Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals
About the cover: The photographs on the cover are of three individual scientists who have been victims of human rights violations. They are, from top to bottom:

- Dr. Moncef Marzouki, a physician from Tunisia;
- Dr. Debora Diniz, an anthropologist and bioethicist from Brazil; and
- Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim, a sociologist from Egypt.

Details about their experiences may be found in the Case Summaries section of this report.

This report is a product of the Science and Human Rights Program of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), which operates under the oversight of the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility (CSFR). The CSFR, in accordance with its mandate and Association policy, supports publication of this report as a scientific contribution to human rights. The interpretations and conclusions are those of the author and do not purport to represent the views of the AAAS Board, the Council, the CSFR, or the members of the Association.


© 2003 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science
All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.
# Table of Contents

Preface.................................................................................................................. vii  
Introduction.............................................................................................................. 1  
   About the Science and Human Rights Program ............................................... 3  

Activism in Action: Stories of Success................................................................. 5  
   Moncef Marzouki (Physician, Tunisia) .............................................................. 5  
   Debora Diniz (Anthropologist, Brazil)............................................................... 7  

Annual Science and Human Rights Reception .................................................. 9  

AAASHRAN Casework Activities,  
June 2001-December 2002 ................................................................................. 17  

Case Summaries .................................................................................................... 21  
   Bangladesh ........................................................................................................ 21  
   Belarus ................................................................................................................ 22  
   Brazil ................................................................................................................... 23  
   Burma (Myanmar) ............................................................................................. 25  
   China .................................................................................................................. 26  
   Colombia .......................................................................................................... 30  
   Cuba .................................................................................................................... 31  
   Egypt ................................................................................................................... 32  
   Ethiopia .............................................................................................................. 33  
   Guatemala ........................................................................................................ 36  
   Honduras .......................................................................................................... 39  
   Iran ...................................................................................................................... 40  
   Israel/Palestine .................................................................................................. 41  
   Kenya .................................................................................................................. 42  
   Malaysia ............................................................................................................ 44  
   Russia ............................................................................................................... 44  
   Sri Lanka ......................................................................................................... 46  
   Sudan ............................................................................................................... 47  
   Tunisia .............................................................................................................. 49  
   Turkey ............................................................................................................... 50  
   Uzbekistan ....................................................................................................... 51  

ISSUE ALERT: Turkey .......................................................................................... 52  

Appendix A:  
Guidelines for Adoption of Cases of Concern .................................................. 53
Appendix B:
Universal Declaration of Human Rights ........................................... 57
Preface

I would like to thank Helen Liu, who interned with the Science and Human Rights Program during the summer of 2002 and helped research cases for the AAAS Human Rights Action Network (AAASHRAN); Sage Russell, Senior Program Associate, for the editing of the text; and Matt Zimmerman, Program Associate, for design and layout.

The Science and Human Rights Program also would like to thank the Ford Foundation and the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation for their generous support of the Science and Human Rights Program’s human rights documentation work.

Copies of this report are available from the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program at:

AAAS Science and Human Rights Program
1200 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202 326 6790, Fax: 202 289 4950
E-mail: shrp@aaas.org

This report is also available on the Program’s website at:

Victoria Baxter
Program Associate
AAAS Science and Human Rights Program
Introduction

Since 1992, the Science and Human Rights Program (SHR or the Program) has published the *Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals*. The Directory presents an overview of the Program’s casework, which is conducted through the AAAS Human Rights Action Network (AAASHRAN). AAASHRAN uses e-mail and the Internet to inform AAAS members and other subscribers of cases deserving special attention, and to coordinate scientists’ efforts to appeal to governments on behalf of their colleagues. Two or three cases or issues are circulated each month, with all the information needed to take action provided in a succinct bulletin. The Directory complements the online version of AAASHRAN, which can be accessed at http://shr.aaas.org/aaashran. The AAASHRAN website offers several additional features, including a fully searchable database of all cases from 1994 to the present, a database of appeal letters sent by the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, and sample letters of appeal that individuals can use to draft their own letters.

AAASHRAN builds on the long-standing tradition of letter writing as an effective means of reminding governments that their transgressions have not gone unnoticed. Many scientists who have been released from prison credit their release to the strong international attention to their cases. Dr. Moncef Marzouki, a professor of public health and medical doctor from Tunisia, commented on the effect of international support on his work as a human rights activist during remarks he made at the Science and Human Rights Program reception at the 2002 AAAS Annual Meeting. He stated:

> It has never been easy to be a human rights activist in Tunisia or elsewhere...you have to face your fears, your own doubts, and this is extremely difficult because it is not easy to face repression day after day, month after month, year after year. That is why these receptions are so important because you make it easy for me to be a human rights activist.

Dr. Marzouki has faced constant repression for his outspoken human rights advocacy, including being jailed, fired from his university position, and living with constant police surveillance of his activities. He credits the successful resolution of his case to the pressure on the Tunisian gov-
ernment from thousands of appeal letters sent by his colleagues and other human rights activists around the world.

The Program monitors human rights violations perpetrated against scientists, engineers, and health professionals, and organizes campaigns on their behalf. We encourage scientists, engineers, and scientific and engineering organizations to work for the promotion and protection of the human rights standards enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and international human rights treaties. The Program’s work is based on the principle that these rights are preconditions for scientific endeavor and should be defended and encouraged as a matter of scientific freedom and responsibility. Rights in the UDHR essential to the conduct of science and protection of scientists include the following:

- the right to life, liberty, and security of person (Article 3);
- freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 5);
- freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile (Article 9);
- freedom of movement and residence (Article 13);
- freedom of thought (Article 18);
- the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes the right to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas (Article 19);
- freedom of association (Article 20);
- the right to work, to free choice of employment (Article 23); and
- the right to education (Article 26).

The Program focuses its individual casework on three main areas: 1) violations of scientific freedom and the professional rights of scientists, engineers, health professionals, students in any of these fields, scientific organizations, and professional groups representing their interests; 2) violations of the human rights of scientists not directly related to the conduct of science; and 3) participation by scientists in practices which infringe on the human rights of others. The Program’s guidelines for the adoption of cases of concern appear in Appendix A.

For casework purposes, the Program defines scientists as those who are members of any of the disciplines meeting the criteria for affiliation with AAAS, or accepted as affiliate societies of AAAS. This includes those engaged in research, teaching, other employment or academic study in the physical, natural or social sciences, engineering, or medical and health-related professions. Students in these professions and fields of study are included as well.
Some of the Program’s casework addresses issues at the intersection of science and human rights. Such issues may relate to governmental policies and practices that restrict the ability of scientists to perform their work, misuse science to carry out human rights violations, contravene internationally recognized professional codes of ethics, or target specific groups of scientists or scientific organizations for repression. Examples of issue-related cases include cases involving academic freedom, restrictions on the right to travel, infringements of medical neutrality, or other violations of principles of professional ethics.

The Program also organizes humanitarian and fact-finding missions to investigate human rights issues; prepares documentation for Congress, other US government officials, and international human rights groups; and organizes symposia on human rights-related issues.

About the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program (SHR or the Program) was established in 1977 to give scientists a way to help their colleagues around the world whose human rights are threatened or violated. Mobilizing effective assistance to protect the human rights of scientists around the world remains central to its mission, as well as making the tools and knowledge of science available to benefit the field of human rights.
One of the most gratifying aspects of human rights activism is learning that your letter, your signature on a petition, or your participation in a human rights protest event contributed to the release of a prisoner of conscience. Such successes are moments to celebrate and serve as motivation for those times when the sheer number of human rights abuses seems daunting.

The following testimonies from individuals that have been the subjects of AAASHRAN alerts demonstrate the truth to the famous statement of fellow scientist Margaret Mead: “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed people can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”

The following scientists wrote to AAAS about what it meant to them to know that their colleagues around the world wrote letters on their behalf.

**Moncef Marzouki, Professor of Public Health (Tunisia)**

As a human Rights activist in a rogue state (Tunisia), I have, like many others, been harassed by the secret police. My telephone has been cut for many years, my passport withdrawn. I was arrested many times, intimidated, jailed, and spent months in solitary confinement. Last but not least, I have been fired from my position at the university and had to go into exile.

Facing such a hard situation, you begin by realising how powerless you are and how powerful your opponent is. He can do to you anything he wants, even suppress your life. You can do nothing to him except protest. You can give up and then return to a “normal” life. All you have to do is to shut your eyes, to shut your mouth, and to shut your nose. So corruption, torture, and mock elections can go on, but it is “none of my business.”

The other choice is to stand up for your rights and to cope with the inevitable repression. It happens that some days are harder than others. You have to dig deep in your soul, to find the necessary energy to accept fear and pain and to refuse your hunger for comfort and security.
What can keep you on the track is your deep belief that what you are doing is good, necessary, and useful for the whole society. But this is not enough. You have to feel that your belief is shared by others, that you are backed, and that you are not alone; otherwise the burden cannot be bearable for very long.

Solidarity among groups of activists is a vital necessity for their struggle. It keeps one’s spirits high, reinforces his resistance, and keeps hope even in the darkest moments. This is why the main concern of a dictatorship is to isolate people from each other by all means: misinformation, intimidation, imprisonment.

Solidarity from within the group is expected at any time. Everybody knows that it keeps things going. Nobody would be foolish enough to refuse it or not to prove it to his fellow activists or their families. When the same solidarity comes from out of the group, say from your fellow-citizens, it is more welcomed because you have a direct proof that your struggle is understood and appreciated. You have been heard and somebody is simply telling you thank you. When support comes from outside the country, you are deeply touched. I remember the day I got the first message from Victoria Baxter on behalf of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It was a happy one.

How could people have heard about you, while the dictatorship has done his best to leave you, helpless and forgotten, in your deep shell? Your first sensation is of a deep relief, a deep gratitude to the unknown persons who care about your fate. Then comes the enthusiasm you badly needed. You can repeat to yourself and be sure that it is not self-suggestion: I am not a Don Quixote; there are many of us all over the world sharing the same values, carefully watching what happens elsewhere in the world. What marvellous news!

The most rewarding outcome of this solidarity is that your pessimism about human nature is reviewed. You have been dealing for so long with the effects of the darkest side of human nature that you have lost faith in the possible existence of an enlightened one.

Please keep writing letters, showing interest, lobbying. It has much more effects than one can imagine. It keeps alive the light of a fire refusing to die called human brotherhood.

*Details on Dr. Marzouki’s case are on page **.*
Debora Diniz, Anthropologist and Bioethicist (Brazil)

My name is Debora Diniz. I am a 32-year old Brazilian anthropologist and researcher on feminist bioethics. In September, 2002, I was dismissed from the Catholic University of Brasilia, where I was a graduate professor. My firing was the result of my research on abortion. Being a crime in Brazil, abortion is a hard subject to debate publicly. Although my work on the subject was more academic than political, my participation as a volunteer researcher in a non-governmental feminist organization strengthened the political weight of the findings of my studies. I was fired in the middle of the Brazilian academic semester, something which significantly reduced my chances of finding a vacancy in another university. My dismissal took place in the immediate aftermath of the Manuel-Velasco International Bioethics Prize, awarded to me by the Pan American Health Organization, in its first edition. The prize came in acknowledgment of my research and work in the field of bioethics in Latin America.

Being fired for political reasons is one of the most oppressive situations in life. One feels sentenced to absolute silence. My dismissal was a supreme act of authoritarianism and disrespect. News of my dismissal was given over the phone, as dictated by the chancellor of the university whom I had never met. I felt abandoned, outcast. For some moments I doubted my idealism and ethical commitment to freedom, solidarity, human rights, principles which form the foundation of my research and advocacy in the field of feminist bioethics. To deal with abortion in Latin America is to enact those principles through the democratic practice of moral confrontation. By firing me, the university managed to force me out of my research ideals and social projects. It pains me to confess that for brief moments such intolerance, that oppressive force that simply does not put up with moral differences, was greater than my capacity to react.

