

Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals

Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals

AAAS Science and Human Rights Action Network
(AAASHRAN) Alerts From January 2000-June 2001



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science and Human Rights Program
Washington, DC

About the cover: The photographs on the cover are of three individual scientists who have been victims of human rights violations. They are, from top to bottom:

- Dr. Flora Brovina, a pediatrician from Kosovo;
- Dr. Gao Zhan, a sociologist from China; and
- Dr. Sergey Piontkovski, a marine biologist from Ukraine.

Details about the experiences of Dr. Gao and Dr. Piontkovski may be found in the “Case Summaries” section of this report. Dr. Brovina was honored at the 2001 annual Science and Human Rights Program reception in San Francisco.

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

ISBN 0-87168-677-5

© 2001 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science
All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
About the Science and Human Rights Program	3
AAASHRAN Casework Activities, January 2000-June 2001	5
Positive Developments	5
New Cases.....	6
Disappearance.....	8
Persecution and Harassment.....	9
Denial of the Right to Travel.....	9
Analysis and Discussion	10
Special Activities	14
Annual Science and Human Rights Reception	16
Case Summaries	23
Austria	23
Belarus.....	24
Burma/Myanmar	25
China.....	28
Cuba	35
Egypt.....	36
Ethiopia	38
Guatemala	40
Israel	40
Liberia	43
Palestinian Authority	44
Russia	45
Sudan.....	48
Tunisia.....	50
Turkey	53
Ukraine.....	54
Vietnam.....	54
Appendix A:	
Guidelines for Adoption of Cases of Concern	57
Appendix B:	
Universal Declaration of Human Rights	61

Preface

I would like to thank Jennifer Gordon, Intern, for her assistance in researching and updating the cases; Sage Russell, Senior Program Associate, for her careful editing and always helpful advice; and Matthew Zimmerman, Program Associate, for the design and layout of the Directory.

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

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

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

This report is also available on the Program's website at:
<http://shr.aaas.org>.

Victoria Baxter
Program Associate
AAAS Science and Human
Rights Program

Introduction

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

AAASHRAN builds on the long-standing tradition of letter writing as an effective means of reminding governments that their transgressions have not gone unnoticed. Many scientists who have been released from prison credit their release to the strong international attention to their cases. Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim (AAASHRAN case number EG0004.Ibr) thanked all those who wrote letters to Egyptian officials about his case. He stated, "Thousands of you had never met me or any of my associates at Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies. But you supported the principles and values for which we stand in this part of the world: democracy, human rights, peace, and development for all. We are determined to continue our struggle, and hope that you will continue your support."

The Program monitors human rights violations perpetrated against scientists, engineers, and health professionals, and organizes campaigns on their behalf. We encourage scientists, engineers, and scientific and engineering organizations to work for the promotion and protection of the human rights standards enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and international human rights treaties. The Program's work is based on the principle that these rights are preconditions for scientific endeavor and should be defended and encouraged as a matter of scientific freedom and responsibility. Under the UDHR, these rights include, but are not limited to:

- the right to life, liberty, and security of person (Article 3);

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

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

For casework purposes, the Program defines scientists as those who are members of any of the disciplines meeting the criteria for affiliation with AAAS, or accepted as affiliate societies of AAAS. This includes those engaged in research, teaching, other employment or academic study in the physical, natural or social sciences, engineering, or medical and health-related professions. Students in any of these professions or 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. Cases may involve, but are not limited to, issues of academic freedom, restrictions on the right to travel, infringements of medical neutrality, or other violations of principles of professional ethics.

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

About the Science and Human Rights Program

Science is an international enterprise. To flourish, it requires freedom of thought, expression and movement, and the freedom to pursue professional activities without interference. Many of the rights and standards set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights treaties are essential to the conduct of science. These include the rights to education and work; freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas; freedom of association and assembly; and nondiscrimination.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program was established in 1976 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.

AAASHRAN Casework Activities

January 2000-June 2001

This Directory is not meant to be exhaustive. The Program adopts individual cases on the basis of corroborated and well-documented information provided by authoritative international human rights and scientific organizations, and checked and verified by AAAS. The Program gives special attention to cases of particular urgency, such as those involving such major human rights violations as extrajudicial execution, disappearance, torture, or imprisonment. It also addresses significant violations of professional rights or scientific and academic freedoms, such as loss of employment, revocation of academic degrees and responsibilities, restrictions on international travel, contacts with foreign scientists, and the free exchange of ideas.

