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Preface

The persecuted scientists listed in this Directory were cases taken up by the AAAS Science and Human Rights Network through of the AAAS Human Rights Action Network (AAASHRAN) during 2003 and 2004. The findings and conclusions of this report are those of the author. They do not necessarily represent the views of the Board or Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Copies of this report are available from the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, 1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, Telephone: 202 326 6790, Fax: 202 289 4950, or E-mail: shrp@aaas.org. This report can also be found on the Program’s website at http://shr.aaas.org.

Victoria Baxter
Senior Program Associate
AAAS Science and Human Rights Program
Introduction

For close to 30 years, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) has been at the forefront of protecting the rights of scientists and the scientific community as well as finding innovative means to apply the tools and methods of science to the benefit of society as a whole. The work of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program has constituted a leading example of the commitment of the AAAS to “advancing science and serving society.”

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.

The Program monitors human rights violations perpetrated against scientists, engineers, and health professionals, and organizes campaigns on their behalf. Program staff engages the scientific community about the connections between science and human rights and encourages 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 the full realization of human rights is a precondition for the 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).

It is noteworthy that international human rights law recognizes a substantive right to the freedom necessary for scientific research and a right to have access to the benefits of scientific progress. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) is the major international human rights instrument addressing these issues. Article 15 specifies that States Parties, that is, the countries that have ratified or acceded to this instrument, “undertake to respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research and creative activity.” Article 15 of ICESCR builds on the text of a parallel provision in article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “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.” Because ICESCR has the status of a treaty and as such is legally binding on those nations that become States Parties, it instructs these countries to “recognize the right of everyone” both “to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications” and “to benefit from the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.” To achieve these goals, the text mandates that States Parties undertake a series of steps, including “those necessary for the conservation, the development and the diffusion of science and culture.” More specifically, States Parties make the commitment to “recognize the benefits to be derived from the encouragement and development of international contacts and cooperation in the scientific and cultural fields.”

2 Art. 15 (1) (b), ICESCR.
3 Art. 15 (1) (c), ICESCR.
4 Art. 15 (2), ICESCR.
5 Art. 15 (4), ICESCR.
AAAS’ Long History of Promoting Human Rights and Scientific Freedom

By Amy Crumpton, AAAS Archivist

With the creation of the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility in 1970 and the Science and Human Rights Program in 1977, AAAS formalized its concern to address human rights abuses of scientists throughout the world and mobilize effective assistance on their behalf. However, AAAS has a long history of working to promote human rights and scientific freedom. Prior to 1970, AAAS responded to science and human rights issues in a variety of circumstances. As fascism pervaded Europe in the 1930s, the association’s journal Science reported on American protests against Mussolini’s dismissals of dissenting Italian professors and Nazi dismissal of Jewish professors. The situation prompted the AAAS Council to adopt a “Declaration of Intellectual Freedom” in December 1933, which stated that “suppression of independent thought and of its free expression as a major crime against civilization itself.”*

In late 1956, as the Soviets invaded Hungary, the AAAS Council resolved that the association and its affiliated societies assist refugee Hungarian scientists and technical personnel in finding new positions. After 1970, AAAS regularly adopted resolutions condemning the persecution of scientists in specific countries such as Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Nicaragua, and the Soviet Union as well as appealing for release of incarcerated scholars in the Philippines, Poland, El Salvador, Uruguay and Pakistan.

AAAS also worked to affirm its commitment to protest repression, harassment and abuse of U.S. scientists as well as to protect their fundamental rights to freedom of expression, of assembly, and of travel. In the late 1940s, the House Committee on Un-American Activities accused a number of American scientists and intellectuals of being or aiding communists and the AAAS Executive Committee publicly defended physicist E.U. Condon against HUAC’s aggressive tactics. During the

“AAAS efforts to defend the rights of scientists have been complemented historically with recognition that science and the credibility of the scientific community might be harnessed in the service of human rights more generally”.

*
1950s, AAAS protested U.S. government restrictions via the McCarran Act that prohibited U.S. scientists and those from “friendly nations” from traveling to exchange scientific information that did not pertain to national security. AAAS addressed this recurring issue of travel for scientists and its importance to the free communication of science most recently in a 1999 resolution on “The Universality of Science and Freedom in the Conduct of Science.”

AAAS efforts to defend the rights of scientists have been complemented historically with recognition that science and the credibility of the scientific community might be harnessed in the service of human rights more generally. Exemplifying this idea, the AAAS Council called for protection of the “land, irrigation, and cultural rights” of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1923, the protection of the Tule of Panama from “aggression and exploitation” in 1926, and the protection of the indigenous peoples and ecosystems of Brazil in 1981. In early 1970s, AAAS called for the cessation of the Vietnam War and urged the U.S. to ban the use of chemical weapons. In the early 1980s, AAAS condemned the genocide of the Cambodian population and urged ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

* AAAS resolutions on science and human rights, as well as on intellectual freedom and a host of other topics, are available at http://archives.aaas.org under “Official Documents.”

The Program focuses its individual casework in 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 casework include cases involving academic freedom, restrictions on the right to travel, infringements of medical neutrality, or other violations of principles of professional ethics. A clearinghouse on the right to travel to Cuba was initiated to gather information on travel restrictions and to assist individuals and scientific societies to understand the travel regulations.

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.
Fostering the Links between Science and Human Rights

Applying Science to Human Rights: The “Human Rights Technology Transfer”

By Audrey R. Chapman
Director, Science and Human Rights Program

Throughout its history, the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program has been a leader in finding innovative and creative ways to apply science to a wide range of human rights related problems. From the earliest days of the Science and Human Rights Program, AAAS has furthered the link between science and human rights by making scientific knowledge, methods, and expertise available to benefit human rights. The Program has been using science to serve societies during extreme violence and violations of fundamental freedoms. This work has also been instrumental in helping societies overcome legacies of abuse and to look forward to a more positive future.

The use of scientific methods for human rights documentation is important because the extent of human rights violations and who bears responsibility for them is often highly contested. Analyses based on anecdotes and counter-anecdotes are easily manipulated with inappropriate comparisons and invalid logic. Scientific work on human rights violations can provide massive, objective, and undeniable evidence. If a political debate turns on an argument about facts, statistical evidence can make findings that support or contradict different positions in the debate.

In 1984, the newly elected Argentine Government called on the Program to provide forensic scientists to help document the level of killing and violence under the brutal military regime that had perpetrated widespread human rights violations during the “Dirty War” (1973-1983), including “disappearances” and extrajudicial killings. The Program’s initial mission led to the establishment and training of the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, which exhumes bodies from mass graves in order to identify the cause of death and determine the identity of the victims. Subsequently the Science and Human Rights Program formed and trained a second forensic anthropology team in Guatemala. Since that time, forensic anthropologists have worked to document mass killings in conflicts around the world, including the ethnic cleansing campaign in the
Former Yugoslavia to the Rwandan genocide of 1994. In many cases, the remains of victims are returned to family members for a reburial that honors the local cultural practices, allowing some measure of closure for surviving family members.

Since 1984, the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, Physicians for Human Rights, Amnesty International, the Committee of Concerned Forensic Scientists, and the Minnesota Lawyers Committee have sponsored or cosponsored forensic missions to conduct initial and second autopsies, to observe official inquests into deaths in detention to exhume graves of alleged victims of political killings, and to assist court-ordered investigations of suspicious deaths in such countries as Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Yugoslavia, Croatia, Chile, the former Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Kenya, Mexico, the Philippines, South Korea, and the West Bank (Israel). In his book documenting the many contributions of science to the field of human rights, Richard Pierre Claude called this and other applications of science a “human rights technology transfer.”

The Argentine Government also made a request for assistance from genetic scientists for the purpose of identifying the missing children of political activists detained by the former regime, who had been given to military couples or offered for adoption to unsuspecting couples. During the years of military rule over 400 such children were believed to have been taken from their families or born in secret detention centers to mothers who had been “disappeared.” Grandmothers of these children wanted to know their whereabouts and also to find ways scientifically to prove that the children were related to them. SHR worked with U.S. scientist Mary Clair King of the University of California, Berkeley to develop blood-typing and mitochondrial DNA sequencing to determine whether there was a family link between a specific child and the likely grandmother. In many cases, this test provided the only means to discover the true identities of these children.

Human rights organizations and commissions increasingly undertake projects that require an understanding of large-scale violations, such as mass killings and genocide, deportations and ethnic cleansing, and systematic detention and torture. However, the usual tools of human rights documentation are inadequate for dealing with such phenomena. In order to understand large-scale violations, human rights groups need to be able to collect, organize, and analyze massive amounts of information. Since

---

the mid-1990s, SHR developed appropriate information management and statistical methodologies for dealing with large-scale violations and provided technical assistance and training to truth commissions, tribunals, ombudsmen, and non-governmental organizations in Guatemala, South Africa, Haiti, Honduras, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, East Timor, Kosovo, and Sierra Leone, as well as the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia.

Collecting and analyzing massive amounts of data requires information management systems that include specialized research and survey designs, interviewing techniques, and database designs. Statistical calculations can go beyond analyzing existing data, and it has been in these areas that work by SHR has had the greatest impact. For example, on behalf of the Guatemalan truth commission, SHR used a statistical method termed “multiple systems estimation” to be able to estimate the total number of victims killed in Guatemala — including those who were documented by one or more projects plus those never documented by any project. When disaggregated by time period and population group, the calculations constituted one of the bases for the commission’s finding that acts of genocide had been committed.

There has been increasing awareness in recent years that the ability to undertake systematic monitoring of the major international human rights instruments is central to evaluating the performance of states and holding them accountable for violations of these rights. Monitoring state compliance with international human rights standards, however, is an exacting process with numerous scientific and methodological prerequisites. Moreover, most human rights specialists are trained in law or philosophy and not science or the social sciences and therefore lack the skills to develop rigorous methodologies.