However, the international support I received on account of my dismissal, through the many letters sent to the Catholic University of Brasilia, the many expressions of solidarity, especially those of scholars worldwide who were unfamiliar with my work, gave me back the dignity needed to keep up the fight and the idealism. Each letter I received helped me keep up my courage, rescuing me from loneliness and fear. The letters gave me back the sense of academic and political belonging required not to pas-
sively accept the silence the university had imposed on me. Those letters were the live expression of something more important, something beyond the moral controversy of abortion: freedom of speech. I profusely thank all those people who shared their astonishment and indignation in view of such an absurd act. I thank them for their solidarity, their respect, their trust. Even more so, I thank all those who, through their letters and life stories, taught me how important it is to keep one’s freedom of thought.

I will continue to dedicate myself to the subject of abortion and to bioethics. However, this will not be the political focus of my academic career. My case gave rise to a national political discussion about academic freedom, a constitutional principle of Brazilian law yet to be enforced. The letters and statements I received will be decisive in showing how essential a part the academic freedom plays in advancing and strengthening academic research, and, even more so, in developing the moral stance of any society. The worldwide reaction in my case came to prove that freedom of speech is a solid principle in international science, and one that needs to be urgently enforced in Brazil. I consider my case a cornerstone of a badly needed process for the democratization of Brazilian society. I have no doubt that this will be a slow and difficult discussion, but one of essential importance for the ethical growth of Brazilian universities.

*Details on Dr. Diniz’s case are on page **.*
Annual Science and Human Rights Reception

In addition to coordinating letterwriting campaigns on behalf of individual scientists, the Program holds a special reception at the AAAS Annual Meeting to honor a scientist who, through action and example, has promoted human rights, usually at great personal risk. The reception provides an opportunity for members of the scientific community to learn more about the human rights work of scientific societies, the plight of persecuted scientists in other countries, and human rights issues that affect scientists worldwide.

In 2003, the Program will honor Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim of Cairo, Egypt. Dr. Ibrahim is the founder and director of the Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies, a Cairo-based think tank that conducts research on democracy, civil society, and minority rights in Egypt. Dr. Ibrahim has been in a two year court battle and was found guilty on charges of deliberately disseminating false information, spreading malicious rumors about the internal affairs of the State, harming the image of the State abroad, and illegally accepting funds from the European Union for producing a documentary on voter fraud in Egypt. In February 2003, he will start his third trial on these charges.

Throughout his long ordeal, the international scientific community has rallied behind Dr. Ibrahim, sending letters of his behalf and protesting the guilty verdicts. The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program immediate issued an AAASHRAN alert after Dr. Ibrahim’s initial arrest in 2000 and closely followed the case, issuing eight more AAASHRAN alerts as developments occurred in the trial. The full description of his case can be found on page **. The American Sociological Association (http://www.asanet.org/public/humanrights.html) has also been very active in protesting the human rights violations against their Egyptian colleague. In an appeal letter to President Mubarak, ASA President Barbara F. Reskin and ASA Executive Officer Sally T. Hillsman wrote: “…as a scientific society, we are particularly concerned that compromising science, as Dr. Ibrahim’s sentencing surely does, undermines a country’s educational and cultural vitality as well as its economic and political stature.”
Past Honorees include:

2002

Moncef Marzouki is a physician and a professor of public health in Tunisia. For his outspoken criticism of the government’s human rights record, Dr. Marzouki endured years of personal and professional intimidation and harassment. In 1994, after announcing that he would challenge President Ben Ali in the next election, the Tunisian government shut down the Center for Community Medicine, a free clinic he founded. In July 2000, Dr. Marzouki was fired from his position as professor of public health at the University of Sousse because of statements he made during a visit to the United States. In December 2000, he was convicted, in a trial that failed to meet international standards of fairness, of the crime of “spreading false information intended to disturb the public order,” for criticizing Tunisia’s human rights practices in a private paper. In response to an international campaign on Dr. Marzouki’s behalf, the Tunisian government formally suspended the sentence in September 2001. Unable to earn a living and subject to increased repression at home, Dr. Marzouki made the difficult decision to leave Tunisia, and accepted a position in the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Paris at Bobigny, where he currently resides.

2001

Flora Brovina is a pediatrician, poet and human rights activist. An ethnic Albanian from Kosova, Dr. Brovina was arrested by Serbian authorities in April 1999 and sentenced to 12 years’ imprisonment in November 1999, for her support of self-determination for Kosovo, advocacy of peaceful and nonviolent change, and humanitarian activities. During the NATO bombing in the spring of 1999, she elected to remain in Pristina and provide medical care to local people. Flora Brovina was released from prison on 2 November 2000 on the orders of Vojislav Kostunica, the new president of Yugoslavia. She continues her human rights advocacy and medical practice in Pristina.

2000

In October 1999, Dr. Sergey Piontkovski, a marine biologist from Ukraine, was accused of revealing state secrets for publishing his unclas-
sified research on plankton, and of illegal currency transactions for accepting grants from foreign funding organizations. Dr. Piontkovski’s case was taken up by members of the international scientific community, human rights advocates, and friends and colleagues, who organized letter-writing campaigns, shared information on a special website set up for the purpose, and began raising funds for his legal defense. These collective efforts were successful. The authorities eventually dropped the charges against him, returned his passport, and permitted him to leave Ukraine with his family in March 2000. Dr. Piontkovski is now living in the United States. Dr. Sergey Piontkovski believes that the international attention and actions on his behalf were largely responsible for his release.

1999

Aleksandr Nikitin, a Russian engineer, was charged in 1996 with high treason and divulging state secrets for co-authoring a report for the Norwegian-based Bellona Foundation that documented the environmental dangers posed by the abandoned nuclear submarines of the Russian Northern Fleet on the Kola Peninsula. The charges were based on secret retroactive acts and legislation, the application of which was contrary to the Russian Constitution. The St. Petersburg City Court acquitted Aleksandr Nikitin in December 1999. The Prosecutor General appealed this decision to the Supreme Court, which dismissed the appeal in September 2000, bringing the criminal case against Nikitin to a close after five long years. In November 2000, the St. Petersburg City Court ruled that Russia’s nuclear minister, Yevgeny Adamov, had to pay Aleksandr Nikitin 10,000 roubles (the equivalent of $350) for publicly calling him a spy.

1998

Alemayehu Teferra, a civil engineer and former president of Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia, was the only university president ever to be voted into office by the faculty. Dr. Alemayehu was arrested on 2 April 1993, on accusations that he was part of the Red Terror campaign of the former government despite the fact that authorities had absolved him of any crime in 1991. In addition, Dr. Alemayehu was among 42 professors dismissed from Addis Ababa University in April 1993 for criticizing the government when security forces used excessive violence during an antigovernment student demonstration, which resulted in the death of at least one student. Dr. Alemayehu remains detained without charge or trial.
Woldeyes Asrat, a renowned surgeon from Ethiopia and a former professor and dean of the medical faculty at Addis Ababa University, was sentenced to a five-and-a-half prison term in July 1994 for allegedly inciting violence for political ends. There is well-documented evidence that demonstrated Dr. Woldeyes’s commitment to non-violent activity. The charges against him appear to have been politically motivated. Dr. Woldeyes’s was released from prison in December 1998. He suffered from a heart condition and diabetes, conditions that were worsened by delays in providing him with adequate medical attention. Dr. Asrat Woldeyes died on 14 May 1999, shortly after his release from prison.

1997

Ma Thida, a Burmese surgeon and writer, was arrested in 1993 and sentenced to twenty years in prison for the nonviolent expression of her beliefs and her association with Nobel Peace Prize winner, Aung San Suu Kyi, one of the founders of Burma/Myanmar’s main opposition political party. In February 1999, Dr. Ma Thida was pardoned and released on humanitarian grounds. Her health seriously had deteriorated while she was in prison. Dr. Ma Thida suffers from endometriosis and other ailments for which she did not receive adequate medical treatment while in detention.

Wang Dan, a history student in China, was among the leaders of the 1989 democracy movement in China. Wang was Number One on the government’s “most wanted” list for his leadership role in the 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrations, for which he spent four years in prison. Upon his release, he resumed his pro-democracy activities and was arrested again in May 1995. After being held incommunicado for seventeen months, Wang was sentenced in a closed trial to eleven years in prison for “conspiring to subvert the government.” The charges were based on articles published in the overseas press, the receipt of donations from abroad, financial assistance received from two US-based organizations, and participation in a correspondence course offered by the University of California at Berkeley. Wang Dan was released from prison on medical parole and went to the United States in April 1998.

1996

Haluk Gerger, a former assistant professor at the University of Ankara, a well-known intellectual, and a respected writer on nuclear weapons strategy, has been repeatedly imprisoned for the peaceful expression of his opinion. Dr. Gerger is a founding member of the Turkish Human Rights Association. He is an ardent defender of Kurdish
rights, although not a Kurd himself. His writings on the issue and his criticism of governmental policies in response to the armed conflict between Kurdish rebels and Turkish security forces in southeastern Turkey have led to frequent arrests by the Turkish authorities. Dr. Gerger was released from prison in October 1995 and attended the 1996 AAAS Annual Meeting. Since then, he has been imprisoned twice more for articles he wrote regarding the treatment of Kurds in Turkey.

Nguyen Dan Que, a Vietnamese endocrinologist, was arrested for his non-violent criticism of Vietnamese authorities. Dr. Que was dismissed from his post as Director of Cho-Ray Hospital in 1978 for his criticism of Vietnam’s health care policies. Also in 1978, he was accused of “rebelling against the regime,” and detained for ten years in prison without trial. Dr. Que was released from prison in 1988 and rearrested in 1990 for issuing an appeal to individuals and organizations in Vietnam calling for freedom, democracy, and political pluralism in that country. He was sentenced to twenty years of hard labor to be followed by five-years of house arrest. Dr. Que was released in an amnesty in 1998. Dr. Nguyen Dan Que lives in Hanoi, where he continues to advocate for democracy in Vietnam.

1995

Wang Juntao, an economist and renowned human rights and pro-democracy activist, was arrested as he tried to flee to Hong Kong after the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989. Wang is a veteran human rights activist who was first jailed for his activism when he was sixteen. He served as an adviser to Wang Dan and other student leaders of the pro-democracy movement in China in the late 1980s. The Chinese government denounced him as a “black hand” of the student movement. Wang was sentenced to a thirteen-year prison term and spent four-and-a-half years in solitary confinement. He was released from prison in 1994 and traveled to the US to seek medical treatment for hepatitis, which he contracted in prison. Wang Juntao currently resides in New York.

Vil Mirzayanov, a Russian chemist, was imprisoned in 1993 after publishing articles that revealed illegal chemical weapons experimentation in Russia. He lost his job at the State Research Institute of Organic Chemistry and Technology, where he had worked for 26 years. He was released from prison in March 1994 after US scientists initiated a major campaign on his behalf. Vil Mirzayanov currently lives in the United States.