This volume of the Directory provides a concise overview of the cases on which the Program has taken action from January 2000 through June 2001. 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.

From January 2000 through June 2001, the Program issued 37 AAASHRAN alerts concerning the cases of 26 individual scientists in 16 countries. Also included are one issue alert concerning violations of medical neutrality and two alerts about violations against large groups of scientists, engineers, health professionals, and students. Although in some of these cases, individual scientists are identified as examples, the cases represented scientists in general in those countries.

Positive Developments

The Program issued AAASHRAN alerts that featured positive developments in five ongoing cases. In May 2000, the Cuban government released three of the “Group of Four” dissidents. Felix A. Bonne Carcases, an engineer and physicist; Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, an economist; and Rene Gomez Manzano, a lawyer, were released. The final member

of the group of dissidents, economist Vladimiro Roca Antunez remains in jail. The four were imprisoned after writing a pro-democracy essay.

On 28 July 2000, Dr. Abdulsittar Qassem, a professor of political science at An-Najah University, was released from Nablus Prison by the Palestinian Authority. Dr. Qassem was initially arrested on 28 November 1999, along with several other academics, in retaliation for signing a petition criticizing the Palestinian Authority and alleging corruption in the government. All the other detainees have also been released.

In May 2000, the Program learned that the Chinese government had quietly released engineer Lin Hai in September 1999. Lin Hai is believed to be the first person in China imprisoned for using the Internet to promote democracy.

In Turkey, Akin Birdal was released from prison on 23 September 2000. Birdal, the former president of the Turkey's Human Rights Association and vice-president of the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues, was convicted and imprisoned in June for his repeated calls for an end to Turkey's 16-year war against Kurdish rebels.

There were positive developments in the court cases of two scientists in the former Soviet Union who were the subject of AAASHRAN alerts. In Russia, Aleksandr Nikitin, an engineer, was acquitted of all charges against him. On 12 September 2000, the Russian Supreme Court affirmed a lower court ruling acquitting Nikitin of the charge of revealing state secrets. The charges were connected to a report he co-authored with the Norwegian Bellona Foundation about radioactive contamination from Russia's aging nuclear fleet anchored off the coast of the Kola Peninsula.

In February 2000, the Ukrainian government dropped all charges against Dr. Sergey Piontkovski, a marine biologist. In October 1999, the Ukrainian government raided Dr. Piontkovski's office confiscating his computer, scientific papers, money, and passport. Dr. Piontkovski was charged with illegal currency transfers for accepting money from a European Union funding agency that supports East-West scientific exchange. Dr. Piontkovski's research concerned bioluminescence in plankton.

New Cases

The Program issued an alert in November 2000 concerning the fate of scientists, engineers, and health professionals in China, who have been among the thousands imprisoned and persecuted for their peaceful practice of Falun Gong, a non-violent spiritual practice that is based on an ancient Chinese form of meditation and special exercises. Such persecu-

tion is in clear violation of their rights to freedom of belief, expression, and association. On 30 March 2001, the Program issued an AAASHRAN alert concerning an incident earlier that month in which the Liberian Special Operations Division (SOD), a unit of the security forces often implicated in human rights violations, entered a university campus to stop a student rally and detained several students. The SOD indiscriminately whipped and beat students and professors, injuring several. The Program also issued an alert concerning violations of medical neutrality in Israel and the Occupied Territories. The alert detailed reports of attacks by the Israeli military against clearly identified Palestinian medical personnel.

From January 2000 to June 2001, the Program took up thirteen new cases of individual scientists who were detained by their governments. Six of the cases involved persecution of scientists in connection with their legitimate scientific activities. One of these cases concerned Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim, a sociology professor and director of the Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies in Cairo, Egypt. Dr. Ibrahim was arrested on 30 June 2000 and charged with accepting grants from the European Union without official permission, deliberately disseminating false information and malicious rumors about the internal affairs of the State, and harming the image of the State abroad. The charges stem from the production of a documentary exposing election fraud in Egypt.

In Belarus, Dr. Yury Bandazhevsky, a respected medical specialist and an expert on the effects of radiation exposure, was arrested in July 1999 and is currently under state investigation for publishing a report critical of the Belarus government's handling of the health risks caused by the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident.

The Russian government arrested Dr. Igor Sutyagin in October 1999 on espionage charges. Dr. Sutyagin was conducting research on military-civilian relations for a Canadian-funded project. As a civilian researcher with no military clearances, Dr. Sutyagin never had access to any classified materials.