SHR has made major contributions to developing new methodologies and resources for monitoring economic, social and cultural rights based on a “violations approach” and thereby plays an important bridging role between social scientists, statisticians, and the human rights community. The Thesaurus of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which is available in both online and print versions in three languages — English, Spanish, and French — organizes and classifies the rights in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to create a common vocabulary and framework for these rights. By introducing standardized and uniform (controlled) vocabulary for use in identifying

[7 http://shr.aaas.org/thesaurus/](http://shr.aaas.org/thesaurus/)
and classifying violations, the *Thesaurus* is the first step in the development of a monitoring system.

Precisely conceptualizing the content of specific rights and the related state obligations is a requirement for the development of indicators and monitoring strategies and SHR has made a major contribution to this process. In *Core Obligations: Building a Framework for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (Intersentia Publishers, 2002) international experts coordinated by Program staff have written chapters applying a common framework to the individual rights in the Covenant, designed to make it possible to use the same approach to monitoring rights as different as the rights to health, education, and access to the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. The Program has also developed a series of manuals providing more in-depth information and resources for monitoring individual rights. These include a manual on the right to health written in partnership with the Commonwealth Medical Trust Association. SHR has also published manuals on monitoring the right to food and labor rights and is in the final stages of drafting a manual on the right to water in collaboration with COHRE, a Geneva based NGO, and the WHO Water and Sanitation Program. Currently, SHR is moving ahead on developing indicators for specific rights, beginning with indicators for the right to health.

SHR has been able to build on its knowledge of the truth commissions to which it has provided scientific assistance to evaluate their “truth” or truth-finding capabilities and to make recommendations about the effectiveness of various methodologies. The expertise of staff in applying systematic social science methodologies has also enabled SHR to undertake the first comprehensive empirical study of the societal impacts of the most influential and widely copied truth commission, the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). Working with a series of South African collaborators, SHR conducted a research project assessing the TRC. The project has used a series of different types of methodologies, including a systematic qualitative and quantitative analysis of the Human Rights Violations Hearings and the Amnesty Hearings transcripts, focus groups with former victims, interviews with a cross-section of religious leaders, in-depth interviews with former perpetrators, re-analysis of the South African public opinion survey data related to the TRC, and a series of case studies of communities and organizations.

Consistent with the Program’s overall mission of bringing human rights to science and science to human rights, a project linking environmental
protection with human rights has three overall goals: (1) to raise awareness among environmental scientists that human rights mechanisms can be invoked to protect the environmental dimensions of health, food and agriculture, and water; (2) to make human rights and environmental protection more effective by improving the ability of practitioners to incorporate the scientific and technical dimensions of these rights into their work; and (3) to develop scientifically accurate methods for monitoring the environmental dimensions of these rights.

Project activities are directed to the following four areas: (1) gathering resource documents and listings on the scientific, technical and environmental dimensions of these rights and making them available online; (2) conducting background research on the scientific and environmental factors that affect the ability to realize these human rights and compiling the results in a series of studies; (3) translating this research into standards, benchmarks and monitoring protocols; and (4) developing resource manuals and other educational materials that will enable staff of governmental and nongovernmental organizations, as well as members of the scientific community, to make practical use of this information to advance the realization of these human rights worldwide.

Thus far, we have developed an online database of environmental and human rights resources. The website contains hundreds of annotated resource listings, including treaties and other legal documents, scientific reports and policy papers, and organizations that work on human rights and/or environmental concerns. The resources are cross-referenced, and linked to the full text of documents and the home pages of organizations. An environmental scientist serving as a consultant to the project has recently completed a study linking environmental protection, public health and human rights. The report explains, to generalists, the scientific component of topics such as the impact of toxic substances on health and the environment, climate change, and biodiversity and explores their human rights implications (currently under peer review). We are also developing scientifically based indicators and methods for monitoring the environmental dimensions of the right to health and will shortly publish a manual on this topic.

A linked-project brings the understanding of human rights to traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), which refers to those aspects of indigenous knowledge systems relating to the use, management and conservation of the environment and natural resources. The Traditional Ecological Knowledge Prior Art Database (T.E.K.*P.A.D.) is an online digital
archive of traditional practices from local communities throughout the world submitted by local communities as well as pre-existing documentation in the public domain. The database captures the knowledge in a format consistent with Western intellectual property guidelines as a form of a defensive disclosure. Defensive disclosure, by describing information in a printed publication or other publicly accessible medium, places traditional knowledge in the public domain and establishes it as prior art. The existence of prior art makes it more difficult for people outside of the traditional knowledge systems to inappropriately claim this knowledge, thus helping to protect both the moral and material interests of the traditional knowledge holders.
Applying Human Rights to Science: Casework on behalf of persecuted scientists

By Victoria Baxter
Senior Program Associate

The core of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program is the work of fostering the human rights protections of scientists around the world. The main vehicle for the Science and Human Rights Program casework activity is 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. This 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.

In the two year period that this Directory covers, January 2003–December 2004, there have been positive resolutions in four of the cases that the Program has covered. All four have been honored by the Program during a special reception organized at the AAAS Annual Meeting. The releases demonstrate the effectiveness that international pressure of scientists writing appeal letters on behalf of their colleagues.

Egyptian sociologist Saad Eddin Ibrahim faced persecution for speaking out about election fraud and promoting democracy in his country. Dr. Ibrahim was the Program’s honoree at the 2003 Science and Human Rights Program reception held at the AAAS Annual Meeting. Dr. Ibrahim had recently been released from prison, but was unable to travel out of Egypt to attend the Annual Meeting as he had to await the final verdict in
his case. His daughter Randa and son Amir traveled to the Annual Meeting to accept the honor on their father’s behalf.

During the reception, Randa stated that the:

“[scientific community’s] support throughout the last three years has sustained our hope and kept the family’s spirits high. Beyond that, your solidarity has reinforced my father’s resolve to fight for human rights and democracy, in a region that lives in fear of war from without and tyranny from within. This dual fear has made the struggle for his freedom all the more complex.”

Another honoree of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program was also released in 2003. 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. He spent six years in jail fighting the spurious charges. The Program honored him in absentia during the 1998 Annual Meeting. Upon his release, he wrote to the Program to inform us that he was finally free. He wrote, “I am grateful for the honour you have bestowed upon me in recognizing my efforts to uphold the independence of the academia. For which I paid a price. The plaque you have given me will be among my few memorabilia that I value highly.”

In 2002, humanitarian aid worker Arjan Erkel was taken hostage in the Russian Republic of Dagestan. He was in the region to provide much needed medical aid to refugees from neighboring Chechnya. After spending 20 months in captivity, he was released in 2004. He credits the strong international pressure on his case to keeping him safe and alive during the long months of his captivity. The Program honored him at the 2005 Annual Meeting.
Vietnamese doctor and human rights advocate Nguyen Dan Que was released from prison in 2005. Dr. Que has spent 19 of the last 27 years in prison for speaking out for democracy and human rights in his country. He has also suffered professionally, as he was fired from his hospital position when he criticized the government’s health care policy. His brother stated that international pressure brought to bear on Dr. Que’s case was instrumental in ensuring his release. The Program honored Dr. Que at the 1996 AAAS Annual Meeting.

(A complete list of honorees from past Science and Human Rights Program receptions is listed below.)

Working within the Scientific Community

The Program also maintains many longstanding and effective partnerships with other professional scientific societies and organizations. The breadth and depth of the involvement in human rights advocacy throughout the scientific community is quite astonishing. AAAS currently works with 25 scientific societies and organizations on specific cases.

For many decades, the U.S. scientific and academic communities have demonstrated a strong commitment to human rights and scientific freedom issues. Several professional scientific societies have a long history of activism and interest in human rights. Much of the focus of various disciplines, notably among physicists, anthropologists and chemists, has been on advocacy on behalf of their persecuted colleagues through writing campaigns, trial observation and the provision of moral or material support to colleagues threatened or imprisoned either as a consequence of their scientific work or their involvement in non-violent pro-democracy or pro-human rights activities. A list of societies that currently have human rights or scientific freedom committees is available on our website at: http://shr.aaas.org/scisocs/

SHR is committed to expanding the human rights work of the scientific society and has several events, conferences, workshops, and other activities planning in the coming years to continue this valuable work. As the largest and most diverse scientific society and with a staff dedicated to human rights, AAAS is the natural organization to play a leading role in developing the human rights agenda of scientists and working to coordinate a wide variety of activities and actors.

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 one or more scientists who, through action and example, have 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 2005, the Program honored both an individual and an organization working to provide critical humanitarian care and medical assistance in times of conflict and natural disaster. The Program honored the organization Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF). MSF is an international humanitarian aid organization that provides emergency medical assistance to populations in danger in more than 80 countries. MSF plays an important role in conflict situations by raising awareness of crisis situations and serving as a witness to speak out, either through public or private channels about the plight of individuals in area of political instability. MSF seeks to alleviate human suffering, to protect life and health and to restore and ensure respect for the human beings and their fundamental human rights.