1994

Liu Gang, a Chinese physicist, was imprisoned in 1989 for his involvement in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations on charges of “conspiracy to overthrow the government.” Liu was sentenced to a six-year term.
A democracy activist since the mid-1980s, Liu was third on the government’s most wanted list of students. Liu was released from prison in 1996. After constant harassment of himself and his family, Liu was forced to flee China. Liu Gang currently lives in New York.
This Directory is not meant to be exhaustive. The Program adopts individual cases on the basis of corroborated and well-documented information provided by authoritative international human rights and scientific organizations, and checked and verified by AAAS. The Program gives special attention to cases of particular urgency, such as those involving such major human rights violations as extrajudicial execution, disappearance, torture, or imprisonment. It also addresses significant violations of professional rights or scientific and academic freedoms, such as loss of employment, revocation of academic degrees and responsibilities, restrictions on international travel, contacts with foreign scientists, and the free exchange of ideas.

This volume of the Directory provides a concise overview of the cases on which the Program has taken action from June 2001 through December 2002. During that time, the Program issued 55 AAASHRAN alerts dealing with human rights violations against 59 named scientists. Twenty of the alerts dealt with new cases; the remaining alerts provided updated information on ongoing cases. The Program issued one Issue Alert dealing with a policy of forced virginity testing of female health students in Turkey.

The cases continued to reflect a wide diversity of countries and scientific professions. The following chart shows the regional distribution of the alerts issued during this period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Alerts</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAASHRAN cases deal with individuals from a wide range of disciplines. The following chart shows the scientific professions of the 59 individuals who were subjects of AAASHRAN alerts:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Anthropologist</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Activist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathologist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (Discipline unknown)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture Treatment Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Directory is intended to facilitate the exchange of information among human rights groups, scientific societies, and individual scientists. Readers who have additional information about the cases listed, or who know of cases falling within our mandate, are encouraged to pass this information on to us. It is our hope that this publication will encourage other scientists around the world to inform their colleagues about violations that they have experienced or witnessed.
The Program can be reached by mail at:

AAAS Science and Human Rights Program
1200 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
USA

Our email address is shrp@aaas.org
Our URL is http://shr.aaas.org

The directory is organized alphabetically by country. Each entry provides updated information for which alerts were issued during the 18-month period from June 2001 through December 2002.
Case Summaries

Bangladesh

Muhiuddin Khan Alamgir, Economist

An economist and former Minister of Planning faced arrest and torture in Bangladesh. In March 2002, the Special Branch of the Bangladeshi police force arrested Dr. Muhiuddin Khan Alamgir as he arrived at the airport in Dhaka. He was returning to Bangladesh after visiting his son, who lives in Boston. Dr. Alamgir was detained under Section 54 of the Criminal Procedure Code, for “instigating” government officials and employees into joining a demonstration in Dhaka in 1996. The rally was a watershed moment in the country and led to the removal of the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) from power. Elections were held and a secular democratic party took office. Dr. Alamgir served as the Minister of Planning in the new government. However, the BNP returned to power in 2001 and has reportedly launched a campaign against individuals who joined in the demonstrations.

For the next seven months, Dr. Alamgir faced frequent torture while being held in pre-trial detention. He reported that every evening at midnight, the police would enter his cell and blindfold him. He was taken to a separate room where masked men interrogated and tortured him. They beat him with lathi (bamboo sticks) and glass bottles filled with water. He reported that he was beaten severely on his buttocks, feet and other muscular parts of his body, and was sodomized with the bottle. In addition, he was denied fresh water and his diabetes medicine. The purpose of the torture was to intimidate Dr. Alamgir into signing a confession. He continued to resist and refused to sign the document.

As soon as Dr. Alamgir was arrested, his family contacted lawyers, who petitioned the courts to clarify the charges against the economist. His son started a website that provided details about the case and coordinated letterwriting campaigns on his father’s behalf. The international pressure worked and in September 2002, the government of Bangladesh finally released Dr. Alamgir. Dr. Alamgir’s lawyers successfully convinced the High Court of Bangladesh that the arrest and detention were illegal. In fact, the Court ruled that the detention was illegal on four separate occasions, each time ordering that Dr. Alamgir be immediately released. How-
ever, the government security officials came up with excuses to keep the economist in jail. On one occasion, the government refused to accept the Court’s orders because they were delivered by hand and not by mail. In September, the High Court took an unprecedented step and issued an ultimatum to the government demanding that it release Dr. Alamgir or risk having the High Court itself free him by force. The government released Dr. Alamgir only one hour before the court-ordered deadline was set to expire.

According to Dr. Alamgir’s son, Jalal, a visiting fellow at Brown University, his father had lost about 40 pounds while in prison and was weak, but was on the road to recovery. On behalf of his family, Jalal thanks everyone who sent appeal letters. He recently wrote, “I, along with my family, am very grateful for all the support you have given us these past few months through this ordeal. Thank you!”

**Belarus**

Yury Bandazhevsky, Medical Doctor

In July 1999, Belarusian security forces arrested Dr. Yury Bandazhevsky at his home in the middle of the night. According to the security forces, the legal basis for his arrest fell under the presidential decree “On Urgent Measures for the Combat of Terrorism and Other Especially Dangerous Violent Crimes,” a measure that is usually used only to arrest violent criminals or terrorists. In August 1999, he was charged with taking bribes from students seeking admission to his research institute. A conviction carries a sentence of five to fifteen years’ imprisonment and confiscation of property. A military court found Dr. Bandazhevsky guilty of bribery on 18 June 2001 and sentenced him to eight years in prison.

Human rights organizations and scientific societies believe that the conviction was in retaliation for Dr. Bandazhevsky’s criticism of government health policies. Vladimir Ravkov, the colleague of Dr. Bandazhevsky who initially made the allegations of bribery, subsequently withdrew the statement and claimed that the testimony he gave was the result of torture inflicted by the security forces. He stated that security forces interrogated him for 14-16 hours a day, denied him food and sleep, and threatened to harm his wife and daughter. The Advisory and Monitoring Group for Belarus in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe issued a statement stating that no evidence had been provided to the court to substantiate Dr. Bandazhevsky’s guilt.
Dr. Bandazhevsky is a well-respected medical specialist and an expert on the effects of radiation exposure. Belarus was one of the areas hardest hit by the 1986 accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant. Health problems have continued to plague the population and have been further complicated by the nation’s struggling economy. Dr. Bandazhevsky specifically chose to set up his medical institute in Gomel, which is in the center of the worst affected region in the country. In 1999, he wrote a report that was highly critical of the manner in which the Belarusian Ministry of Health was spending its resources and questioned the scientific findings of the Ministry’s research institute, the Institute of Radiation Medicine. At issue was a government policy to remove restrictions on contaminated foods. Dr. Bandazhevsky had been critical of this policy, charging that the Belarusian government had not spent enough resources researching the health hazards of radiation contamination and had also not provided adequate information about this issue to the public.

In September 2002, Dr. Yury Bandazhevsky’s wife, Galina Bandazhevskaya, visited her husband in jail and found his health had dramatically deteriorated and that he was severely depressed. In a letter of appeal to the United Nations Human Rights Committee and the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, she wrote that her husband “had lost all confidence in himself. He did not even believe any more in what had been sacred to him: his scientific work on the Chernobyl-related problems. He had become indifferent to all of this, it frightened him and appeared threatening to him. He told me several times that, when released, he would never again do any scientific research: ‘I will never again touch this science, linked to radiation.’ When I asked him how he could betray his cause and let everything go, he responded: ‘I am afraid for our children.’”

Dr. Bandazevsky remains in jail. He has exhausted all appeal processes available to him in Belarus. The only domestic recourse is a presidential pardon. Dr. Bandazhevsky’s lawyers are preparing an appeal to the European Court of Human Rights.

Brazil

Dr. Debora Diniz, Anthropologist and Bioethicist
Dr. Mariana Ferreira, Anthropologist
Hiparidi Top’tiro, Indigenous Leader

In September 2002, the Catholic University in Brasilia fired Debora Diniz, an anthropologist and bioethicist, from her position as a professor.
The dismissal appeared to be in retaliation for her participation in a public debate about abortion in March 2001. Dr. Diniz is a respected scholar and winner of the Manuel Velasco-Suarez International Bioethics Award given by the World Health Organization. In addition to her teaching position, she is the director of the Feminist Approaches to Bioethics Network, a NGO in Brazil. A government ministry had invited Dr. Diniz to take part in the debate, to present her research findings on the issue, and generally to discuss the ethical and sociological issues of abortion in Brazil. However, the other participants grew quite hostile and little substantive discussion took place during the debate.

Immediately after the debate, public attorneys pressured the university chancellor to fire Dr. Diniz. However, because Dr. Diniz had participated in the debate in her capacity as director of the NGO and attended the debate during a school holiday, the university chose not to take any formal action against her at that time. However, the university announced at the end of the semester, in July 2001, that they did intend to fire Dr. Diniz. Dr. Diniz challenged the dismissal and after a conversation with an official from the Public Defenders Office, the university rescinded it. Nevertheless, her status at the university changed and she was no longer allowed to teach bioethics. She eventually found a position teaching methodology in the Psychology Department.

The already tense relationship between the scholar and the university worsened in the spring of 2002, when a book co-authored by Dr. Diniz about abortion laws in Brazil was published. The University fired Dr. Diniz in September 2002.

Several international bioethicists have criticized the dismissal and expressed their concerns regarding academic freedom in Brazil. An email message from one of the supporters stated, “The point of scholarship is to produce knowledge, whether of the world or of ourselves, to ask questions that stimulate further inquiry, and to teach others what they know. Scholars can be neither productive, nor curious, nor good educators if they must continually be careful not to offend those in power.”

Dr. Diniz is continuing her research and writing with the Feminist Approaches to Bioethics Network.

Another anthropologist has also faced threats in Brazil. In the summer and fall of 2002, Brazilian indigenous leader Hiperidi Top’tiro and Univer-
University of Tennessee anthropologist Dr. Mariana Ferreira received numerous death threats. Dr. Ferreira is a cultural and medical anthropologist who specializes in the ethnology of indigenous peoples in Brazil, the United States, and India. She conducts research in Brazil with Hiparidi Top’tiro, a well-known environmental campaigner for the Xavante Wara association, a Brazilian environmental organization active in the Sangradouro Indian reserve of Brazil. During a June 2002 research trip to the reserve, government officials warned Dr. Ferreira that Hiparidi Top’tiro and members of his family had received numerous death threats. During that trip, Dr. Ferreira also received threats; while she was driving, an unmarked car tried to force her off the road.

It is believed that Hiparidi Top’tiro and, by association, Dr. Ferreira, were being targeted because of a legal action led by Xavante Wara against local landowners for deforesting part of a protected indigenous area. The threats were reportedly coming from the regional administrator of the National Indigenous Foundation (Fundacao Nacional do Indio, FUNAI). According to an Amnesty International researcher in the region, “the regional administrator of FUNAI allegedly has strong links to landowners in the region and has been intimidating and threatening Hiparidi Top’tiro and his family for a long time.” The threats were very strongly worded, with the FUNAI official reportedly telling Hiparidi Top’tiro that he would tie up his feet and hands and throw him into the trash. The FUNAI regional administrator also reportedly stated that no one can hurt him because he “has powerful friends” in the government. Hiparidi Top’tiro has filed numerous reports detailing the threats with local authorities but no official action has been taken against FUNAI.

Hiparidi Top’tiro continues to work with Xavante Wara. Dr. Mariana Ferreira is at the University of Tennessee.