In Sudan, Dr. Nagib Nagmeldin, Director of the Amel Center for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Torture and Violence, was arrested in March 2001. The Amel Center provides free medical treatment and counseling for victims of human rights abuses; it is the first of its kind to be established in Sudan. The reason for his arrest is not clear and he was not formally charged. When Dr. Negmeldin was detained, security forces also confiscated confidential patient medical records.

In March and June, the Program issued alerts that the Chinese government had detained several social scientists, including Dr. Gao Zhan and Dr. Li Shaomin. Dr. Gao, a faculty fellow at the School of International

Service at American University, was arrested on charges of espionage and “activities damaging state security.” She traveled to Taiwan twice to conduct academic research on women’s issues and economic reform. Dr. Li, a professor of marketing at the City University of Hong Kong, was detained on 25 February 2001, after crossing the border into mainland China. After serving a lengthy detention, both were convicted of spying and expelled from China. The charges of espionage appear to be related to unclassified academic research the two scholars conducted.

The Program also issued AAASHRAN alerts concerning scientists detained for activities not directly related to the conduct of science. In many of the cases, the alerts reported persecution of scientists, engineers, and health professionals for their work promoting human rights. In Vietnam, biologist, Dr. Ha Si Phu was placed under house arrest on May 12, 2000, in connection with a pro-democracy statement he wrote. Ha Si Phu is a member of a group of intellectual dissidents in Dalat, Vietnam, who have published several essays concerning repression in Vietnam.

In Burma, the Program issued an alert about the continued detention of four women activists and scientists, Daw May Win Myint, Daw San San, Daw Shwe Bo, and Ma Khin Khin Leh. Daw May Win Myint, a medical doctor, and Daw San San, a retired marine biologist, were arrested in October 1997 with other prominent pro-democracy activists after attempting to hold a meeting with Burmese dissident Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. Ma Khin Khin Leh, a history teacher, and Daw Shwe Bo, a medical doctor, were arrested in July of 1999 on suspicion that they were part of a group planning a pro-democracy march.

In Ethiopia, several students were beaten and killed during a academic freedom rally at Addis Ababa University in April 2001. Ethiopian government security forces raided the university to stop the rally, leaving 41 individuals, mostly students, dead and several more injured. A few weeks after the rally, security forces arrested two prominent civil society activists, Professor Mesfin Wolde Mariam and Dr. Berhanu Nega, on charges of inciting students to protest. Both men have stated that they did speak to students, but only to inform them of their human and academic freedom rights.

Disappearance

There was one case of a disappearance. Dr. Mayra Angelina Gutiérrez Hernández, a psychology professor at the Rafael Landivar University in Huehuetenango, Guatemala, was last seen 7 April, 2000. She was an active

member of the Women's Commission at the University of San Carlos, which conducts research on issues relating to women's rights. Three years ago, she published a research paper about illegal adoption in Guatemala that implicated several prominent lawyers there.

Persecution and Harassment

The Program has been monitoring the cases of persecution and harassment of academics and scientists in Tunisia. The Program has issued several alerts about Dr. Moncef Marzouki, a human rights defender. In July 2000, Dr. Marzouki was fired from his post as a professor of Community Medicine at the University of Sousse in retaliation for criticizing the Tunisian government while on a trip to the United States. On 30 December 2000, a criminal court in Tunis sentenced Dr. Marzouki to twelve months in jail for maintaining an outlawed organization, the National Council on Liberties (Conseil national pour les libertés en Tunisie, CNLT) and "spreading false information." At the time of this writing, it appears that international attention to the case has prevented the government from carrying out this sentence, but Dr. Marzouki has been prevented from leaving Tunisia to travel to France where he has obtained a teaching position. Another Tunisian scientist, Professor Khadija Cherif, a sociology professor at the University of Tunis and President of the Tunisian Association of Democratic Women was attacked as she was attempting to attend a CNLT meeting. A group of men in civilian clothes surrounded Professor Cherif's car, reached through the open windows and repeatedly slapped her in the face, and beat her on the neck, head, and breasts while screaming obscenities at her. Eyewitnesses identified the attackers as plainclothes police officers.

Denial of the Right to Travel

In May 2001, the Program issued an alert about the Chinese government's denial of a scientist's right to travel. Dr. Gao Yaojie, 74, a retired gynecologist and HIV/AIDS activist, was invited to travel to Washington, DC, where she was to receive an award for her work promoting health and human rights. Dr. Gao, who has often been the subject of harassment from the Chinese government for her HIV/AIDS work, applied for official permission to leave China to attend the award ceremony. The Chinese government denied her request.