The individual honored was Arjan Erkel, a Dutch humanitarian aid worker who was the Head of Mission for the French medical aid association Médecins Sans Frontières in Dagestan. Erkel was abducted on 12 August 2002 by three gunmen in Makhachkala, Dagestan. Erkel was in the region providing medical assistance and humanitarian aid to displaced people from the neighboring region of Chechnya. The Program issued urgent appeals on the AAASHRAN about Erkel’s kidnapping and urged members of the scientific community to pressure the government to investigate the case, ensure Erkel’s safety and to hold those responsible accountable. Arjan Erkel was freed after 20 months in captivity.
Past Honorees include:

2004

- The Guatemalan Forensic Anthropology Foundation (Fundación de Antropología Forense de Guatemala, FAFG) investigates mass human rights abuses, focusing on the recovery and identification of victims killed and buried in clandestine gravesites during Guatemala’s 36-year internal armed conflict. The FAFG uses forensic anthropology and archeology to search for the estimated 200,000 lives that were lost. The work of FAFG is critical in Guatemala as there is no official government exhumation program and exhumations have played a critical role in scientifically documenting massacres perpetrated by the Guatemalan military and providing resolution to the family members of victims. Since 2001, FAFG members have faced increased repression and have been subject to numerous attacks and death threats. The individuals behind the threats may have had ties to the military during Guatemala’s civil war. One of the threatening letters sent to the FAFG forensic scientists 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. FAFG Executive Director, Fredy Peccerelli attended the reception to accept the recognition on behalf of the Foundation.

2003

- Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim is a sociologist and 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. In 2000, Egyptian security forces appeared late one night at his house to arrest him 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. The charges were related to a documentary that the Ibn Khaldun Center had created about voting rights and voter fraud in Egypt. The Center has been a leading moderate voice in Egypt calling for democracy, fair elections, and tolerance within the Egyptian society. Dr. Ibrahim faced two-and-a-half years of trials and appeals on the charges and was at one point sentenced to a seven-year prison term. In early 2003, Dr. Ibrahim placed his final appeal in Egypt’s highest court, the Court of Cassation, which acquitted him of all charges. Since his initial arrest, Dr. Ibrahim had spent over 500 days in prison. His health suffered greatly while he was in prison. He suffers from a neurological disorder that impedes the flow of oxygen to his brain and he was not receiving sufficient medical care for this condition or a broken leg he suffered while in prison. He continues to live and work in Egypt.

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 Kosovo, 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 unclassified 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 anti-government student demonstration, which resulted in the death of at least one student. On 9 June 2003, Dr. Alemayehu Teferra was released from prison. He credits his release to the international attention to his case.

- 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. Woldeyes Asrat 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

Haluk Gerger
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. He was arrested again in 2003 and released in an amnesty in 2005. Dr. Nguyen Dan Que lives in Hanoi.

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.
AAASHRAN Casework Activities: January 2003–December 2004

This Directory is not meant to be exhaustive of all the human rights violations perpetrated against scientist, but to provide an update of the cases taken up by the Program during this period. 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 January 2003 through December 2004. During that 24 month period, the Program issued 44 AAASHRAN alerts and/or updates regarding 27 cases.

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</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAASHRAN cases deal with individuals from a wide range of disciplines. The following chart shows the scientific professions of the individuals who were subjects of AAASHRAN alerts:
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 24 month period of January 2003 to December 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Worker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture Treatment Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burma/Myanmar

- **Salai Tun Than, Agronomist**

  Dr. Salai Tun Than is a former Rector of the Yezin University, Professor at the Institute of Agriculture in Burma, and current director of the Myanmar Integrated Rural Development Association (MIRDA). He received his Bachelor of Science in Agriculture from the University of Rangoon, Burma in 1953, his Master of Science in Agronomy from the University of Georgia in 1955 and his Ph.D. in Crop Nutrition from the University of Wisconsin in 1959.

  Dr. Salai was arrested in November 2001 after he staged a one-man protest in front of the Rangoon government building, during which he called for a multiparty general election and the unconditional transfer of state power to the winning party, the National League for Democracy (NLD). The NLD is the party of Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi. The NLD won more than 60 percent of the popular vote and 80 percent of the parliamentary seats. However, the ruling military junta, the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), has not allowed the elected representatives to convene parliament. A few months after his arrest, the government sentenced Dr. Salai to a seven-year prison term under Article 5(j) of the 1950 Emergency Provisions Act. The trial failed to meet international standards for fairness. In addition, international human rights groups have criticized the emergency act as a tool of the government to suppress legitimate dissent.

  In May 2003, the SPDC announced the release of 18 detainees, including Dr. Salai, for humanitarian grounds. The SPDC stated that these releases were part of an effort to restore multiparty democracy and national reconciliation. However, the government continues to hold hundreds of political prisoners, including members of ethnic minority groups and elected members of parliament, in detention. In addition, as a condition of their release, the individuals were made to promise that they would not engage in future political activities or face immediate re-arrest to serve out the remainder of their original sentences.

  Upon his release, Dr. Salai told reporters that he plans to continue his work on rural development projects. He was aware of the letterwriting
campaigns on his behalf, including those organized by his almae matres of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the University of Georgia. He thanked all individuals who wrote to the government protesting his arrest and sentencing.

China

- **Charles Li, Medical Doctor, Businessman**

  Dr. Charles Li has a degree in medicine and is a businessman. He received a graduate degree in Physiology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and did further research at Harvard University. He is a naturalized American citizen and lived with his family in Menlo Park, California prior to his arrest in China.

  Chinese officials detained Dr. Li as he arrived in Guangzhou Airport in January 2003 from the United States. Chinese officials charged Dr. Li with sabotaging T.V. and/or radio equipment, which carries a maximum penalty of 15 years in prison. Dr. Li was sentenced to a three-year prison term. Dr. Li intended to find information about the repression of Falun Gong practitioners. Falun Gong is a non-violent spiritual practice that is based on an ancient Chinese form of meditation and special exercises. The Chinese government has often used extreme means against Falun Gong members, which they see as a “cult” and a challenge to Communist Party control over the country.

  According to reports from friends of Dr. Li, he is in weak health and has been forced to work at a shoe factory. Dr. Li has complained to American Consulate officials that he has been mistreated while in detention and routinely deprived of sleep by prison officials. He is under pressure to “confess” to the charges, but refuses to admit guilt. He is currently serving out the remaining year of his prison term.

- **Jiang Yanyong, Medical Doctor**

  Dr. Jiang Yanyong is a retired medical doctor and nationally renowned surgeon in Beijing, China. He was the Chief of Surgery at the No. 301 Hospital in Beijing.

  Dr. Jiang became the subject of international attention in 2003 when he publicly exposed information about the numbers of cases of people suffering from Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in China. At that time, the Ministry of Health had only officially admitted to a handful of cases of SARS in Beijing. Dr. Jiang reported that there were at least 170
known cases and later reports confirmed a widespread epidemic of SARS in China. His whistle blowing report forced the government to admit to the extent of the spread of SARS and to step up their public health response. Time Magazine named Dr. Jiang as one of “People who Mattered in 2003” for his decision to expose the extent of the SARS problem in China.

In February 2004, Dr. Jiang felt that he had built up enough political capital to press the government on other issues. As the 15-year anniversary of the assault against the student-led demonstrations in Tiananmen Square was approaching in June 2004, Dr. Jiang wrote a public letter detailing the suffering inflicted on the civilians he had treated at the No. 301 Hospital during the government crackdown. His letter urged the government to take official responsibility for the attacks on civilian protesters. The Chinese government has steadfastly refused to admit wrongdoing in the Tiananmen Square massacre. It remains one of the most highly sensitive topics in China. Many activists have been imprisoned for the mere suggestion that the government was wrong in pursuing its violent reaction to the peaceful, student-led, pro-democracy protest.

The letter was leaked to the press and the authorities tightened surveillance of Dr. Jiang and monitored his every action. On 1 June 2004, Dr. Jiang and his wife, Hua Zhongwie, traveled to the U.S. embassy to apply for a visa to visit their daughter in California. On the way to the embassy, his hired car broke down and the driver requested that they enter another van with a different driver. After settling into the second car, they continued on. Before reaching the embassy, several men stopped the second car and pulled Dr. Jiang and his wife into an armored vehicle with iron bars across the windows. They were taken to a security facility. His wife was released two weeks later, but Dr. Jiang remained in prison.

About two months later, on 20 July 2004, Dr. Jiang Yanyong, a 72-year old retired medical doctor in Beijing, was released from prison after spending almost seven weeks in arbitrary detention. It appears that the government detained Dr. Jiang to prevent him from speaking out on the 4 June anniversary of the Tiananmen Square protests.

- **Li Dan, HIV/AIDS activist**

  Li Dan is one of several outspoken activists who are protesting the Chinese government’s HIV/AIDS policy. The 25-year old was a student of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, but has since left the Academy and the Communist Party to devote his life to helping
those suffering with AIDS, with a special focus on AIDS orphans. He set up a school for children whose parents are HIV-positive or had died of AIDS.

In August 2004, local authorities detained Li Dan and another unnamed man traveling with him from Beijing to the Henan Province. The two were traveling to the province to take part in a planned peaceful protest of the government’s AIDS policy. Both men were later released. However, Li Dan reported that immediately after his release, he was attacked by two unknown assailants and was beaten for about 15 minutes before the police intervened. The police later released the two assailants without charge. They reportedly told the police that Li “should know why they were beating him.” Li believes that the attack was intended to intimidate him and to prevent his involvement in HIV/AIDS activism in the Henan Province.

China is dealing with a massive HIV infection rate, with international health officials estimating that China will have over 10 million AIDS patients by 2010 if the government does not enact measures to combat the spread of the virus. The government originally sought to cover up information about the extent of the infection rate, preventing the implementation of effective anti-HIV policies and programs. Authorities restricted the international media’s access to hospitals and treatment centers throughout China and harassed doctors who reported infection statistics.

One region of particular concern is the Henan Province, where AIDS activists and medical researchers uncovered a massive infection rate. The large scale infection rates were directly linked to state-run blood donation centers in the region. Throughout the 1990s, officials at the centers paid villagers in Henan for their blood donations. Selling their blood was the only way for many villagers to supplement their meager salaries. At many of these centers, blood dealers illegally obtained the blood specimens and resold them at a higher rate. In the rush to maximize profits, safety precautions were largely ignored; needles were reused, medical equipment was not sterilized, and the blood was not tested for diseases. The result was a massive rate of cross infection, with many of the villages in the province reporting infection rates as high as 65%.