**Burma (Myanmar)**

Dr. Salai Tun Than, Agronomist and University Rector

On 25 March 2002, the Burmese government sentenced Dr. Salai Tun Than, the retired rector of Yezin University, to seven years in prison. Government officials first arrested Dr. Salai in November 2001 for staging a one-man protest in front of a Rangoon government building. During the peaceful protest, Dr. Salai distributed a petition calling for the government to hold a multiparty general election within one year and to unconditionally transfer state power to the winning party.
Dr. Salai was convicted under Article 5(j) of the 1950 Emergency Provisions Act. Human rights groups have criticized the act as a tool of the ruling military junta, known as the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), to suppress legitimate dissent. There were some positive developments in the last two years, including confidence-building talks with Aung San Suu Kyi, the head of the opposition party, the National League for Democracy (NLD), and a mass release of 243 political prisoners in 2001. However, the SPDC has not made any fundamental changes to its laws or policies to insure greater respect for human rights or political participation. Over 1,000 political prisoners remain in prison for exercising their rights to freedom of expression and association. The NLD has repeatedly called for the unconditional release of all political prisoners and considers it a prerequisite for moving to the next phase of talks with the SPDC.

Dr. Salai, who holds a Ph.D. in Crop Nutrition from the University of Wisconsin and a Masters Degree in Agronomy from the University of Georgia, had led a distinguished career as an entomologist and professor of agronomy since the 1950s.

Dr. Salai Tun Than remains in prison.

China

Gao Zhan
Li Shaomin
Xu Zerong
Huang Qi
Liu Di

In July 2001, two of the Chinese academics held on charges of espionage were released. On 25 July 2001, China granted Dr. Gao Zhan medical parole and allowed her to leave the country. Dr. Gao had spent 166 days in detention; she was convicted in a closed door trial the day before her release of collecting intelligence for Taiwan. Also on 25 July 2001, China deported Dr. Li Shaomin. Dr. Li, a professor of marketing at the City University of Hong Kong, was detained on 25 February 2001, after crossing the border into mainland China. He was convicted of spying and ordered to be expelled from China on 15 July 2001.

Chinese officials first arrested Dr. Gao, her husband, and their five year old son on 11 February 2001 from the Beijing airport. Dr. Gao and her family were about to board a plane after a three-week holiday in China to visit family. Her husband and son were released 26 days later and
returned to Washington, DC, where the family currently lives. Dr. Gao is a sociologist and is faculty fellow at American University. Her academic research focuses on gender issues and economic reforms in China.

Dr. Gao was arrested under national security provisions as a suspected spy for Taiwan. She was held for 40 days without charge and not granted access to a lawyer until only a few days before her trial. Officials forced Dr. Gao to sign a written confession and stated that “evidence has shown that Gao Zhan accepted missions from overseas intelligence agencies and took funds for spying activities in mainland China.” The government never provided further details to support these charges.

On 25 February 2001, Chinese officials arrested Dr. Li Shaomin as he was crossing the border from Hong Kong to mainland China to visit a friend. His wife reported her husband’s disappearance to the police when his friend called and said that Dr. Li had never arrived. She learned the next day from the American Embassy that Dr. Li had been detained by the Chinese security forces and charged with espionage.

On 15 July 2001, Dr. Li was found guilty and ordered to be deported from mainland China. Dr. Li’s research has focused on China’s economic development and e-commerce. He has written extensively on the impact of privatization and market reforms on the performance of foreign enterprises conducting business in China. Dr. Li is a naturalized US citizen who received his Ph.D. in sociology from Princeton University.

Aside from the timing of the arrests, the cases of Dr. Gao and Dr. Li were also connected during court proceedings. During Dr. Li’s trial, a deposition by Dr. Gao was submitted as evidence. However, Dr. Gao’s lawyer described the interaction of the two individuals as academically collegial. What appears to have been in question is photocopies of books and magazines on Taiwan-China relations that Dr. Gao gave to Dr. Li. Her attorney stated that none of the material was marked sensitive or would damage China’s national security.

Dr. Gao Zhan continues to work at the American University in Washington, DC. Dr. Li Shaomin returned to his faculty position at the City University of Hong Kong.

A third academic still remains in jail. In January 2002, Chinese officials sentenced historian Xu Zerong to a thirteen-year prison term for espionage. Dr. Xu, an associate research professor at the Provincial Academy of Social Sciences and an affiliated professor at Zhongshan University, was sentenced to three years in prison on charges related to the alleg-
edly illegal publication of books and periodicals. The remaining ten years of his prison sentence is for charges of “leaking state secrets” by circulating allegedly classified documents on Chinese military operations in the Korean War.

Dr. Xu received his Ph.D. in 1999 from St. Anthony’s College, Oxford University. His dissertation was on Chinese military intervention in the Korean War. Originally from Guangzhou in South China, Dr. Xu became a permanent resident of Hong Kong in 1985. While in Hong Kong, he helped to set up the Chinese-language academic journal *Chinese Social Sciences Quarterly*. He also worked as a researcher for the official *Xinhua News Agency*.

Dr. Xu has been in detention since June 2000 and little is known about his conditions of confinement. Authorities have not allowed him to see his family at any time during his lengthy detention. He is appealing the sentence.

In the past year, China also continued its crackdown on its citizens’ use of the Internet. Since 1994, the year before the Internet became available in China, the Chinese government has adopted increasingly restrictive regulations aimed at controlling content on the Internet and curtailing freedom of expression. The regulations give Chinese authorities wide discretion to arrest and punish individuals for posting any information that would “damage the reputation of the State.” The government has also created a special policy unit that is charged with monitoring Internet content. Since the laws were enacted, Chinese authorities have shut down numerous websites and electronic bulletin boards after users posted materials deemed controversial or subversive by the state. Such material includes discussions about human rights violations, government corruption, and relations with Taiwan.

On 5 September 2001, the Chinese government shut down the electronic bulletin board *Baiyun Huanghe* (formerly located at http://bbs.whnet.edu.cn) in Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei province. The government issued the order after students posted articles on the site about the Tiananmen Square massacre. Baiyun Huanghe, which has operated for five years and has 30,000 registered users, serves as a public forum for students to discuss politics and student life. A university official told Reuters news service that the shutdown was due to “technical difficulties” and that the site would eventually be operational again, but would be managed by the university. The university will require users to register with their full name and identification number.

The crackdown on the Internet has also resulted in several arrests of individuals for posting information to websites deemed to be subversive.
by Chinese authorities. One such individual is Huang Qi, a computer engineer from Chengdu, Sichuan Province, who was detained in June 2002 on charges of inciting subversion against state power. Huang created a website a year earlier to help find missing persons and reunite families. In just under one year of operation, Huang’s Tianwang network, www.6-4tianwang.com, collaborated with other organizations to find missing persons and alone succeeded in reuniting more than 20080 families. This total includes the rescue of seven abducted girls who had been sold as wives. In 1999, the police reported 7,660 cases in which women were abducted into forced marriages or servitude, but Huang believes that number to be just a small fraction of the true total.

The website also became a forum for visitors to express their dissent regarding the Chinese government. The government began to monitor the site more closely as local media began to publicize Tianwang’s accomplishments. In February 2000, Premier Zhu Rongji ordered an investigation into Huang’s activities. After several articles concerning the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre were posted, government officials arrested Huang Qi on 3 June 2000, the eve of the eleventh anniversary of the Tiananmen crackdown. Huang maintains that he was not personally responsible for the anti-government postings and that he had no connection to those who had voiced their dissent. Since Huang’s arrest Tianwang’s technical support administrator has confirmed that he designed the message board and that Huang did not know how to delete postings.

Huang was charged with violating Articles 103 and 105 of the Criminal Law, which punish crimes related to “organizing national separatism, destroying national unity”; “organizing, plotting or carrying out activities aimed at subverting state political power”; and “overthrowing the socialist system.” His trial was set to begin on 13 February 2001 but was postponed because the police reported that Huang was ill and not well enough to stand trial. Huang reports that he has been tortured while in custody. The trial was scheduled to resume in early summer but was again postponed. It has been suggested that the reason for the delay was that the Chinese government did not wish to attract more attention to its dismal human rights record at the height of its bid for the 2008 Olympics.

In a letter from jail Huang wrote, “If I put myself into danger to rescue seven missing girls from the countryside, help over 200 families reunite, sell all of my belongings to start a missing persons search service to help people, and make it possible for thousands of people to air their grievances, please tell me how this can be considered as attempting to subvert the government?”
On 15 August 2001, Dr. Huang Qi’s trial resumed in secret but no verdict was announced. He remains imprisoned, awaiting his sentence.

In November 2002, Chinese officials arrested Liu Di, a psychology student at Beijing Normal University. She was reportedly detained for posting opinion pieces that were highly critical of the Chinese government on an Internet site. Using the pseudonym “Stainless Steel Mouse” (bu xiu gang laoshu), Liu posted several pieces protesting the government’s policies on Internet usage and the arrest of Huang Qi. Liu’s postings denounced Huang’s arrest as a miscarriage of justice and called for other Internet users in China to give themselves up to the police as a form of protest and to express solidarity with Huang.

Liu is being held incommunicado at an unknown location. Her family has not been officially notified of the reasons for her arrest or her whereabouts; they have great fears for her safety.

Colombia

Policarpo Emilio Mazo Mazo

On 21 September 2001, officials identifying themselves as from the Technical Investigation Body of the Attorney General’s Office reportedly arrested Policarpo Emilio Mazo Mazo, a student at the Universidad Autonoma Latinoamericana in Medellín, Colombia. Eyewitnesses reported the incident at a nearby police station. According to eyewitnesses, the police went to the location where the men were detaining Mazo and helped them put the student into a waiting car. He has not been seen since that date. It is suspected that he may have been “disappeared” by the security forces.

Policarpo Mazo is student leader at his university. In the months before his disappearance, he had been the subject of increased repression by paramilitary groups, received death threats and was physically attacked on one occasion. Paramilitary groups have attacked and threatened several student activists across Colombia. These groups target students, along with human rights defenders, trade unionists, and other activist organizations in Colombia, for their suspected sympathy and assistance to rebel groups. These groups are often not aligned with any of the rebel guerrilla groups and, in fact, often suffer similar repression from the rebel groups, who accuse them of collaborating with the government and paramilitary factions.
Human rights organizations have documented a clear link between paramilitary groups and government forces. A recent Human Rights Watch report on the subject concluded that “Colombian military and police detachments continue to promote, work with, support, profit from, and tolerate paramilitary groups, treating them as a force allied to and compatible with their own.” Paramilitary groups often employ harsh tactics, including death threats, disappearances, and torture.

No new information is known on the whereabouts of Policarpo Mazo.

**Cuba**

Vladimiro Roca Antunez, Economist
Oscar Elias Biscet, Medical Doctor

In May 2002, the Cuban government released Vladimiro Roca Antunez, the final member of the Internal Dissidents’ Working Group for the Analysis of the Cuban Socio-Economic Situation who remained in jail. The working group is also known as the Group of Four after its four members: the economist Roca, engineer and physicist Felix A. Bonne Carcases, economist Maria Beatriz Roque Cabello, and attorney Rene Gomez Manzano. Bonne, Roque, and Gomez were released in May, 2000.

Members of the Group of Four were arrested on 16 July 1997 after releasing a pro-democracy briefing entitled, “The Homeland Belongs to Us All.” After being detained for 15 months without charge or trial, the government charged all four with sedition in October 1998. According to the Cuban Criminal Code, sedition includes nonviolent opposition to the government. Bonne and Gomez received a four-year prison term and Roque was sentenced to three and a half years. Because of his perceived role as the leader of the group, Roca received the longest sentence—five years—the majority of which he spent in solitary confinement.

International pressure may have worked to promote the release of the four individuals. The other members of the Group of Four were released one month after the United Nations Human Rights Commission voted to censure the Cuban government for its human rights practices, specifically mentioning the Group of Four in its report. Roca’s early release came one week before former US President Jimmy Carter visited Cuba.

Despite the release of Roca, several human rights activists in Cuba remain in jail, including Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet. Dr. Biscet is an outspoken critic of the Castro regime and has faced years of persecution for stag-
ing protests against the government. Dr. Biscet is a physician and founder
of the Lawton Foundation, an anti-abortion non-governmental advocacy
organization. He has been arrested for criticizing the government’s policy
on abortions and repression of individual freedoms.

