the final report from the Database Design Workshop can be obtained by contacting the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program. E-mail: dsalcedo@aaas.org.

The analyses which database programs are capable of conducting rely on the availability of sufficient amounts of timely, accurate, data. To facilitate the sharing of such information among human rights organizations in North America, the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, Amnesty International-USA, and HURIDOCS will cosponsor a meeting on November 10-12 at AAAS headquarters in Washington, D.C.

The meeting will be the second of its kind, the first having been held last year on "Coordinating Human Rights Documentation in North America." Representatives of U.S. and Canadian human rights groups agreed then that much could be accomplished by improving the sharing of information on a wide range of topics from urgent actions on specific cases, to more general analytical reports. Strategies for accomplishing this goal will be the focus of the upcoming meeting which will inaugurate the Canada/U.S. Human Rights Documentation and Information Network.

Daniel Salcedo

For Human Rights Organizations: A Primer on Communications Surveillance

Telephone conversations, fax transmissions, and electronic mail can be intercepted by governments and others. David Banisar of Privacy International has written a paper that can help human rights advocates become aware of vulnerabilities and measures that can limit surveillance. A Primer on Communications Surveillance for Human Rights Organizations, briefly excerpted below, is available free of charge from the Washington office of Privacy International. Phone: 202-544-9240. Fax: 202-547-5482. e-mail: pib@epic.org on the Internet. The Primer is also available through the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, co-publisher of the nine-page, referenced paper.

In numerous instances, human rights groups have been targets of surveillance. In 1991, wiretaps and microphones were found in the offices of the Mexican Human Rights Commission. In 1993, officials discovered an office operated by the Guatemalan army in the Mail and Telegraphy Administration that intercepted mail sent to human rights advocates and labor organizers. The U.S. Department of State, in its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1992, reports widespread use of wiretaps by both-government and private groups in dozens of countries.

These incidents are not limited to developing countries. In the U.S., the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the 1980s used surveillance techniques to monitor the activities of CISPIS, a group critical of U.S. governmental policy in El Salvador. In the United Kingdom and France, the law allows the government to conduct extensive legal wiretaps for non-criminal investigations. It was disclosed in 1993 that French counter-intelligence agents wiretapped the telephones of prominent journalists and opposition party leaders during the mid-1980s.

The need for human rights groups to be concerned with surveillance is obvious. Governments monitor human rights groups to discover what they know, who their sources are, and what their future activities will be. A lack of secure communications heightens the threat of physical harm to human rights advocates.

Unfortunately, most types of electronic communication can be intercepted without a high level of expertise or expensive equipment. Surveillance equipment is not difficult to construct and is available in many electronics stores. Most manufacturers sell surveillance devices to any buyer without restrictions.

Telephones, both standard and cordless, are a major area of concern. There are several techniques for tapping standard telephones which are undetectable to the target. Cordless telephones are especially easy to intercept. Many of the older models broadcast just above the top range of the AM radio band and conversations can be easily overheard with any AM radio. Newer models operate in please see "Primer" on page 7
conversations, can be used to protect computer communications and to verify the identity of the sending party. Many commercial software packages such as Lotus Notes and upcoming versions of the Microsoft and Apple Computer operating systems will have built-in encryption, although encryption in these products may be weakened to allow for export. Efforts are also underway to implement encryption as a standard for all electronic mail. Called Privacy Enhanced Mail (PEM), it will be several years before it will be in common use.

However, there is a program currently available at little or no cost that is ideal for human rights advocates. Pretty Good Privacy (PGP) was developed by Phil Zimmerman, an American software engineer and human rights activist, who developed the program for use by human rights groups and individuals when the U.S. government attempted to enact legislation to limit use of encryption in 1991.

To use PGP, a person writes out a message using a word processor, runs PGP to scramble the message, then sends the scrambled file as a mail message. The receiver runs PGP to convert the message back to a readable form. The process takes only an additional minute or two, depending on the length of the message and the processing speed of the computer. PGP can also provide digital signatures that are unique to the sender and can verify that a message is from the stated sender. Thus, readers of electronically transmitted alerts from Amnesty International, Americas Watch, or other human rights groups can be assured that the alerts have not been altered by people wishing to disrupt the groups' activities.

Finally, PGP can also be used to protect files on a computer. It can prevent the accessing of electronically stored papers or correspondence in the event of a physical break-in or theft of a computer. Many groups in Central America use PGP to protect databases of human rights abuses. The Primer contains complete information on obtaining PGP on the Internet.

News In Brief

Directory of Persecuted Scientists

The 1994 Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals has been published by the AAAS. The Directory documents the cases of 468 scientists, engineers and health professionals and students in these fields who experienced human rights abuses over the last year. Countries with the greatest number of affected individuals were China, Syria and Libya. Professional disciplines with the greatest number of affected individuals were medicine (47) and engineering (55).

The Directory includes complete information to enable readers to send letters of appeal to government officials. New to this edition is a section on laws and policies in several countries which adversely affect the human rights or professional freedoms of the scientific community. The Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals is available from the Science and Human Rights Program for $10 per copy.

On Health Care and Human Rights

Health Care Reform, A Human Rights Approach, is available from Georgetown University Press in Washington, D.C. ($14.95 paper, $37.50 cloth) Edited by Audrey Chapman, and published in June, this timely volume argues that a right to a basic and adequate standard of health care should be adopted as the fundamental premise of a reformed health care system for the United States. Contributors examine the problems of the health care system and solutions suggested by a human rights approach.

AAAS Consulting Service Taking Requests

The AAAS Human Rights Consulting Service in Information Management is taking requests from human rights organizations for low-cost or no-cost technical assistance in data analysis, quantitative methods, and electronic communications. For a brochure describing the Consulting Service write or phone the Science and Human Rights Program, or forward E-mail to shrp@aaas.org on the Internet.

Human Rights and Environment Declaration

The first-ever declaration of principles on human rights and the environment is being developed at the United Nations. A draft declaration was submitted to a U.N. sub-commission in July by U.N. Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment, Mme Fatma Zohra Ksentini. It is the first international legal instrument to address comprehensively the connections between human rights and the environment.

The declaration was included with the Special Rapporteur’s final report to the sub-committee on Human Rights and the Environment. Included in the three-page declaration is the following statement of principle: “All persons have the right to an environment adequate to meet equitably the needs of present generations and that does not impair the rights of future generations to meet equitably their needs.”

Rather than proclaiming new rights, the declaration seeks to identify the environmental components of existing rights. The next step for the declaration is consideration by the full Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations.

The Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund (SCLDF) has been actively involved in the development of the declaration and is collecting comments for use in further U.N. consideration. To receive a copy of the declaration or to submit comments, contact SCLDF at:

International Program
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund
180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, California 94104-4209
E-mail: scldfintl@igc.apc.org
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