In recent years, the Chinese government has enacted some better health policies including, the provision of antiretroviral drugs to the poor and free HIV tests. However, the implementation of these measures has not been consistent and discrimination against those with HIV remains high.
The government has also been arresting and harassing other HIV/AIDS activists and HIV-positive individuals seeking medical treatment. In the past two years, the government has reportedly detained several people with HIV/AIDS and beat activists.

Cuba

• **Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, Economist**

  Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello is an economist in Havana, Cuba. She is a member of a group of dissidents called the “Group of Four” who wrote an analysis of the Cuban socio-economic situation and advocated pro-democracy policies.

  Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello and the other members of the Group of Four were initially arrested in 1997 and held for 15 months without charge. In 1998, all four were charged with sedition, which according to the Cuban Criminal Code includes nonviolent opposition to the government. She received a sentence of three-and-a-half years. She and two of the other detainees were released early from prison in May 2000. She remained active on human rights issues and became the leader of a national association of civic groups on the island.

  In March 2003, Roque was one of the 80 pro-democracy activists arrested by the Cuban government in a major crackdown. In trials that failed to meet international standards of fairness, Roque and 33 other journalists, writers, scientists, and librarians were charged with sedition and sentenced to harsh prison terms. Roque received a 20-year prison term. She was conditionally released on medical grounds and is seeking medical treatment. As a condition of her release, she is not allowed to participate in political meetings.

• **Oscar Elias Biscet, Medical Doctor**

  Oscar Elias Biscet is a Cuban physician and worked at the Hijas de Galicia hospital. Dr. Biscet is also an anti-abortion activist and founder of the Lawton Foundation for Human Rights in Cuba.

  Dr. Biscet was initially arrested in 1998 and charged with “improper use of state-owned materials.” The materials in question were a hospital computer and some of the medical records of the hospital. Dr. Biscet used the computer to conduct a study on abortion rates in Cuba, particularly around the use of the drug Rivanol, which was reportedly used by state-
run medical centers to induce termination of pregnancies after the third month.

Since his initial arrest, Dr. Biscet has become an outspoken critic of government policy and has become a strong advocate for democracy in Cuba. He has been arrested several more times in connection to his anti-government statements. In 1999, he organized a protest and hung the Cuban flag upside down. He was arrested and sentenced to a three-year prison term for “dishonoring national symbols,” “public disorder,” and “inciting delinquent behavior.” In 2002, he was re-arrested only one month after his release when he made public statement about the harsh prison conditions he faced.

In April 2003, Dr. Biscet was sentenced to a 25-year prison term. He has mounted several hunger strikes in protest of his incarceration for exercising his human right to freedom of expression. He remains in prison and there are great fears for his health.

Egypt

• **Saad Eddin Ibrahim, Sociologist**

Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim is a sociologist and a former professor of sociology at the American University of Cairo and the University of Wisconsin. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Washington in 1968. He is the founder and director of the Ibn Khaldun Center for Developmental Studies in Cairo.

In the summer of 2000, Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim began a three year legal ordeal to fight against government persecution of his advocacy efforts and his sociological analysis of some of Egypt's most pressing social problems.

In June 2000, Egyptian security forces arrested him from his house. He and 27 of his associates at the Ibn Khaldun Center were taken to a Cairo jail and charged with 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. The charges were related to a documentary that the Center had created about voting rights and voter fraud in Egypt. The EU provided grants to fund the making of the documentary.

Dr. Ibrahim faced three trials and a seven-year sentence for these charges. His first two trials were held in a State Security Court, which operate as a
parallel legal system with far reaching powers to suspend some of the usual rights and protections guaranteed in the civil court system. The Court issued a guilty verdict, which Dr. Ibrahim appealed first within the Security Court system and then to Egypt's highest appeal court, the Court of Cassation. The Court heard the case on February 4th and finally acquitted Dr. Ibrahim on 18 March 2003. This decision cannot be appealed.

Throughout his long court battle, Dr. Ibrahim has insisted on his innocence. He has not been alone in his struggle. The individual who made the original claim of embezzlement of the EU funds later recanted his testimony and claimed that he had been pressured by security forces into making the false allegations. The EU also submitted multiple affidavits to the court, restating its position that none of the $250,000 in grants had been misused. The former head of the Egyptian Supreme Court also testified on Dr. Ibrahim's defense, challenging the constitutionality of the 1992 military decree that made it illegal for Egyptian organizations to accept foreign money without government permission.

Dr. Ibrahim’s health suffered greatly during the over 500 days he spent in prison. He suffers from a neurological disorder that impedes the flow of oxygen to his brain and he did not receive sufficient medical care for this condition or a broken leg he suffered while in prison. He remains active in Egypt and speaks often about reform in Egypt and his arrest.

• **Issue alert: Physicians Involved in Cruel and Degrading Medical Exams**

Egyptian medical doctors have been conducting forensic examinations on men suspected of engaging in sex with other men in Egypt. The forensic examinations are part of a larger targeted campaign by the government of arresting, torturing, and imprisoning men suspected of having sex with other men. A recent Human Rights Watch report documents 179 cases of men being prosecuted for the “habitual practice of debauchery,” which is the official legal charge against them.

The role of doctors in investigating these cases raises several concerns about the use of medical skills to inflict harm on detainees. The doctors have performed unnecessary and often painful forensic anal examinations for use in court proceedings. The exams are conducted without consent and are a violation of physical integrity and the rights to privacy protected under international human rights law. In addition, the forensic tests are frequently inaccurate, a fact that the government has acknowledged in recent statements. The science underlying the forensic exams are based on
a book published in 1857. According to the Human Rights Watch report, these tests are “obsolete, nineteenth-century medical mythology about the physiological effects of anal intercourse. They are virtually valueless as investigative tools.” Nevertheless, numerous allegedly gay men have been sentenced to prison terms citing the findings of flawed forensic exams.

Reports also indicate that doctors are failing to address the health of detainees who have suffered torture. It appears that many detainees are subject to torture to pressure them to “confess” to the crime of debauchery. In some cases, doctors appear more interested in performing forensic exams than in investigating and reporting any physical wounds stemming from torture.

Dual loyalty refers to a situation in which medical professionals have simultaneous obligations to the patient and the state. The International Dual Loyalty Working Group, an initiative of Physicians for Human Rights Watch and the School of Public Health and Primary Health Care at the University of Cape Town issued guidelines that state that the “health professional should not perform medical duties or engage in medical interventions for security purposes” (Guideline 14). Doctors should never engage in a medical intervention that is not in the individual’s therapeutic interest, even when requested to do so by security officials.

While homosexuality is prohibited by Islam and is a cultural taboo, homosexual activity is not expressly illegal in Egypt. Amnesty International states that “the imprisonment of people solely for their perceived or actual sexual orientation constitutes a violation of the right to freedom from discrimination as guaranteed in international treaties.” Human Rights Watch has expressed concern about the arrests and convictions of individuals for “debauchery” because that provision of the law is being understood to criminalize consensual, non-commercial homosexual sex. Gay men have been singled out by Egyptian authorities, in what may be considered to be an effort to cleanse Egypt of “immoral behavior.” Undercover police and informants have been using aliases on internet chat rooms and gay personals-advertisement sites to solicit suspected homosexual men into meeting them, where they are then arrested and charged.

Discrimination against a particular group violates non-discrimination protections in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Egypt ratified the ICCPR on 4 August 1967.
The government’s use of forensic medicine to provide grounds for convicting people for consensual homosexual activity is intrusive and degrading. The health professionals who administer the tests are in violation of the Oath of Athens, which was unanimously approved by the International Council of Prison Medical Services in 1979. The Principles of Medical Ethics, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1982, also outline ethical codes which apply to physicians treating prisoners.

- **Staff of the El Nadim Center for Psychological Management and Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence**

The El Nadim Center for Psychological Management and Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence is a torture treatment center in Cairo. The center provides medical and psychological rehabilitation to victims of torture and violence.

In July 2004, three representatives of the Medical Licensing Department in the Health Affairs Office of the Governorate of Cairo, a department of the Egyptian Ministry of Health, conducted a surprise inspection visit to the El Nadim Center for Psychological Management and Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence, a torture treatment center in Cairo. According to international human rights organizations, torture is a widespread and persistent phenomenon in Egypt. Security officials and police routinely torture suspects during interrogation sessions and torture has been used to suppress and intimidate political dissidents. The government consistently fails to investigate cases of torture or to hold those responsible accountable.

The Licensing inspection team wrote a negative report about the center for violating an article of the Law on Medical Establishments that prohibits the use of clinics for any other purpose than direct service care. The inspectors also searched the Center’s files and library and confiscated confidential patient files and center publications. It is expected that the Ministry of Health will take action to shut down the center in the next few days.

The center is not formally registered as a non-governmental organization (NGO). While the center did begin in 1993 with an exclusive focus on providing direct medical and psychological services to torture survivors, it has developed several independent programs related to torture treatment, documentation, and advocacy for ending the practice of torture in Egypt. When individuals are willing, the center has assisted them in publicizing their case, seeking redress, and pursuing all available legal charges against their perpetrators. Most torture treatment centers around
the world have similar programs as advocacy and working for justice is part of the process of supporting victims of torture and to ensure that torture is abolished in all nations.

The Egyptian law requiring non-governmental organizations officially register with the government is used as a means to repress political dissent and to restrict freedom of expression. According to the law, NGOs must seek and received approval from the government in order to conduct their activities. The law also allows for the government to close organizations without seeking a court ruling. Many NGOs in the country have refused to register under this law.