Dr. Biscet was most recently arrested in December 2002, only weeks
after he had been released from a three-year prison term. The government
sentenced Dr. Biscet to jail for “public disorder,” “incitement to commit
a crime,” and “insult to the symbols of the homeland” for hanging the
Cuban flag upside down in his house. Dr. Biscet had been arrested and
charged in a major crackdown by the Cuban authorities on the dissident
community in the days leading up to the 9th Ibero-American Summit in
November 1999. Cuba hosted the Summit, which drew officials from 19
Latin American nations, Spain, and Portugal.

Dr. Biscet was held in Cuba Sí, a maximum-security prison in Holguin
province, 450 miles from Havana, where his family lives. During his time
in jail, Dr. Biscet reported that he was beaten about the face and shoul-
ders, kicked in the ankles, burned with a cigarette on his elbow, forced to
strip, and threatened with longer detentions if he continued his involve-
ment with opposition activities. Prison authorities placed him in a dark
isolated cell with no running water after he staged a 42-day hunger strike
on behalf of all political prisoners in Cuba. Because of the hunger strike
and subsequent poor quality food, Dr. Biscet lost 20 pounds while serving
his sentence and his health suffered greatly.

Dr. Biscet remains in jail awaiting formal charges.

Egypt

Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim, Sociologist

In December 2002, Egypt’s highest court ordered a new trial for Dr.
Saad Eddin Ibrahim and ordered the release of the sociologist from prison
pending the new trial. This is the latest chapter in a court battle that has
been ongoing since July 2000, when Dr. Ibrahim and 27 of his associates
at the Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies, a Cairo-based civil
society organization, were first arrested and charged with tarnishing the
image of Egypt abroad and illegally accepting funds from the European
Union. The funds were designated for a pro-democracy documentary that
detailed corruption in Egypt’s voting practices.

In May 2001, a court found Dr. Ibrahim guilty and sentenced him to
a seven-year prison term. The first ruling was set aside in February 2002
when Egypt’s highest appeals court found the original court’s decision to be flawed on six counts. Dr. Ibrahim had a second trial, but was unable to address any of the substantive points of the case. Egyptian law permitted the defense to address procedural grounds only. Defense lawyers argued that the court had ignored several aspects of their testimony, including evidence from Awad El-Mor, a former judge of the Supreme Court, who challenged the constitutionality of the 1992 military decree that made it illegal for Egyptian organizations to accept foreign money without government permission. The defense had also presented testimony from Khaled Fayad, who had originally accused Dr. Ibrahim of embezzling the funds from the European Union. Fayad testified that he had been pressured by security forces into making the false allegations. The European Union had also submitted an affidavit, restating its position that none of the $250,000 in grants had been misused.

The second trial ended in July 2002 with a second guilty verdict. Dr. Ibrahim’s lawyers filed an appeal, which resulted in the December ruling for a third trial that is scheduled to begin in February 2003. During this trial, Egyptian law will allow Dr. Ibrahim’s defense lawyers to address the substance of the case. Although it is far from clear what the outcome of this trial will be, defense lawyers maintain that they have enough evidence to convince a court that the charges against Dr. Ibrahim are baseless and that he should be acquitted.

Dr. Ibrahim’s health has suffered greatly while in prison. He suffers from a neurological disorder that impedes the flow of oxygen to his brain and he did receive adequate medical care while in prison. He was released in December 2002 and is currently in Cairo seeking medical treatment and preparing for his trial.

Ethiopia

Dr. Taye Woldesemayat, Political Scientist
Mesfin Wolde Mariam, Political Scientist
Berhanu Nega, Economist
Students at the University of Addis Ababa
In May 2002, Dr. Taye Woldesemayat, a political scientist and president of the Ethiopian Teachers’ Association (ETA), was released from prison. Dr. Taye was arrested in 1996 on fabricated charges of terrorism and conspiracy to assassinate government officials and sentenced to a 15-year prison term.

Dr. Taye, who hold BA and MA degrees from Illinois State University (1983, 1985) and a Ph.D. degree from the University of Missouri, Columbia (1989), joined Addis Ababa University as a professor of political science in 1990. Two years later, he was elected the chair of the ETA, an independent union with 120,000 members. Under his leadership, the ETA actively promoted the rights of teachers and students. His advocacy proved to be controversial with Ethiopian authorities. In 1992, he was one of 42 professors, mostly from the political science department, who were fired from Addis Ababa University for writing a letter protesting against the government’s violent reaction to a student demonstration that had occurred that year.

During the mid-1990s, the Ethiopian government targeted independent unions. The government cut funding for ETA and harassed its members. Dr. Taye faced repeated death threats. In May 1996, Ethiopian security forces surrounded Dr. Taye in Bole International Airport where he was attempting to pass through immigration after returning from an international conference. He was arrested without a warrant and taken to the Central Investigation Center. In August 1996, he was formally charged with armed conspiracy against the government. The trial dragged on for two years. Witnesses for the prosecution later retracted their statements, claiming that the statements had been extracted under torture. Extensive searches of Dr. Taye’s office and home failed to turn up any evidence to support the conspiracy charges. Despite the lack of evidence, Dr. Taye was convicted and sentenced to a lengthy prison term in 1999.

International human rights groups and scientific societies protested Dr. Taye’s imprisonment. In 1997, the AAAS Board of Directors passed a resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of scientists who were prisoners of conscience in Ethiopia, including Dr. Taye. Upon his release, Dr. Taye stated that peace would only happen in Ethiopia when all citizens could freely exercise their rights. He called for the release of all political prisoners in Ethiopia.

Egyptian security forces have been guilty of extreme violence against student protesters on multiple occasions resulting in the arrest of thousands, injuries to hundreds, and the deaths of 46 students. The worst of the violence occurred in April 2001 when Egyptian security forces attacked students who were protesting several university policies that restricted
academic freedom, increased government control on university campuses, and limited students’ ability to participate in student unions and student government organizations. In February 2001, the government banned student unions and adopted a new charter for the University, ending student participation in the University Senate and several oversight committees. Of particular concern to the students was the increased presence of security forces on campus. Ethiopia is reported to be the only country in sub-Saharan Africa where the government has set up a police station on campus for the purposes of controlling dissenting students and professors. The recently adopted charter made this police presence legal and permanent.

Student leaders attempted to negotiate with the government about the charter, but when the government refused to remove security forces from the universities, the students staged large-scale boycotts and peaceful protests. In response, the government issued an ultimatum that threatened to deploy the police against students who did not return to classes. The standoff between the government and the students turned violent in mid-April 2001 when security officials raided Addis Ababa University during a student protest. Witnesses reported that the police were extremely violent and fired live ammunition at hundreds of students and teachers. According to witnesses, “riot police beat civilians with batons though they offered no resistance, and then turned on bystanders, including women and children. Students were dragged out of local churches and mosques, where they had sought refuge, and taken into detention.” During the raid, riot police beat or shot to death 41 individuals, mostly students. Fifty-five more students were hospitalized with injuries. The police arrested about 2,500 students during the raid.

Although many were later released, students suspected of having leadership roles in the university student council are still being held incommunicado. The unrest spread to at least ten other universities and several high schools in Ethiopia, including Alemaya University of Agriculture and Bahir-Dar Polytechnic Institute.

The government also used the unrest on campuses as a justification to round up political activists and journalists who have been critical of the government, including two prominent civil society activists, Professor Mesfin Wolde Mariam and Dr. Berhanu Nega. Professor Wolde Mariam, 71, is a founder of the Ethiopian Human Rights Council. Dr. Nega, an economist, is the President of the Ethiopian Economic Association, a non-governmental organization in Addis Ababa. Authorities are charging Professor Wolde Mariam and Dr. Nega with instigating the student protests. Both were released on bail in June 2001 and are awaiting trial.
Extreme police violence against students also occurred in Ethiopia’s Oromiya state in March 2002 during peaceful demonstrations by high school students against the regional government’s education policies. Authorities declared the demonstrations to be illegal and attempted to break them up. In several towns, the police used live ammunition against the students. The regional government later acknowledged that police shot and killed two students, but a local human rights organization contradicted the official claim and stated that five students were shot dead and a dozen were wounded.

The recent surge in violence against student activists follows a disturbing trend of government repression against Oromo student activists and intellectuals. A rebel group called the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) has been engaged in a decade-long armed struggle for greater autonomy for the Oromo. The Academic Freedom Program of Human Rights Watch states that the “federal and regional government authorities tend to view all forms of protest of their policies as instigated by the rebel OLF.” The government has a long history of targeting individuals and groups perceived to be sympathetic to the OLF, including intellectuals and students.

Guatemala

Matilde Gonzalez Izas, Historian
Pedrina Burrero Lopez, Forensic Anthropologist
Carlos Chen Osorio, Forensic Anthropologist
Juan de Dios Garcia Xajil, Forensic Anthropologist
Jesus Tecu Osorio, Forensic Anthropologist

In recent years, the human rights situation in Guatemala has dramatically worsened. A serious concern has been the attacks and intimidation against those documenting human rights abuses, including social scientists and forensic anthropologists. The level of violence against those working in the field has forced human rights researchers and forensic anthropologists to leave the country or scale back their work. Human rights organizations believe that the attacks are intended to interfere with human rights advocacy efforts.

One of those individuals is Matilde Gonzalez Izas, a historian who works for the Association for the Advancement of Social Sciences (Asociación para el Avance de las Ciencias Sociales, AVANCSO). She began receiving threatening phone calls in October 2001. On 2 October 2001, a man entered Dr. Gonzalez’s house and stole her laptop computer. Also on that day, neighbors noticed that two different cars appeared to be watching
Dr. Gonzalez’s house. Over the next few days, Dr. Gonzalez reported that she was being followed when she left her house. One on occasion, seven cars surrounded her car on the road, boxing her in and forcing her to take a different route. Fearing her safety, Dr. Gonzalez went into hiding for a month. Despite taking this precaution, she continued to receive threatening phone calls on her mobile phone.

Dr. Gonzalez conducts research on how the 36-year civil conflict in Guatemala has been experienced on the local level, particularly in indigenous communities. She conducted extensive interviews in the municipality of San Bartolome Jocotenango and documented the various mechanisms that the military employs to maintain local power in the region. Her work has been controversial as it revealed the complicity of the military in the region’s rising tide of mob violence and lynchings.

The recent harassment is not the first time that Dr. Gonzalez or a member of AVANSCO has been a target of human rights abuses. Since beginning her research in 1998, Dr. Gonzalez has received numerous threats and intimidation. In 1990, AVANSCO co-founder and anthropologist Myrna Mack was killed by a military death squad. She was conducting investigations that proved the military targeted civilian populations during Guatemala’s armed conflict. Such threats against AVANSCO members appeared to be consistent with a pattern of harassment conducted by member of the government’s security forces against its perceived opponents.

Dr. Matilde Gonzalez has returned to Guatemala and is continuing her research with AVANSCO.

Another group of professionals who have been subject to repeated harassment from the military are forensic anthropologists carrying out exhumations of victims killed during Guatemala’s 35-year civil conflict. It is estimated that there are thousands of mass graves throughout the country. Certain regions have been described as “one big graveyard.” Exhumations have played a critical role in providing forensic investigation teams with evidence to scientifically document massacres perpetrated by the Guatemalan military. Such evidence is currently being used in two genocide suits filed against officials in the administrations of former Presidents Lucas García (1978-1982) and Ríos Montt (1982-1983).