Analysis and Discussion

The casework conducted by AAASHRAN may not be representative of larger trends in human rights violations around the world. The Program's casework concerns itself with addressing human rights violations perpetrated by or against scientists, engineers, and health professionals. This is not because scientists are more deserving than any other group of individuals whose rights might be violated. However, the Program believes that scientific groups should have a special interest in responding to violations involving individual scientists, groups of scientists, or scientific organizations or institutions because of a special collegial identity. Furthermore, the Program supports the principle that the full realization of human rights is a precondition for scientific endeavors and should be defended and encouraged as a matter of scientific freedom and responsibility. For a more comprehensive analysis of the general state of human rights around the world there are several excellent publications, including the Annual Reports of Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch.

However, the particular "snapshot" of human rights violations that is captured by the cases during this time frame do suggest some trends, especially with regard to restriction on scientists' ability to pursue their work freely. One trend is a rising level against repression of academics and scientists in Russia and the other republics of the former Soviet Union. Several aspects of the growing repression are likely to have a profound impact on the conduct of science and the safety of individual scientists and researchers.

Scientists conducting research and publishing articles on environmental issues are particularly vulnerable. They have been subject to a rising level of intimidation and harassment from the state. Despite professing to Canadian journalists a secret dream to one day become an environmentalist, Russian President Vladimir Putin has often used strong-arm tactics against environmentalists who call international attention to the failure of the Russian state to adequately address its environmental problems. In July of 1999, Putin made statements in the press claiming that environmental groups were working in collusion with foreign intelligence agencies. The case of Alexandr Nikitin (see page 45 for more information on this case) demonstrates Russia's growing intolerance to criticisms of its environmental record.

In Russia and other former Soviet republics, scientists have also experienced increased scrutiny of research collaborations with Western organizations. For example, in the case against Dr. Sergey Piontkovski, the

Ukrainian government was highly suspicious of grants he had received from INTAS, a European organization supporting East-West scientific cooperation. In Russia, scientists conducting a study funded by two Canadian universities also ran into trouble with the authorities. Dr. Igor Sutyagin, the researcher contracted to undertake a study on military-civilian relations, is under arrest and will be standing trial on espionage charges. (See page 47 for more information on this case.) There were reports that the Russian Academy of Sciences was in the process of drafting a plan that would more closely monitor its members' contact with foreigners. Under the proposed rules, the Academy's 53,000 scientific researchers would be required to report a wide variety of information about their foreign scientific collaborations. Many scientists feared that the proposed rules represented a return to the Soviet-era police state.

In response to these events, numerous scientific societies and Western funding organizations are actively speaking out against persecution in Russia and the former Soviet Union States. Dr. Piontkovski credits the active role of Western scientific societies and funding organizations on his behalf with the positive outcome in his case. INTAS reportedly threatened to cancel 55 new science projects in Ukraine if Ukrainian scientists were faced with prosecution "simply for cashing INTAS checks." Representatives from the Institute on U.S. and Canada Studies have also publicly defended Dr. Igor Sutyagin and have written letters to the Russian government on his behalf. Financier George Soros voiced concerns about the Russian Academy of Sciences' proposed plan to sharply increase oversight and control of its members' international contacts. He announced that he would reconsider his investments in Russia if the Academy implemented this plan. In the face of strong international condemnation, the Russian Academy of Sciences quietly rescinded the proposed plans. Continued pressure from scientific societies has brought about positive changes in several other cases and serves as a warning to government authorities that scientists and academics around the world are monitoring the cases of their colleagues whose human rights have been violated.

An area of increasing concern in 2001 has been the repression and detention of scientists in China. The Program took up a case on behalf of several scientists, engineers, and health professionals who, like other practitioners of the Falun Gong, a non-violent spiritual practice, have had their right to freedom of belief and association systematically violated in China. (See page 33 for more details on this case.)

The Program closely monitored the cases of several detained academics in China: among them, Dr. Gao Zhan, a sociologist and faculty fellow at the School of International Service at American University in Washing-

ton, DC, and Dr. Li Shaomin, a professor of marketing at the City University of Hong Kong. (See pages 30-32 for more information.)