As of this writing, the situation remains unstable, but the Center remains open. Staff have started a legal case with the government to resolve the questions of the Center’s status.

Ethiopia

- Alemayehu Teferra, Civil Engineer

Dr. Alemayehu Teferra is a civil engineer and former president of Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia. He received his B.Sc. degree in Civil Engineering from the College of Engineering in Addis Ababa in 1961. He received his M.Sc. in Civil Engineering from Technion, the Israel Institute of Technology in 1963. He won a scholarship to the Technical University of Aechen, where he obtained his Dipl.-Ing in 1969 and his Dr.-Ing degree in 1974.

In the early 1990s, Dr. Alemayehu faced charges that he carried out anti-revolutionary activities under the former government of President Mengistu Haile-Mariam in 1977–78, a period commonly referred to as the “Red Terror” campaign. During this period, tens of thousands of people were killed, tortured or disappeared. In 1977, Dr. Alemayehu had been the chairman of a local urban-dwellers association, but he steadfastly denied committing any atrocities. The government, itself, had absolved him of any crimes in 1991.

In 1993, Dr. Alemayehu was arrested when the government stated that it had new evidence that implicated him in the atrocities of the Red Terror Campaign. The arrest occurred despite testimony from other individuals that Dr. Alemayehu was innocent and the government’s own earlier determination of his innocence. Many human rights organizations believe that the arrest was related to Dr. Alemayehu’s criticism of the government
following a brutal 1993 repression of students, who were protesting a planned referendum on Eritrean independence on the Addis Ababa University campus. After the crackdown on the protestors, the government sent armed security agents to the campus. Dr. Alemayehu requested the immediate withdrawal of these forces. He was fired from his position of University President shortly thereafter and was arrested four months later.

Dr. Alemayehu remained in jail without formal change until 1997. In 1997, he was charged with “aggravated genocide” and for the next six years, his case moved slowly in the Federal High Court. Allegedly there were no magistrates to hear the case. This appears to have been a stalling tactic used by the government to delay the case.

On 9 June 2003, Dr. Alemayehu Teferra was released from prison. He credits his release to the international attention to his case. The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program honored Dr. Alemayehu during its annual Science and Human Rights reception at the 1998 AAAS Annual Meeting. The reception honors a scientist, who, through action and example, has promoted human rights, usually at great personal risk. In a letter to the Program, Dr. Alemayehu wrote, “I am grateful for the honour you have bestowed upon me in recognizing my efforts to uphold the independence of the academia. For which I paid a price. The plaque you have given me will be among my few memorabilia that I value highly.”

Dr. Alemayehu currently lives in Addis Ababa.

Guatemala

- **Myrna Mack, Anthropologist**

Myrna Mack received a postgraduate degree in Social Anthropology from the University of Manchester in England. She also received a Master of Philosophy in the Department of Latin American Studies at the University of Durham in 1982. After her studies, Mack returned to Guatemala and was a founding member of the Asociación para el Avance de las Ciencias Sociales (Association for the Advancement of Social Science, AVANSCO) in Guatemala City in 1986. The mission of AVANSCO is to stimulate the development of social science in Guatemala.

On 22 April 2004, Guatemalan President Oscar Berger publicly acknowledged the government’s responsibility for the 1990 killing of
anthropologist Myrna Mack. In a ceremony at the Presidential Palace, he stated, “In the name of the state, I ask for the forgiveness of the Mack family and of the people of Guatemala for the murder of this young anthropologist.”

Myrna Mack was stabbed 27 times outside of her Guatemala City office on 11 September 1990. Her death was believed to be a political killing in retaliation for an academic report she wrote that detailed that the killing of Mayan civilians by the military during the country’s 36-year internal armed conflict. It estimated that between 1960 and 1994, when the official peace accords were signed, over 200,000 people were killed, the majority of them Mayan civilians.

Until President Berger’s statement, the government actively denied involvement in Myrna Mack’s killing. Police initially told the Mack family that Myrna had died in a traffic accident. The police also suppressed official documentation that concluded that killing was political motivated with conclusive links to the military. Myrna’s sister, Helen Mack, continued to pressure the government to release all available information and to hold those responsible accountable. Her advocacy resulted in convictions of army officer Sgt. Noel Beteta and Col. Juan Valencia Osorio. Sgt Beteta is serving a 25-year sentence for his role in the murder. Col. Osorio won an appeal of his case and was freed. In 2003, the Guatemalan Supreme Court reinstated the initial ruling and 30-year sentence. However, Col. Osorio had since fled the country and his whereabouts remain unknown.

Human rights organizations enthusiastically supported the official acknowledgement of government responsibility in the murder of Myrna Mack. José Miguel Vivanco, executive director of the Americas Division of Human Rights Watch, stated, “President Berger has sent an encouraging signal that he is committed to promoting accountability for past human rights abuses. He should now take steps to ensure that those responsible for the Mack murder and thousands of other political killings in Guatemala are brought to justice.”

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program has followed the developments in the Myrna Mack cases and Program staff have served as international observers of the trials.
The Fundación de Antropología Forense de Guatemala (Guatemalan Forensic Anthropology Foundation, FAFG) is a non-governmental organization of forensic anthropologists. In 2003, there was an increase in threats, intimidation, and attacks against anthropologists working with FAFG and their family members. FAFG has been working to exhume and identify bodies from massacre sites throughout Guatemala. The threats and attacks followed a pattern of increasing violence against forensic anthropologists working in Guatemala by individuals believed to have had ties to the military during Guatemala’s 36-year civil war. Exhumations have played a critical role in providing forensic investigation teams with evidence to scientifically document massacres perpetrated by the Guatemalan military.

In early 2003, a few of the members of FAFG reported that there were held up and robbed only of their cell phones. The individuals whose numbers were stored on the cell phones began receiving threatening phone calls. In early April, the home of Fredy Peccerelli, FAFG Director, was burglarized and his passport and several FAFG documents were stolen. On that same day, 3 April, his sister and mother noticed two unidentified men watching the family house. When one of the family members confronted the men, they stated that they were members of the police and were investigating another house in the area. However, neither man produced official documentation and sped off after the Peccerelli family called the police. Fredy Peccerelli’s sister was also harassed by men and received death threats.

In April 2003, Fredy Peccerelli, FAFG Director, reported to authorities that shots were fired at his house. No one was injured. Investigating police also discovered bullet holes in his neighbor’s house.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program was instrumental to the creation of the FAFG by supporting the training and development of forensic anthropologists. Today, there are forensic anthropology teams through Latin America, Eastern Europe and Africa. The Program honored the FAFG at the 2004 Science and Human Rights Program reception at the AAAS Annual Meeting.

Despite threats and intimidations, FAFG continues it work in Guatemala and to-date has exhumed close to 500 graves and recovered over 3,000 human skeleton remains. The work of the FAFG is vital in establishing the
truth of the government’s scorched earth policy and providing comfort to the families by returning remains to be reburied according to Mayan cultural traditions. Current estimates are that it will require another 30 years to complete all of the exhumations.

Honduras

- **Staff of the Center for the Prevention of Torture Victims and their Relatives (Centro de Prevención Tratamiento y Rehabilitación de las Víctimas de la Tortura y sus Familiares, CPTRT)**

  The Centro de Prevención Tratamiento y Rehabilitación de las Víctimas de la Tortura y sus Familiares (Center for the Prevention of Torture Victims and their Relatives, CPTRT) is a torture treatment center in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. CPTRT offers psychological support to victims of torture and institutional violence and their family members.

  In 2003 and 2004, staff of the CPTRT in Tegucigalpa received death threats as an apparent reprisal for their human rights work. Unknown intruders broke into the offices, rifled through confidential patient files, and left threats scrawled over the walls of the offices.

  In addition to rehabilitation services, CPTRT conducts trainings with prison personnel, police officers, and administrators in the judicial system on culturally sensitive treatment models and organizational skills. The center also documents and monitors cases of torture and conducts research on the general human rights situation in Honduras.

  CPTRT staff believes that the threats and break-ins were intended to intimidate the organization from pursuing their documentation work. In the past few years, the center has conducted research that demonstrates that the National Police and the Public Ministry are responsible for extrajudicial executions of street children and the abuse of prisoners in federal jails. The center has also lent its support to members of the Public Ministry who have been apparently dismissed from their position for publicly voicing their concern about internal corruption and mistreatment of prisoners at many of Honduras’ prisons.

  International attention to these attacks is critical to help push the Honduran government to investigate the attacks and to hold those responsible accountable. The authorities rarely investigate these cases effectively sending a dangerous message that impunity is guaranteed.
Despite threats and attacks, the staff of CPTRT continue their work in Honduras.

Indonesia

• Joy Lee Sadler, Nurse and Lesley McCulloch, Social Scientist

Joy Lee Sadler is a registered nurse from Waterloo, Iowa. Lesley McCulloch is a Research Fellow at Deakin University in Melbourne, Australia. She specializes in the Indonesian province of Aceh.

At the end of December 2002, Joy Lee Sadler, a U.S. nurse, and Lesley McCulloch, a British academic based in Australia, were charged by an Indonesian court to be in violation of the terms of their travel visas and sentenced to four and five months in prison, respectively. Both women were arrested on 11 September 2002 for violating the terms of their visas by visiting a rebel group in Aceh province. Both women deny the charges. Dr. McCulloch has stated that she was in Aceh on a personal vacation and was not doing any work. Sadler, who is a registered nurse from Waterloo, Iowa, said that she was traveling with Dr. McCulloch and that both women intended to go to a nearby island resort. When they could not find a boat to transport them, they visited a nearby refugee camp and Sadler treated some of the wounded refugees there.