The three main organizations conducting exhumations are the Guatemalan Forensic Anthropology Foundation (Fundación de Antropología Forense de Guatemala, FAFG), Center for Forensic Anthropology and Applied Sciences (Centro de Antropología Forense y Ciencias Aplicadas, CAFCA), and the Association for the Integral Development of Victims of Violence in the Verapaces Maya Achi (Asociación para el Desarrollo
Integral de las Víctimas de Violencia en las Verapaces, Maya Achi, ADIVIMA). Since 1992, FAFG has carried out 191 exhumations of more than 2,000 victims of the Guatemalan military’s counter-insurgency campaign. ADIVIMA has carried out 19 exhumations of clandestine graves in and around the Rabinal municipality where there was a massacre in 1982. Forensic anthropologists have found the remains of over 700 people and believe that there are 61 more clandestine mass graves in the Rabinal area alone.

Scientists working with these groups have faced repeated harassment and death threats. In late February and again in early March 2002, several of the forensic anthropologists exhuming remains from mass graves received threatening letters and phone calls. On 21 February 2002, one of the scientists received a typed letter that explicitly named eleven forensic anthropologists who either were currently working on exhumation projects or who have done so in the past. Four of the individuals named in the letter are current employees of the FAFG. The letter demanded that all exhumations stop immediately and threatened the individual scientists and their families. The letter stated that if the forensic anthropologists continued their work, their families would “soon be burying their own bones and those of their children.”

Also in February 2002, there was a fire in a church in Nebaj, El Quiché Department. The forensic anthropologists used the church to store equipment, documents, and, on occasion, the human remains exhumed from mass graves. The fire destroyed most of the documents in the church. Among the destroyed documents was detailed information collected by the Catholic Church concerning 35 massacres that occurred during the early 1980s in Nebaj. No remains were lost in the fires, as the forensic anthropologists had removed them the day before the fire.

In March 2002, one of the forensic anthropologists, Miguel Morales, was held up at gunpoint. The men demanded his cell phone, which contained the phone numbers of several of the forensic anthropologists on the exhumation team. The following day, five of them received anonymous telephone death threats. Mariana Valdizón and Franscisco de León both received calls from men making threatening remarks about their families. Federico Reyes received a call warning him to plan his funeral. Fredy Peccherelli, director of FAFG, and Fernando Moscoso, a forensic anthropologist working with FAFG, both received death threats at FAFG offices.

In May 2002, Juan de Dios García Xajil and Carlos Chen both received calls during which anonymous callers threatened to kill them if they continued their work. Other callers have hung up when they answer. On 1 May 2002, Pedrina Burrero Lopez received a call that played funeral music.
In April and May 2002, shots were fired near the homes of both Carlos Chen and Pedrina Burrero.

It is believed that the individuals behind the threats had ties to the military during Guatemala’s civil war. One of the letters stated that “in a war there are no guilty parties, and it is not your place to judge us.” Many of those responsible for past human rights abuses still remain in positions in power. According to Amnesty International, the lack of accountability for past abuses has created “a climate of impunity in which those responsible for past atrocities lash out with ever increasing virulence at those who are collecting evidence and mounting bids to bring them to justice.”

The forensic scientists are continuing the exhumations of mass graves throughout Guatemala. In the past year, the government has taken steps to ensure the security of the scientists, including placing 24-hour police guards around FAFG and CAFCA. Although this is a welcome development, there have been incidents where human rights defenders have suffered attacks, even while under police protection, and their safety and security remains a source of concern.

Honduras

Leo Valladares Lanza, Director of the Human Rights Commission
Sonia Marlina Dubon, Lawyer

In the months following the publication of a report that criticized the Honduran government’s curtailment of freedom of expression, the report’s authors, Dr Leo Valladares Lanza and Sonia Marlina Dubon, began receiving anonymous telephone death threats. The January 2002 report detailed how government officials and economic interests in the country exert a large amount of control over journalists and the media. Dr. Valladares also participated in a national effort to end what the US State Department calls a “subculture of corruption” in the Honduran judicial system. Dr. Valladares served on a national Nominating Board that drew up a short list of 45 qualified candidates to serve on the Supreme Court. The National Congress was to vote on the list and select the final 15 justices to serve seven-year terms. Sonia Marlina Dubon was one of the shortlisted candidates for appointment to the Supreme Court.
In January 2002, the judicial reform process suffered a major setback. An applicant who did not make the final short list appealed to the current Supreme Court and within hours, the court ruled in favor of the rejected applicant, nullified the short list, and dissolved the Nominating Board. Civil society groups in Honduras were dismayed at the Supreme Court’s decision, as it appeared to confirm the existence of widespread corruption in the judicial system.

This is not the first time that Dr. Valladares has been targeted for exposing human rights abuses in Honduras. In April 2001, the Human Rights Commission released a report alleging political interference and corruption within the judiciary. In response to the criticism in the report, the Supreme Court charged Dr. Valladares with engaging in “corruption, extortion, and blackmail.” The charges were baseless and were subsequently dropped. After the widespread devastation of Hurricane Mitch in 1998, Dr. Valladares accused the government of corruption in the management of foreign aid to survivors, hundreds of thousands of whom were left homeless. The government sought to limit his powers and reduce his period in office, but an international outcry on Dr. Valladares’ behalf forced the government to back down.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program has worked closely with Dr. Valladares and the National Human Rights Commission on several human rights projects in Honduras. Program staff, working with Dr. Valladares and the Commission, developed a computerized system to record, classify, and process complaints of human rights violations. Those in the program who have met Dr. Valladares describe him as a compassionate man committed to the defense of human rights in Honduras. He continues his human rights advocacy in Honduras.

**Iran**

Hashem Aghajari, Historian

In November 2002, the Iranian government sentenced Dr. Hashem Aghajari, a professor of history at Tarbiat Moddaress University in Tehran, to death for apostasy, or the renunciation of his belief. The charges were related to a philosophical lecture he gave in which he rejected demands to “blindly follow” clerical rule and called for reform within the Islamic clerical establishment.
Conservative, hard-line clerics immediately criticized Dr. Aghajari, claiming that he was attacking the Prophet of Islam and fundamental Shiite Islamic traditions. Dr. Aghajari repeatedly denied that his speech was intended as an attack on Islam or the Prophet and apologized for any inadvertent offense his remarks may have caused.

Many religious leaders from the more liberal end of the spectrum opposed the death sentence, including a group of senior religious officials who ruled that there was nothing culpably blasphemous about Dr. Aghajari’s statements. The death sentence prompted an outcry from the international human rights community, who believe that he was exercising his internationally guaranteed right to freedom of expression. Dr. Aghajari’s students also staged a three-day hunger strike to protest the sentence.

Dr. Aghajari was tried and found guilty of apostasy in August 2002 in a trial that observers believe did not meet international standards of fairness; it was held behind closed doors and Dr. Aghajari was granted only limited access to his lawyers. Dr. Aghajari’s sentence also includes 74 lashes of the whip, eight years’ imprisonment and internal exile, and a 10-year prohibition against teaching.

Dr. Hashem Aghajair remains in jail. Once he receives the official text of his sentence, he plans to appeal the sentence.

**Israel/Palestine**

Muhammad Al-Hassi, Paramedic  
Ibrahim Mohammad Assad, Ambulance Driver  
Safiyyah Balbisi, Paramedic  
Mahmoud Hussein Bijawi, Paramedic  
Kamal Hamdan, Ambulance Driver  
Ahmad Othman Khoudari, Hospital Administrator  
Sa’ed Shalaile, Paramedic  
Khalil Sulieman, Medical Doctor  
Ra’ed Ghaleb Yasin, Paramedic

Amid the violence that has marked the relationship between Israel and Palestinian Authority since September 2000, there have been serious violations of medical neutrality. Although these violations have occurred in the context of an escalating conflict, marked by violence on both sides, respecting the principles of medical neutrality is critical during such situations. These principles for these circumstances: to safeguard the rights and ensure the safety of medical workers engaged in legitimate humanitarian activities in the midst of violent conflict.
In March 2002, international human rights observers reported serious violations of human rights, several of which resulted in the death of medical workers. Among those killed was the head of the Palestine Red Crescent Society (PRCS) emergency medical service, Dr. Khalil Sulieman. Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) soldiers fired on the ambulances holding Dr. Sulieman and five other PRCS medical workers while they were in the Jenin refugee camp. The IDF issued a press release shortly after the attack that stated that they fired on the ambulance because it was speeding toward a group of Israeli soldiers. Other medical personnel who witnessed the incident claimed that the vehicle was driving slowly down a narrow street.

Other attacks on ambulances in the Tulkarem refugee camp in March 2002 resulted in the wounding of ambulance driver, Ibrahim Mohammad Assad, and medics Safiyah Balbisi and Hussein Bijawi. IDF soldiers also fired on a United Nations Refugee Works Agency (UNRWA) ambulance in Tulkarem, killing Kamal Hamdan, a Palestinian refugee employed by the agency who was driving a clearly marked UN ambulance. He was the first UN worker to be killed since the present outbreak of widespread violence began in September 2000.

In the town of Sudaniyya in north Gaza, bombardments resulted in the death of medic Sa’ed Shalail and serious injuries to medic Muhammad Al-Hassi. The administrative director of Yamama Hospital, Dr. Ahmad Othman Khoudari, was killed while attempting to bring medical supplies to the hospital in a private vehicle. He had secured permission from the Red Cross and the IDF for this delivery ahead of time.

The Israeli government has claimed that Palestinian ambulances have been used to smuggle arms and/or fighters into conflict areas. Such an act also constitutes a violation of medical neutrality.

Kenya

Moses Njue, Pathologist
Andrew K. Gachie, Pathologist

In April 2002, two Kenyan physicians were threatened with the loss of their official registration after concluding that torture caused the death of a detainee in the Nyeri jail. Dr. Moses Njue is the Central Provincial Pathologist. Dr. Andrew K. Gachie is an independent pathologist hired by the detainee’s family to investigate his death.
The police initially denied the torture claim and requested that a new autopsy be performed. The Chief Government Pathologist performed the second autopsy and concluded that the death resulted from natural causes. Shortly after the second post-mortem, the Minister of Health held a press conference and accused Drs. Njue and Gachie of lying and threatened to de-register them. The Health Minister summoned the doctors to his office and requested that they harmonize their report with that of the government pathologist. When both physicians refused, the Ministry fired Dr. Njue and threatened again to de-register both of them. Shortly after the press conference, Drs. Njue and Gachie began receiving death threats.

In May 2002, the government ruled that only state-appointed doctors could perform autopsies. This requirement would prevent victims’ families from requesting that independent pathologists participate in autopsies. This is a serious interference with the professional independence of physicians and could hinder independent medical analysis in cases of suspected torture. International human rights organizations and medical doctors around the world wrote letters supporting Drs. Njue and Gachie and protesting the de-registration threat and the change in rules regarding independent autopsies.

In June 2002, a third autopsy on the Nyeri jail detainee was performed and confirmed that torture was the cause of death. In late July, the Kenyan Ministry of Health changed its original position and issued written statements confirming that neither Dr. Njue nor Dr. Gachie would be de-registered. The Ministry of Health reversed its position after meeting with the Director of the Independent Medico-Legal Unit (IMLU) in July 2002. The IMLU coordinates independent autopsies. The government also rescinded a recent regulation that required all doctors working in the civil service, government hospitals, or universities to obtain their employer’s permission before undertaking private or independent post-mortem examinations.

IMLU reports that its work is beginning to return to normal although some doctors report that they are still have difficulties conducting independent post-mortems in the City Mortuary in Nairobi. However, the IMLU believes that this problem will soon be resolved and it will continue to work with the government to ensure that independent autopsies are performed in Kenya.

Both Drs. Njue and Gachie thanked all individuals who wrote letters on their behalf. They believe that the strong international attention had a “great impact on what could have been a very damaging situation for independent post-mortem work and the investigation and reporting of human rights in Kenya.”
Malaysia

Khairul Anuar Ahmad Zainuddin
Mohamad Fuad Mohd Ikhwan

In July 2001, Malaysian security officials arrested Khairul Anuar Ahmad Zainuddin and Mohamad Fuad Mohd Ikhwan, university students at the Institut Kemahiran Mara (IKM) in Kuala Lampur. Both students appear to have been arrested in connection with their advocacy in favor or repealing the Internal Security Act, a draconian law that grants authorities far reaching powers to arbitrarily arrest and detain individuals merely on the suspicion that one “may be likely” to commit any act that would endanger the national security of the state. The Act allows the state to hold an individual under solitary confinement for 60 days without access to legal representation and/or indefinitely without trial. The Act has been used by the state to detain thousands of its critics, including academics, lawyers, trade unionists, and political opposition leaders, among others.

University students in Malaysia are subject to severe reprisals for exercising their rights to freedom of expression and association. There were reports that IKM authorities arbitrarily expelled one student for allegedly participating in a reformist demonstration and that students at other universities also face disciplinary actions for selling anti-ISA badges, printing leaflets, and issuing press releases. The Education Ministry has informed private educational institutions that they should refuse to accept students who have been expelled from state universities for their alleged political activities.

Khairul Anuar Ahmad Zainuddin is an electrical engineering student at IKM and was reportedly arrested for his suspected involvement in workshops that were characterized by the security forces as an effort to encourage reformists and students at IKM to “overthrow the government via street demonstrations.” Mohamad Fuad Mohd Ikhwan, 24, is the president of the Student Representative Council of the Universiti Malaya. He was arrested on 6 July 2001 under Section 73(1) of the Internal Security Act, which allows the police to detain anyone “acting or about to act in any manner prejudicial to the security of Malaysia.”

Both students were released about two weeks later.

Russia

Igor Sutyagin, Political Scientist
Valentin Danilov, Physicist

Since his initial arrest in October 1999, Dr. Igor Sutyagin has remained in jail and caught up in a seemingly unending legal nightmare. Dr. Sutyagin, a researcher with the US and Canada Institute in Moscow, faces treason and espionage charges in connection with research he performed for a British consulting firm. Dr. Sutyagin’s research dealt with civilian-military relations in Russia. He maintains that he used non-classified research, such as newspaper articles, and that as a civilian researcher with no security clearance, he did not have access to any classified materials. Russian authorities contend that the accuracy of the research indicates that Dr. Sutyagin had to have used classified documents to draw his conclusions. However, the FSB investigation, which has dragged on for more than two-and-a-half years and has included numerous and thorough investigations of Dr. Sutyagin’s office and home, has failed to turn up any evidence that he had access to classified materials.

In the last 18 months, the case has continued to wind its way through the legal system. In June 2002, Russian authorities transferred Dr. Sutyagin to a Moscow prison from the Kaluga regional prison, where he had been held since his arrest. The investigation was also transferred from the Kaluga branch to the central department of the Federal Security Service (known by its Russian acronym, FSB). Dr. Sutyagin’s case was first heard in the Kaluga Regional Court in a closed door trial that began in early 2001. In December 2001, the regional court ruled that the indictment presented by the FSB was too vague and the prosecution had failed to present sufficient evidence to convict Dr. Sutyagin. However, instead of dismissing the case at that point, the Kaluga court sent the case back to the FSB for further investigation. His lawyers appealed the second investigation to the Russian Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court upheld the lower court’s decisions’ both to proceed with a second investigation and to keep Dr. Sutyagin in detention pending the second trial.

Dr. Sutyagin’s lawyers believe that the transfer of the court case and FSB investigation to Moscow is a troubling sign. They believe that by bringing the case to Moscow, the central FSB office will put additional pressure on the court and make it politically difficult for the court to acquit Dr. Sutyagin. The lawyers are also concerned because Moscow city courts have rendered guilty verdicts in similar so-called “spy trials,” in which the government is alleging treason and the FSB fails to provide compelling evidence. This fear may not be unwarranted as in December 2002, the Moscow court ruled against the defense’s plea to release Dr. Sutyagin from pre-trial detention.
However, one of the “spy trials” did end successfully for the defense. On 27 September 2002, the pretrial jail term of Russian physicist Dr. Valentin Danilov expired, and the regional Krasnoyarsk prison chose not to extend it. Human rights observers believe this indicates that Dr. Danilov’s 19-month legal nightmare may finally be ending. The Russian Security Service arrested Valentin Danilov, head of the Thermo-Physics Centre at Krasnoyarsk State Technical University, in February 2001, on charges of treason and fraud for allegedly selling top secret satellite information to a Chinese company. His research dealt with the effect of solar activity on space satellites. Dr. Danilov has consistently maintained that this information has been declassified and available in scientific journals for more than 10 years.

The Sutyagin and Danilov cases highlight the issue of government action against scientists who attempt to commercialize their research. Scientists are at risk because the rules on what constitutes a state secret are very unclear. According to a recent editorial in the *Moscow Times* about Dr. Danilov’s trial, “A 1993 law lists the categories of state secrets, but various government ministries and agencies issue their own, secret lists with new categories, and researchers have no way of knowing for sure what they can reveal and what they cannot.”

The case is also an example of the positive role that the international scientific community can play in advocating for the human rights of their colleagues. Last spring when the regional court ruled that Dr. Danilov could be released on bail, his family was unable to raise the necessary funds. The American Physical Society (APS) stepped in and initiated a successful campaign to raise money for bail. In total, they raised over $4,000 from 40 US-based scientists. This action was widely publicized in Russia and was effective in demonstrating the strong international support for Dr. Danilov.

Dr. Danilov reports that he is doing well. While in pre-trial detention, he suffered a heart attack and was briefly hospitalized. Although he received some medical attention, his lengthy time in jail took a serious toll on his health. Dr. Danilov credits his release to the strong international pressure and is especially thankful to all those who contributed funds for his bail.

**Sri Lanka**

Maldeni Kamkanamlage Piyratne, Zoologist
In July 2002, Maldeni Kamkanamlage Piyratne died shortly after Peradeniya police severely beat him. Mr. Piyratne was a zoologist, working at the Department of Zoology of the University of Peradeniya. His wife, Nilmini Herat, took him to a local hospital on 29 June because he had a high fever. Mrs. Herat had visited him in the hospital early in the morning on 3 July and said that her husband had been quite normal and that nothing was out of the ordinary.

A colleague of Mr. Piyratne, Ranasinghe, called Mrs. Herat at about 10:30 that morning, to say that he had been riding a bus near the Gatabe Temple, where he saw police beating Mr. Piyratne. Ranasinghe attempted to intervene by pleading with the police to stop the abuse, but he was chased away, whereupon Mr. Piyratne was taken to the Peradeniya police station. Ranasinghe went to the university to recruit another colleague to help intervene on behalf of Mr. Piyratne. By the time the two men arrived at the police station half an hour later, police were washing blood off the floor. Mr. Piyratne was taken back to the hospital, where he died before doctors could give him oxygen.

It is not clear why Mr. Piyratne did not remain in the hospital that morning. There is speculation that he suffered some mental disorientation as a result of an injection, but there has been no inquiry into this matter. Mr. Piyratne’s wife feels that an adequate investigation has not been conducted and that police have attempted to hush up the incident.

Sudan

Nagib Negmeldin, Medical Doctor
Fatih Abdel Rahman, Torture Treatment Center Staff
Zienab Omer Ahmed, Torture Treatment Center Staff
Faisal el Bagir Mohamed, Torture Treatment Center Board Member
Tahani Ibrahim Ahmed, Computer Science Student
Adam Fadl Allah Adam, Law student
Husam El-Din Abdullah, Medical student
Allaa El-Din Mustafa Mohamed Ali, Agriculture student
Ghosai El-Nour Mohamed Ahmed, Agriculture student
Mohamed Al-Hadi Awad Sulieman, Economics student
Amal Center for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Torture and Violence

In 2001 and 2002, the Amal Center for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Torture and Violence continued to face ongoing harassment from the Sudanese government. The Amal Center, which was established in November
2000, provides free medical treatment and counseling for victims of human rights abuses and is the first of its kind in Sudan.

On 11 March 2001, Sudanese security forces arrested the Director of the Amal Center, Dr. Nagib Negmeldin, and two of his colleagues, Mr. Fatih Abdel Rahman and Mrs. Zienab Omer Ahmed. After being interrogated for several hours, Mr. Abdel and Mrs. Omer were released at close to midnight that evening. The government continued to hold Dr. Negmeldin in custody, releasing him 18 days later. During the March 2001 arrests, the security services also raided the Amal Center, confiscating computers, office equipment, a generator, medical equipment, and confidential patient records. Security officials closed down the Center for eight months.

It is believed that the arrest and raid were an attempt of the government to impede a meeting between Dr. Negmeldin and the UN Special Rapporteur for Human Rights, which was scheduled to take place two days after his arrest. Throughout his professional career, Dr. Negmeldin has advocated for respect for human rights and democracy in Sudan. In the last two decades, the government has arrested him several times in reprisal for his activism. During previous detentions, Dr. Negmeldin was subjected to torture while in custody.

In October 2001, the government reopened the Amal Center and returned all confiscated materials, including patient records. Center staff remain at risk for future government reprisals, but have continued to offer medical services to survivors of torture.

Others attempting to raise the issue of human rights and torture in Sudan also faced harsh repression by security forces. In June 2001, Faisal el Bagir Mohamed, a member of the Amal Center and the Sudan Victims of Torture Group (SVTG), was arrested after meeting with government officials. He was seeking official permission to organize events commemorating the fourth annual United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, which is observed on 26 June. Mr. Mohamed was interrogated for several hours and his home and office were searched. He was held incommunicado for several weeks. Faisal el Bagir Mohamed was released on 26 June, the day he was originally seeking to hold his event.

In February 2002, officials at the College of Technological Science in Omdurman, Sudan suspended several students for their human rights advocacy. Tahani Ibrahim Ahmed, a computer science student and members of the SVTG student network, received a twelve-month suspension for attempting to form a local chapter of SVTG at the Technical College. In order to be readmitted to her program, she was forced to sign a pledge to uphold the Student Discipline and Code of Conduct Act. The act,
which was adopted this year, prohibits students from taking part in human rights and political organizing. Another five students were also suspended. Fadl Allah Adam (law student), Husam El-Din Abdullah (medical student), Allaa El-Din Mustafa Mohamed Ali (agriculture student), Ghosai El-Nour Mohamed Ahmed (agriculture student), and Mohamed Al-Hadi Awad Sulieman (economics student) were suspended for participating in a symposium on democracy at the university.

Tunisia

Dr. Moncef Marzouki

On 29 September 2001, a Tunis criminal court formally suspended Dr. Moncef Marzouki’s one-year prison sentence. As a condition of the suspended sentence, Dr. Marzouki lost certain civil rights, including the right to be elected to a government position. Unable to earn a living and subject to increased repression at home, Dr. Marzouki made the difficult decision to leave Tunisia, and accepted a position in the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Paris at Bobigny. He arrived in Paris in December 2001.

In December 2000, Dr. Marzouki was sentenced to twelve months in jail after a trial that was widely criticized as failing to meet international standards of fairness. Eight months of the sentence was for maintaining an outlawed organization, the National Council on Liberties (Conseil national pour les libertés en Tunisie, CNLT). The CNLT is an active human rights organization that often speaks out against government repression. The remainder of his sentence was for charges of “spreading false information liable to disturb the public order.” These charges were related to a private paper critical of Tunisia’s human rights policies that Dr. Marzouki wrote for an October 2000 regional meeting of human rights defenders in Morocco.