When they were stopped at an army checkpoint during their trip, the two women refused to allow officials to search their belongings. However, the guards insisted and found several documents about the Aceh conflict saved on Dr. McCulloch’s laptop computer. At that time, Dr. McCulloch was a lecturer at the University of Tasmania and has written extensively about human rights violations in Indonesia and the 26-year struggle for independence that has claimed more than 10,000 lives. The two women were immediately arrested.

Prosecutors delayed the case by several weeks, apparently to further investigate evidence to support possible charges of espionage. The government finally chose not to pursue the espionage charges, but to charge the women with violating their visas, which carries a maximum penalty of five years in jail or a fine of 25 million rupiah (about $5,000). The trial began on 25 November 2002, but adjourned for a day to allow witnesses to travel to the provincial capital, Banda Aceh, where the trial was held. When the trial resumed on 27 November, the judge granted the prosecution’s request to postpone the trial for three weeks. On 1
December 2002, Joy Lee Sadler started a hunger strike to protest the delay. Sadler suffers from an HIV-related illness and the hunger strike took an extreme toll on her already fragile health. Both women also reported being mistreated, beaten, and sexually harassed by military officials while in detention.

Visa violations in Indonesia usually result in the deportation of the offender. According to one source, academics regularly travel to Indonesia on tourist visas to conduct research; imposing the maximum fine or holding trials is quite unusual. International human rights groups believe that the harsh treatment and sentence is in response to Dr. McCulloch’s human rights activism. Speaking from her jail cell, Dr. McCulloch stated, “I know that the judge was under pressure from the military to make me pay for some past misdeeds by exposing some of the military and police corruption that's been going on, then relating it to the human rights abuses here.” She believes her arrest was meant as a warning to other academics and human rights activists that their human rights reporting will not be tolerated by the government.

Joy Lee Sadler was released in January, 2003 and Lesley McCulloch was released in February, 2003.

Iran

- **Dariush Zahedi, Political Scientist**

Dariush Zahedi received his Ph.D. in political science from the University of Southern California in 1998. He served as a Postdoctoral Fellow at Harvard University’s Center for Middle Eastern Studies and is currently an adjunct faculty member at the University of California at Berkeley. He also serves as the director of the West Coast operations of the American Iranian Council, a non-profit, educational organization devoted to improving relations between the US and Iran. His research focuses on a comparative study of state building and modernization in Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan and the patterns of political participation and engagement as well as the political attitudes of Iranian expatriates in the U.S.

In July 2003, Dr. Dariush Zahedi traveled to Iran to visit his family. While in Tehran, Dr. Zahedi met with several Iranians at his brother’s office. Iranian officials raided the office and arrested all of the individuals present. The Ministry of Intelligence conducted an investigation and
determined that no wrongdoing had occurred and immediately released everyone except Dr. Zahedi.

The authorities were concerned with Dr. Zahedi because he had traveled to Iran several times on the anniversaries of the 1999 Tehran University protests, which occurred in the summer. The authorities suspected that he might have been involved in organizing student protests around this politically-charged anniversary. The timing of his trips was related to the facts that, as an academic, Dr. Zahedi was able to travel during his university’s scheduled summer break.

During the first 40 days of his detention, the Ministry of Intelligence conducted an investigation of the espionage charges, but failed to find any evidence to support Dr. Zahedi’s involvement in student protests. Despite the lack of evidence, the case was transferred to the judiciary and Dr. Zahedi was required to remain in detention in Tehran’s Evin Prison for an additional three months. The majority of time he was in detention, he was placed in solitary confinement. Dr. Zahedi was denied access to a lawyer and his family was only able to visit him briefly in the prison on two occasions and speak with him once on phone.

Told by security officials that Dr. Zahedi would be harmed if the case was widely publicized, the family originally chose to work through informal means and made numerous informal efforts to secure his release. Frustrated with the lack of movement, the family decided in October 2003 to bring international attention to Dr. Zahedi’s case in the hopes that it would bring pressure to bear upon the Iranian government to clarify the charges or for his release. A month later, Dr. Zahedi was released on bail.

He was free to leave Iran, but was required to return to Tehran in December 2004 for a trial where he was acquitted of all charges. He reports that the experience was “frightening and humiliating.” Dr. Zahedi has returned to California and is teaching classes at UC-Berkeley.
• **Hashem Aghajari, Historian**

Dr. Hashem Aghajari is a professor of history at the Tehran Teachers Training University.

In June 2002, Dr. Aghajari delivered a speech to students in Hamedan, Iran in which he rejected demands to “blindly follow” clerical rule and called for reform within the Islamic clerical establishment. His controversial comments directly challenged the Islamic regime’s doctrine and provoked the hardliners within the government. A month later, Aghajari was compelled to appear in court to answer questions about the comments he made in the Hamedan speech.

In early August 2003, authorities arrested Dr. Aghajari and convicted him in a closed door trial on charges of apostasy. He was sentenced to death by hanging and 74 lashes of the whip. His sentence also prohibited him from teaching for 10 years.

His case provoked strong domestic and international protests. After the death sentence was announced, thousands of students and human rights activists gathered at universities in Tehran to protest the verdict. Eventually Iranian President Khatami spoke out against the death sentence calling it “inappropriate.”

Dr. Aghajari appealed the case to the Supreme Court and the sentence was repealed. However, a regional court reimposed the death sentence in May 2004. A month later, the judiciary ruled again on the case and again rescinded the death sentence. Dr. Aghajari was finally charged with a five-year sentence with two years suspended. As Dr. Aghajari has already spent two years in jail, he is required to serve one more year in jail.

**Libya**

• **Kristiana Malinova Valcheva, Nasya Stojcheva Nenova, Valentina Manolova Siropulo, Valya Georgieva Chervenyashka and Snezhanka Ivanova Dimitrova, Nurses from Bulgaria and Ashraf Ahmad Jum’a, Medical Doctor from Palestine**

In 1999, the Libyan government rounded up several medical professionals, both foreign and domestic, from the Benghazi hospital after an outbreak of HIV occurred among patients. The medical workers were charged with deliberately infecting 400 children with HIV and causing the death of 40 children. The nine Libyan medical workers initially arrested were eventually released, but a trial continued against the foreign workers,
including five Bulgarian nurses, Kristiana Malinova Valcheva, Nasya Stojcheva Nenova, Valentina Manolova Siropulo, Valya Georgieva Chervenyashka and Snezhanka Ivanova Dimitrova and one Palestinian doctor Ashraf Ahmad Jum’a.

In 2003, the court dismissed the case against the Bulgarian nurses and the Palestinian doctor for lack of evidence, but the prosecution resubmitted the charges. On 6 May 2004, a Libyan court convicted all six and sentenced them to death by firing squad.

Expert witnesses at the trial, including Dr. Luc Montagnier, the researcher who first isolated the HIV virus, testified that the children's infections were caused by poor hygiene at the hospital and not an international conspiracy or intentional actions on the part of the nurses and doctors as the prosecution claimed. Dr. Montagnier presented a report that demonstrated that the infection had already begun before the accused started working at the hospital, and continued to spread after they were arrested.

Reports indicate that prison conditions are extremely harsh and that the medical professionals were subject to torture. It appears that the authorities used torture, including electrical shock, beating and rape, to extract a “confession” from the nurses.

It appears that the case has strong political overtones and the foreign medical workers were targeted because the authorities needed someone to blame for a public health tragedy that caused widespread outrage in Libya. Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi has made statements claiming that the HIV outbreak in the hospital was a plot of the CIA and international forces hostile to Libya.

The nurses and doctor have submitted an appeal to the Supreme Court of the Jamahiriya. There is as yet no fixed date for a hearing of the case. International medical associations and human rights organizations continue to oppose the sentence and campaign for the release of six medical professionals. There are news reports that there are on-going negotiations with European officials who are offering to pay compensation to the victim families and to provide treatment to the HIV+ children in exchange for a review of the case.

All six remain in prison pending their appeal.
Russia

- *Arjan Erkel, humanitarian aid worker*

Arjan Erkel, a Dutch citizen, has a degree in cultural anthropology from Nijmegen University in Holland. He was the former Head of Mission for the French medical aid organization Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) in the Russian Republic of Dagestan.

On 12 August 2002, three gunmen in Makhachkala, the capital of the Russian Republic of Dagestan, abducted Arjan Erkel. Erkel was working with MSF to provide humanitarian aid to displaced people from neighboring Chechnya. Erkel first started working with MSF six years ago, when he undertook an evaluation project for the organization of their aid delivery program in a Ugandan refugee camp. As Erkel continued his work with MSF, he began to be interested in the refugee situation in the Caucasus and Central Asia. In 1998, he went on a mission to Tajikistan and in 2002 became the Head of Mission in Dagestan.

Reports periodically surfaced that Erkel was alive. MSF and government officials in Russia and Holland worked to secure his release. MSF released several public statements voicing their concerns that Russian authorities have not demonstrated enough political will regarding a full investigation of Erkel’s case. The group has also been highly critical of the authorities for not providing MSF with any information about the likely kidnappers or their motives. In February 2003, MSF launched an online petition on Erkel’s behalf (http://www.msf.org/arjan/petition/international.htm). Within one month, over 220,000 signatures for Erkel were collected. To celebrate Erkel’s 33rd birthday, MSF volunteers all over the world organized events for 9 March 2003, including birthday cakes and petition drives.

Humanitarian aid workers in the region have been at increasing risk for kidnapping by criminal groups. In January 2001, another MSF worker, Kenneth Gluck, was kidnapped and held for 25 days by unidentified gunmen in Chechnya. In July 2002, a Russian aid worker, Nina Davidovich, was also abducted in Chechnya. She was released in January 2002.