Dr. Marzouki, one of Tunisia’s leading human rights defenders, endured years of systematic intimidation and harassment for his outspoken criticism of his government’s human rights record. Dr. Marzouki was subject to constant police surveillance. He was arrested in 1994 and placed in solitary confinement for four months after he declared himself the opposition candidate to president Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali. That year, the gov-
Government also shut down the Center for Community Medicine, a clinic he founded, which provided medical care to residents in the slums of Sousse, a city 100 kilometers south of Tunis. In 2000, the Ministry of Health fired him from his position as professor of public health at the University of Sousse, because of statements he made during a visit to the United States.

Dr. Moncef Marzouki currently lives in France.

**Turkey**

Recai Aldemir, Medical Doctor  
M. Emin Yüksel, Medical Doctor  
Sezgin Tanrikulu, Lawyer

In the past 18 months, Turkish authorities have continued their repression of the Diyarbakir Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, one of the regional torture treatment centers run by the Ankara-based Human Rights Foundation of Turkey (HRFT). This center has particular significance because the Diyarbakir region is in the southeast of Turkey, a region that is very close to the areas of armed conflict between Kurdish rebels and the state. Diyarbakir has experienced a large influx of refugees from the southeast region in recent years. The police have attempted to shut down the Diyarbakir Center several times since it opened in 1998.

On 7 September 2001, police raided the center and confiscated confidential staff files, including information on doctors and patients at the torture treatment center. Although the files were later returned, human rights advocates were concerned that the information would be used to intimidate doctors and patients at the center. The Turkish police have been known to raid torture treatment centers to find the names of patients, whom they then harass and intimidate from seeking further treatment. In November 2001, the government transferred two civil servants working as doctors at the Diyarbakir Center out of the clinic and reassigned them to work in medical facilities in different cities. Dr. Recai Aldemir was sent to the Silvan district and Dr. M. Emin Yüksel was transferred to the Hazro district. The government opened an investigation of the physicians citing “misuse of his duties as a civil servant.” Since the September 2001 raid, patient numbers at the Diyarbakir Center have dramatically decreased. HRFT believes that the raid is deterring individuals from seeking medical help. In March 2002, the government brought charges against HRFT lawyer Sezgin Tanrikulu for establishing a medical treatment and rehabilitation center without seeking permission from the relevant authorities.
Since the HRFT opened in 1990, it has become a highly respected human rights organization. It is recognized internationally as one of few reliable sources of human rights information in the country. In 1998, the Council of Europe awarded HRFT its European Human Rights Prize for its “outstanding contribution to the protection of human rights in Turkey.” Since 1991, it has been providing treatment and rehabilitation services to torture survivors and their families.

The HRFT torture treatments centers have been subject to repeated attacks from the Turkish government. In 1996 and 1997, the founding members of the HRFT were brought to trial in Turkey in connection with HRFT publications, and physicians from its Istanbul and Adana torture treatment facilities were accused of operating illegal medical facilities. AAAS Science and Human Rights Program staff attended a number of trials against the HRFT as international observers.

Uzbekistan

Elena Urlaeva, Human Rights Society of Uzbekistan
Larissa Vdovina, Occupation Unknown

In August 2002, the government of Uzbekistan forcibly detained two women in a psychiatric hospital in the capital of Tashkent. One of them, Elena Urlaeva, is a member of the human rights organization, the Human Rights Society of Uzbekistan. She and another woman, Larissa Vdovina, were attending a peaceful protest on Tuesday, 27 August 2002, in front of the Ministry of Justice building. They were protesting human rights abuses committed by the Uzbek government against Urlaeva, who has been repeatedly targeted for her human rights activism. Police arrested both Urlaeva and Vdovina, along with six other protesters. The two women were held in a district police station for one night, but transferred the next day to a psychiatric hospital for compulsory treatment. The other detainees were released.

Human Rights Watch researchers confirmed that both women were given psychiatric drugs during their detention. Urlaeva told the researcher that she had been given “injections and tablets.” This is great concern that such treatment represents a misuse of psychiatry and was an attempt to punish human rights activists.

This is not the first time that Urlaeva had been forcibly detained in a psychiatric hospital. In 2001, she was detained for two months in connection with her human rights activism. After her release, she continued
working at the Human Rights Society and denounced her arrest. On 5 June 2002, a judge in Tashkent ordered that she again be detained in a psychiatric hospital. However, the police did not take action until August when she was arrested at the protest.

In June 2002, Urlaeva and Vdovina left the psychiatric hospital voluntarily. Urlaeva lodged a complaint about the legality of her forced detention. In July a Tashkent city court ruled that the detention was legal. There is some concern that she could be detained again at a psychiatric hospital.

**ISSUE ALERT: Turkey**

Policy of Forced Virginity Testing of Health Students

In July 2001, the Turkish Ministry of Health adopted a code of conduct that required virginity exams of female students in state-run health schools. The code required any female student suspected of having had sexual relationships, whether consensual or not, or of being a prostitute to undergo a virginity exam. Females who were determined not to be virgins faced mandatory expulsion from school.

The predominantly Muslim culture of Turkey emphasizes virginity as an important social norm and women are expected to remain virgins until marriage. Until 1999, forced gynecological exams were commonly performed. The government instituted a ban on the practice in 1999 after five female students who did not want to undergo the physical exam committed suicide by ingesting rat poison.

The code of conduct came under immediate and widespread criticism from women’s organizations and human rights groups, both internationally and in Turkey. The Turkish Medical Association (TMA) and the Association of Turkish Nurses have long condemned this practice. In 1992, the TMA released an official statement against virginity examinations, calling the practice “an assault to the woman’s sexual identity.”

In late 2001, under the intense pressure, Health Minister Osman Durmus publicly reversed his position on the policy of physical exams and instructed doctors to observe the 1999 ban. However, the policy was not officially rescinded until February 2002.
Appendix A: Guidelines for Adoption of Cases of Concern

The Science and Human Rights Program of the AAAS focuses its casework activities on three main areas: 1) violations of scientific freedom and the professional rights of scientists, engineers, health professionals, students in any of these fields, scientific organizations, and professional groups representing their interests; 2) violations of the human rights of scientists not directly related to the conduct of science; and 3) participation by scientists in practices which infringe on the human rights of others.

Cases may relate to government policies and practices that violate the professional and human rights of scientists in general, or to repressive actions taken against or by individual scientists.

In addition, cases may relate to governmental policies and practices that restrict the ability of scientists to perform their work, misuse science to carry out human rights violations, contravene internationally-recognized professional codes of ethics, or target specific groups of scientists or scientific organizations for repression. Cases may involve, but are not limited to, issues of academic freedom, restrictions on the right to travel, and infringements on medical neutrality or other violations of principles of professional ethics.

For the purposes of deciding whether action by AAAS is appropriate, scientists are defined as members of any of the disciplines meeting the criteria for affiliation with AAAS. This includes those assisting in scientific initiatives and health care workers.

The Program’s human rights activity is based on the following principles:

1. Science is a worldwide enterprise that requires freedom of thought, communication, and travel, and the freedom to pursue professional activities without interference.
2. Scientific societies should encourage international respect for the human rights standards embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international treaties, as a matter of scientific freedom and responsibility.
3. Respect for human rights is an end in itself and not a means to other desirable ends (such as scientific progress), although it may serve to promote such ends.

4. Scientific groups should not seek any special rights for scientists outside of those general rights embodied in international law.

5. Scientific groups have a special interest in responding to violations involving individual scientists, groups of scientists, or scientific organizations or institutions because we have a special collegial identity with scientists, not because scientists are more deserving than any other group of individuals whose rights might be violated.

6. The role of scientists in society is a priority of AAAS. Scientific groups have a responsibility to speak out against government policies that require scientists to participate in the execution of policies that result in human rights violations or that use science to carry out human rights violations.

7. Groups should support their international counterparts who are vulnerable to governmental restrictions and abuses because they engage in research that may be perceived as having negative political implications.

8. Scientific societies should support individual scientists, groups of scientists, or scientific organizations or institutions in countries where governmental policies may conflict with established professional ethics.

9. Cases of human rights violations frequently occur in conditions of widespread political repression, the elimination of which is likely to be a long-term process. Nevertheless, pressure from public bodies outside the country concerned can be effective in these cases (for example, in securing the release of a political prisoner, helping to protect the safety of someone whose life has been threatened, or ensuring respect for scientific freedom and responsibility).

The Program communicates its concern about the violation of scientists’ professional and human rights to the appropriate government officials of the country involved and to US government officials. The Program also provides AAAS member associations and other non-governmental organizations with information about specific cases and encourages them to express their concern.

The Program adopts individual cases on the basis of information provided by authoritative international human rights organizations and, where suitably documented, by human rights groups or scientific associations in
the country concerned. The goal is to deal with all cases meeting AAAS criteria as soon as possible after the particular violation has occurred. The Program also attempts to keep old cases under review, and to periodically renew complaints or inquiries until a satisfactory resolution is achieved.

Sources of Information

This report is based on information received from many human rights organizations and scientific societies from around the world, including:

- American Association of University Professors
- American Chemical Society Human Rights Committee
- American Political Science Association
- American Physical Society Committee on International Freedom of Scientists
- American Sociological Association
- Amnesty International
- Association for the Advancement of Social Science (AVANSCO), Guatemala
- Association for the Prevention of Torture
- Bellona Foundation
- B’Tselem
- Burma Information Group
- Campaign for Human Rights in Tunisia
- The Committee to Protect Journalists
- Cuba Press
- Democratic Movement in China
- Derechos Human Rights
- Digital Freedom Network
- Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
- El-Nadim Center for the Management & Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence
- Ethiopian Democratic Action League
- Free Burma Coalition
- Free Vietnam Alliance
- Global Health Council
- Guatemala Human Rights Commission
- Human Rights Foundation of Turkey
- Human Rights in China
- Human Rights Watch
- Human Rights Watch, Academic Freedom Program
Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies
Information Center for Human Rights
The International Federation of Health and Human Rights Organiza-
tions
International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX)
International Human Rights Law Group
International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights
International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims
LAW - The Palestinian Society for the Protection of Human Rights
and the Environment
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights
League of Human Rights in Tunisia
National Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Rights
National Council on Liberties in Tunisia
National Security Archive
NEAR-Network for Education and Academic Rights
Network of Concerned Historians
Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders
Palestinian Human Rights Monitoring Group
Physicians for Human Rights-United States
Physicians for Human Rights-Israel
Scholars at Risk Network
United Ethiopian Civic Organizations
World Organisation Against Torture (WOAT)

Supporting information came from news and articles published in
major US newspapers and journals; information supplied by individual
scientists, family members, and friends; scientific societies; US embas-
sies; and the US Department of State.
Appendix B:
Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948

Preamble

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, therefore, The General Assembly,

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect
for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

**Article 1**

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

**Article 2**

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

**Article 3**

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

**Article 4**

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

**Article 5**

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

**Article 6**

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.
Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11

1. Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.
2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.
   2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.
   2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16

1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.
   2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.
   3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
   2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.
Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21

1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.
2. Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country.
3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human
dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protec-

4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the pro-
tection of his interests.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limita-
tion of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health
and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing,
housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to
security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood,
old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assis-
tance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the
same social protection.

Article 26

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least
in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be
compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally
available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the
basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human
personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and funda-
mental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship
among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activi-
ties of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall
be given to their children.

Article 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the
community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its
benefits.
2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29

1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.