After 20 months being held hostage, on 10 April 2004, Arjan Erkel was released in relatively good health. He returned to Holland and is currently writing a book about his experience. The Program honored Arjan Erkel at a special reception during the 2005 AAAS Annual Meeting.
• **Igor Sutyagin, Physicist and Historian**

Igor Sutyagin graduated from the Moscow State University in 1988 with a degree in physics. In 1995, he received a Ph.D. in History from the U.S. and Canada Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 1998, he became the head of the Institute’s subdivision for Military-Technical and Military-Economic Policy. At the Institute, he researched the structure and operations of Russian and U.S. strategic forces, strategic command and control and nuclear weapon development and production.

Early in the morning of 27 October 1999, the Russian security forces (known by their Russian acronym, FSB) raided Dr. Igor Sutyagin’s office and home. Other staff members of the Institute, including an American Ph.D. student from Princeton University, were also subject to a detailed search by the FSB. Dr. Sutyagin was brought to the FSB office in Obninsk, where FSB officials questioned him. He was not charged formally, but was “strongly discouraged from leaving” the FSB station. This appeared to be an attempt by the FSB to keep Sutyagin from contacting a lawyer. Two days later, the FSB arrested Dr. Sutyagin and charged him with treason, a charge that carries a penalty of twelve to twenty years in prison.

The treason charges are related to a freelance research analysis Dr. Sutyagin conducted for a London-based consulting firm. The government contends that the firm is a front for Western intelligence. This claim has not been definitively proven by the FSB. Even if it were true, Dr. Sutyagin engaged in no activity that could be construed as espionage. The research he conducted for the British firm was on military civilian relations in Russia and relied on publicly available resources, such as newspapers. Dr. Sutyagin is a civilian researcher and has no security clearance and therefore, had no access to any classified government materials. In fact, several thorough FSB investigations of his home and office have failed to provide evidence to support a treason charge. At the crux of the issue is a
government contention that the findings in Dr. Sutyagin’s research were so accurate that he must have used classified sources.

Dr. Sutyagin’s case is part of a series of trials against scientists in Russia who are accused of espionage when they turn to commercial ventures abroad and sell their unclassified research or maintain contacts with Western organizations and researchers. There are several similar “spy cases” currently in Russia of researchers being targeted for their work. In part, these cases reflect a deep unease of the Russian government with the international nature of science and represent an attempt by the government to more fully control researchers and their international contacts.

Since his initial arrest in 1999, Dr. Sutyagin has faced numerous trials, appeals and continued detention. There have been several procedural irregularities in the trials raising the fears that the trials have not met international standards of fairness. For example, his earlier trials were held behind closed doors. At various points, the prosecution has sought to limit the defense’s access to critical documents of the case. There have been several restrictions placed on the communications between Dr. Sutyagin and his lawyers. The case was sent back to the FSB for a second round of investigations after one of the trials resulted in the dismissal of the case for lack of evidence. This practice of sending cases back to the FSB for further investigation was recognized by the government itself as an infringement on a defendant’s rights and repealed in new criminal procedures that came into effect in mid-2002. The new code requires a court to acquit a defendant if the prosecution fails to provide sufficient evidence. However, since the Sutyagin case began before it took effect, the new code did not apply to his case.

After a lengthy trial and appeal process, a Moscow court sentenced Dr. Sutyagin to a 15-year sentence in April 2004. According to a website maintained by colleagues of Dr. Sutyagin, the case should raise concern for scientists and researchers throughout Russia. Colleagues are concerned that the “prosecution of Igor Sutyagin sets a very dangerous precedent. It shows that in today’s Russia the security services can bring an accusation of espionage against anyone. The Russian judicial system is too weak to assure a defendant a fair trial under the pressure from the FSB.”

Dr. Sutyagin is currently serving his sentence in a high-security colony in the city of Sarapul in the Udmurt region of Russia. His wife and two young children continue to campaign for his release.
• **Nikolai Girenko, Anthropologist**

Dr. Nikolai Girenko was a leading expert on racism and discrimination in the Russian Federation. He graduated from Leningrad University’s Oriental Institute in 1967 with a degree in African studies. He worked as translator for Soviet specialists working in Tanzania. He joined the Institute of Ethnography in Leningrad in 1970 and worked there until his death. He served as the head of the Minority Rights Commission of the St. Petersburg Scientific Union. His research specialty was on neo-Nazi and skinhead groups in Russia. His research demonstrated that these groups were on the rise and becoming more active in Russia.

On 19 June 2004, Dr. Nikolai Girenko was shot and killed by two gunmen inside his home in St. Petersburg. Dr. Girenko was 64. It is believed that his death was related to the work he did as a researcher and expert witness in racism, neo-Nazi and skinhead trials and investigations. Racially based violence is a serious problem in Russia with as many as 50,000 racist attacks and two dozen related murders per year. Dr. Girenko had testified at 20 cases in the last two years alone. His testimony angered members and supporters of these groups and over the years, he has received numerous death threats.

While the murder was most likely committed by private actors, there is widespread concern that the Russian government fails to adequately investigate racially based crimes. International human rights organizations and the anthropology community mourned the loss of Dr. Girenko and pressed the government to take its obligations to address racial discrimination more seriously and to hold those responsible for the killing of Dr. Girenko responsible.

• **Valentin Danilov, Physicist**

Dr. Valentin Danilov was awarded a degree from Novosibirsk State University School of Physics. He also holds an advanced degree from the Russian Academy of Sciences Institute of Nuclear Physics. Until the time of his arrest, he was the head of the Krasnoyarsk State Technical University Thermophysics Research Center.

In February 2001, the Russian government charged Dr. Valentin Danilov with espionage and fraud for allegedly selling top secret satellite information to a Chinese company. Dr. Danilov’s research dealt with the effect of solar activity on space satellites. Dr. Danilov has consistently
maintained that this information has been available in scientific journals and had been declassified for over 10 years.

While in pre-trial detention, Dr. Danilov suffered a heart attack and was briefly hospitalized and despite some medical attention while in detention, his health suffered greatly. His defense lawyers petitioned the court to release Dr. Danilov on bail or on humanitarian reasons to seek further medical treatment. At one point, Dr. Danilov was too ill to attend his trial and the court was forced to postpone. Eventually, the court ruled that Dr. Danilov could be released and set bail at 200,000 rubles ($10,000), a fee that was too high for his family. Unable to raise the bail money, the family appealed to the Russian Supreme Court to allow a humanitarian release, but the Supreme Court upheld the bail conditions of the lower court.

The American Physical Society (APS) initiated a campaign to raise money for the family to pay bail. In total, they raised over $4,000 from 40 U.S.-based scientists. The money raised by the physicists was publicized in Russia and was effective in demonstrating the strong international support for Dr. Danilov. In September 2002, the pretrial jail term of Russian physicist Dr. Valentin Danilov expired, and the regional Krasnoyarsk prison chose not to extend it and Dr. Danilov was released pending his trial.

The trial occurred in late 2003 and a jury decided to acquit Dr. Danilov. The prosecution appealed the decision to the Supreme Court, which overturned the acquittal of espionage on procedural grounds, stating that the defense team had pressured jurors, a charge that the defense team strongly denies. The case was then retried in a regional court and resulted in a guilty charge.

Dr. Danilov’s case is another example of a series of so-called “spy cases” in Russia. According to a Moscow Times editorial on the case, Russian scientists are at risk for attempting to commercialize their research because the rules on what constitutes a state secret are unclear. The editorial states, “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.”

Dr. Danilov’s was one of the first jury trials in Russia. The use of juries is a new practice in the Russian courts, but is one still plagued by procedural irregularities and a lack of due process. For example, prosecutors have been able to ask leading questions of witnesses and frame questions to juries in ways that ensure the desired outcome. Danilov’s attorney
maintained that this is what occurred during Dr. Danilov’s trial; the judge framed the trial’s central questions in such a way as to avoid the issue of whether the information used in the research was, in fact, secret. The lawyer was also unable to present testimony proving that the research in question had been publicly available for more than a decade. Despite this concern, the court upheld the verdict and sentenced Dr. Danilov with a 14-year prison term.

Saudi Arabia

• Matrouk al-Falih, professor of political science; Abdullah al-Hamid, former professor of contemporary literature; and Tawfiq al-Qussayyir, professor of electronics

Dr. Matrouk al-Falih is a professor of political science at King Sa’ud University. Dr. Tawfiq al-Qussayyir is a professor of Electronics at King Sa’ud University. Dr. Abdullah al-Hamid is a former professor of contemporary literature at Imam Muhammad bin Sa’ud University and a prominent reformist in Saudi Arabia. He has been jailed previously for speaking out against the government and advocating for democratic reform.

On 15 March 2004, the Saudi government arrested eleven people apparently for criticizing the government’s human rights policy. The group, which includes prominent academics, issued statements that claimed that the recently created National Commission on Human Rights lacks independence from the government and cannot be a credible watchdog for human rights in Saudi Arabia. The Ministry of Interior announced that the detainees were suspected of issuing “statements which do not serve the unity of the country and the cohesion of the society...based on the Islamic religion.”

Among the detained were Dr. Matrouk al-Falih, Dr. Tawfiq al-Qussayyir, and Dr. Abdullah al-Hamid. Two weeks later, Dr. Tawfiq al-Qussayyir and several of the other detainees were released from prison after signing a pledge that they would liaise with government authorities before carrying out public activities. Dr. Matrouk al-Falih and Dr. Abdullah al-Hamid refused to sign the pledge and remained in a Riyadh prison pending charges and a trial.

In August 2004, the government began a trial against Dr. Matrouk al-Falih and Dr. Abdullah al-Hamid and the other remaining detainee Mr. Ali al-Deminy. The decision to hold a public trial for these dissidents is a step
toward greater transparency and adherence to international standards for fair trials. However, the government refused to allow international trial observers from human rights organizations to attend the trial.

The trial has been postponed and there is no information about when it will resume.

**Syria**

- **Khalil Sulayman, Engineer**

  Khalil Sulayman is an agricultural engineer and a Kurdish activist. He works at the Department of Agriculture in the village of Tell al-Dhaman, Syria.

  In August 2003, Khalil Sulayman was arrested by military intelligence personnel from his workplace at the Department of Agriculture. He was not formally charged at the time of his arrest and was held incommunicado in Damascus for one month and then released on bail. In December 2003, he was tried before a military court on charges of “inciting racial hatred.” He was reportedly arrested for organizing a social event of students at which people sang Kurdish songs. There is concern that his arrest was part of ongoing repression of Syrian Kurdish activists by the Syrian authorities. Khalil Sulayman is an activist on Kurdish issues and was nominated as an independent candidate in the 1994 parliamentary elections. He was then reportedly subjected to harassment and was transferred to a new place of employment 240 kilometers from his home.

  Kurds make up approximately ten percent of the total population of 13.8 million people in Syria; they are the largest non-Arab ethnic minority in Syria. In 1962, about 120,000 people belonging to the Syrian Kurdish population were stripped of their citizenship, leaving them stateless and without claim to another nationality. They have become a stateless people under international law and have been issued special red identity cards by the Ministry of Interior. In accordance with state policy, Syrian Kurds are denied many rights that other Syrians enjoy, such as the right to vote, the right to own property and the right to have marriages legally recognized. They are not entitled to passports and thus cannot exercise the internationally guaranteed right to freedom of movement nor can they legally leave and return to Syria.
In January 2004, all charges were dropped against him. It is believed that the strong international attention to his case played a contributing factor in his release and the dropping of all charges.

United States

- **Scientists and Researchers Attempting to Attend the Fourth International Symposium on Coma and Death in Cuba**

At the end of February 2004, the U.S. government sent warning letters to American scientists who were planning to travel to Cuba to attend the Fourth International Symposium on Coma and Death, a conference on the scientific, medical, and ethical issues related to human death and coma. The letters warned that they risked criminal or civil penalties for breaking the Cuba travel regulations. Fearing government reprisals, more than 70 American medical school professors, doctors, and scientists opted not to attend the conference.

The U.S. government enforces a travel ban on American citizens traveling to Cuba through the Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC). Certain categories of travel to Cuba are permitted under OFAC regulations, including scientists who are attending international scientific meetings. The group of scientists booked their tickets to Cuba under provisions of what is known as a general license. General licenses do not need prior government approval. A government authorized travel agent can arrange travel under a general license.

According to the authorized travel agency, Marazul Tours, OFAC officials contacted them and requested detailed information about the conference and the travelers. Marazul Tours immediately complied with this request, sending all the information by courier. On 4 March 2004, OFAC officials contacted Marazul tours and informed them they would issue a specific license to authorize the travel. However, later that same day, OFAC called Marazul Tours back and said that the State Department decided to deny permission for the travel.

OFAC sent a letter that arrived at the Marazul Tours office on 10 March 2004 that explained the government’s position. The Bush administration determined that the international conference was not organized by an international professional organization, institution, or association as required by OFAC regulations. In its view, the conference was “merely endorsed by the World Federation of Neurology,” which is based in London. In addition, OFAC requested that they would require a copy of
each participant’s resume and a statement from each individual explaining the reasons why he or she needed to attend the conference. Given that the conference had already started by the time that the OFAC letter had arrived, there was no time to obtain the requested documentation for each of the 70 scientists.

There have been three previous International Symposia on Coma and Death held in Cuba. Each has been organized in the exact same way as the Fourth Symposium was and had the same sponsors. American scientists who attended in previous years did not encounter any problems with OFAC regulations and participated freely in the conference. Cuba has a vibrant scientific community and has made significant advances in medical and biotechnological research. There are several international scientific conferences held in Cuba each year. OFAC has expressed concern about other scientific conferences scheduled to occur in Cuba and may prevent other scientists from attending future scientific meetings and congresses.

Vietnam

- **Nguyen Dan Que, Endocrinologist**

  Dr. Nguyen Dan Que is an endocrinologist and former Director of the Cho-Ray Hospital in Ho Chi Minh City.

Dr. Nguyen Dan Que has been a strong supporter of democratic reform and human rights in Vietnam for over 25 years. He has suffered a lot for his outspoken criticism of the Vietnamese government. He has spent a combined total of 19 years in prison for his advocacy. He was first arrested in 1978 for criticizing the government and spent ten years in prison without a trial. He was re-arrested in 1990 after organizing a pro-democracy organization and released eight years later under provisions of a special amnesty. His political advocacy has been directly related to his scientific work; he was fired from his position at the hospital and detained after he publicly criticized the national health care policy.

His most recent arrest occurred in March 2003. Dr. Que was arrested as he left his home four days after issuing a public statement about the lack of freedom of information in Vietnam. In July 2004, the Ho Chi Minh People's Court sentenced Dr. Nguyen Dan Que to two-and-a-half years' imprisonment for “abusing democratic rights to jeopardize the interest of the state, and the legitimate rights and interest of social organizations and citizens.” The trial was not held in accordance with international
standards for a fair trial. According to reports, Dr. Que did not have access to legal representation and the trial lasted only three hours. Dr. Que was allowed to make a statement at the beginning of trial, during which he proclaimed his innocence. He was then removed from the courtroom to listen to the rest of the proceedings in a separate room.

On 31 January 2005, the Vietnamese government announced that Dr. Que would be among more than 8,325 prisoners released as part of a general amnesty for prisoners associated with Tet, the Lunar New Year. Those released are expected to abstain from political advocacy work.

Zimbabwe

**Issue Alert: Violations of Medical Neutrality**

The Zimbabwe Association of Doctors for Human Rights (ZADHR) issued a formal statement that there were violations of medical neutrality in Zimbabwe during nationwide protests that occurred in June 2003. In early June, the opposition party in Zimbabwe, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), called for nationwide workplace and university stayaways in protest of the deteriorating economic, political, and human rights situation and to force the resignation of President Robert Mugabe. The protests were met with massive arrests and beatings from the state security forces.

According to reports by human rights organizations and the media, on 4 June 2003, security force members forcibly entered the Avenues Clinic, a private medical hospital in Harare that was treating more than 150 individuals who were injured in the political violence. ZADHR reports that uniformed police abducted at least one injured patient from the waiting room before the individual could receive medical attention. Seven individuals were arrested from the clinic that day. Witnesses report that security forces harassed and intimidated injured people and medical personnel and demanded information about the MDC.

The ZADHR stated their concern “that the heavy presence and intimidating behavior of the uniformed forces in hospital premises will prevent patients from accessing treatment.” The organization condemned the use of violence against the public and called for all parties to immediately cease violence. The human rights situation in Zimbabwe began deteriorating in 2003 as the country experienced an economic freefall. In response to the nationwide protests, the government security forces stepped up their harassment of opposition leaders.
Access to medical treatment is a fundamental human right and is protected in the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, Relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II). Article 3 of the Geneva Convention states, “Persons taking no active part in the hostilities, including members of armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed hors de combat by sickness, wounds, detention, or any other cause, shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction founded on race, color, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria. The wounded and sick shall be collected and cared for.” Article 18 states, “Civilian hospitals organized to give care to the wounded and sick, the infirm and maternity cases, may in no circumstances be the object of attack, but shall at all times be respected and protected by the Parties to the conflict.”
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 of their 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 http://www.aaup.org
- American Chemical Society Human Rights Committee http://www.acs.org
- American Political Science Association Human Rights Section http://www.apsahrs.org/
- American Physical Society Committee on International Freedom of Scientists http://www.aps.org
- American Sociological Association http://www.asanet.org/
- Amnesty International http://www.amnesty.org/
- Association for the Advancement of Social Science (AVANSCO), Guatemala
- Association for the Prevention of Torture http://www.apt.ch/
- Bellona Foundation http://www.bellona.no/
- B’Tselem http://www.btselem.org
- Burma Information Group
- The Center for Victims of Torture http://www.cvt.org
- Committee of Concerned Scientists http://www.libertynet.org/ccs/
- The Committee to Protect Journalists http://www.cpj.org/
The Cuba Free Press Project http://www.cubafreepress.org/
Derechos Human Rights http://www.derechos.org/
Egyptian Organization for Human Rights http://www.eohr.org/
Ethiopian Democratic Action League
Free Burma Coalition http://www.freeburmacoalition.org/
Free Vietnam Alliance http://www.fva.org/
Guatemala Human Rights Commission http://www.ghrc-usa.org/
Human Rights First http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/
Human Rights Foundation of Turkey
http://www.tihv.org.tr/eindex.html
Human Rights in China http://www.hrichina.org/
Human Rights Watch http://www.hrw.org/
Irrawaddy http://www.irrawaddy.org/
The International Federation of Health and Human Rights Organizations
International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX)
http://www.ifex.org
International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights
http://www.ihf-hr.org/
International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims
http://www.irct.org
National Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Rights
http://www7.nationalacademies.org/humanrights/
National Security Archive http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/
NEAR-Network for Education and Academic Rights
http://www.nearinternational.org/
Network of Concerned Historians http://odur.let.rug.nl/~nch/
Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders
http://www.omct.org
Scholars at Risk Network  http://scholarsatrisk.nyu.edu/

The United Nations  http://www.un.org

World Organisation Against Torture (WOAT)
http://www.omct.org/

Zimbabwe Association of Doctors for Human Rights

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 embassies; and the US Department of State.
Appendix B: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

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

On December 10, 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the full text of which appears in the following pages. Following this historic act the Assembly called upon all Member countries to publicize the text of the Declaration and “to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories.”

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 of equal access to public service in his country.

3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this 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 protection.

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

Article 24.

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation 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 assistance. 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 fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities 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.