On 11 February 2001, Dr. Gao and her family were at Beijing International airport about to board a plane back to Washington after visiting family members for the Chinese New Year. Several Chinese security officials entered the airport and surrounded the family. Dr. Gao, her husband Xue Donghua, and their five-year old son were taken into police custody. The government denied both Gao's and Xue's request that their son be allowed to stay with relatives and instead placed him in a state kindergarten. After 26 days in detention, the Chinese government released Mr. Xue and his son and they traveled back to Washington. The government did not inform Mr. Xue where his wife was being held.

The Chinese government detained Dr. Li on 25 February 2001 after he crossed the border into mainland China to visit a friend. When the friend called Dr. Li's wife Liu Yingli to tell her that her husband never arrived, she feared that he had had an accident and reported his disappearance to the police. The next day, the American Embassy informed her that her husband was not missing, but had been detained by Chinese security forces. Dr. Li is a naturalized U.S. citizen.

During the first months of detention, the two scholars were not allowed access to lawyers, family members, or U.S. consular officials. It was unclear what evidence existed to support the espionage charges they were facing. Chinese officials claimed that Dr. Gao "openly confessed her crimes" and that they possessed evidence that Dr. Gao "accepted missions from overseas intelligence agencies and took funds for spying activities in mainland China." Dr. Gao's husband and her colleagues at American University strongly denied any claims that she was engaging in any espionage activities. They contended that Dr. Gao had only carried out legitimate scientific research in her area of scholarship: women's issues, economic reform in China, and students returning to China after studying abroad. Dr. Li's wife also emphatically denied the charges against her husband. She stated that she "could not comprehend why Shaomin's devotion to academic research brought him and our family such a nightmare."

During Dr. Li's trial, a deposition by Dr. Gao was submitted as evidence, which was the first time that the cases had been explicitly linked. However, Dr. Gao's lawyer described the interaction of the two individuals as academically collegial. What appears to have been in question were photocopies of books and magazines on Taiwan-China relations that Dr. Gao gave to Dr. Li. Her attorney stated that none of the material was marked sensitive or could be considered compromising to China's national security.

In July 2001, Dr. Gao Zhan and Dr. Li Shaomin were found guilty on espionage charges at separate trials. The detention of both academics was marked by serious violations of due process. Dr. Gao was held for 40 days without charge and only allowed to see her lawyers a few days before her trial. There is also a concern that any confession made during her detention would have been made under duress. Dr. Li was held for 80 days before being formally charged. Lawyers for both scholars maintained that the government did not have enough evidence to support the charges of espionage.

On 25 July 2001, China allowed Drs. Gao and Li to leave China. The government formally deported Dr. Li and granted Dr. Gao's medical parole request. Both scholars appeared to be cautious in talking to reporters so as not to jeopardize any of their relatives and friends in China. However, they each expressed their happiness to be reunited with their loved ones and relief that their ordeals were over. Dr. Gao stated that her "firm belief in her innocence" sustained her through her detention. Dr. Gao, who suffers from a heart condition, said that her health suffered greatly while in detention, where she was fed meager rations. Dr. Li told reporters, "I feel great to be home and reunited with my family and see all of my friends. It was a long journey home."

Academics, especially scholars who travel to China for research, have followed the news of these detentions very closely. Three hundred and seventy-five members of the international academic community working in the field of China studies signed a petition to President Jiang Zemin protesting the detention of academics. Such a large-scale protest of the Chinese government by Chinese scholars is unusual, especially when one realizes that many of the scholars who signed the petition need to be able to visit China to conduct their research and that their participation in the petition could jeopardize future visa requests. But is also precisely the fact that these scholars need to be able to freely travel to China to conduct research that may have prompted such a strong participation level in the petition. Dr. Shaomin's wife, Liu Yingli, expressed the fear that many academics might feel in traveling to China when she stated, "It's scary. Who else would want to go to that part of the world? You go there, you disappear."

There is no strong consensus about what sparked this recent round of detentions of academics. All of the detained scholars are social scientists. Some experts believe that China may feel threatened by their ability to assess the country's policies. Another factor may be the scholars' research on China-Taiwan relations. Some international policy experts have contended that China may be using the detentions of Chinese-Amer-

ican scholars to test the resolve of President Bush. While the reasons may not be clear, it is obvious that these detentions are a serious blow to the continuing intellectual and academic exchange between China and the rest of the world.

Special Activities

- In June 2000, the Program organized a special reception to honor Dr. Sergey Piontkovski, a marine biologist from Sevastopol, Ukraine. The Program honored Dr. Piontkovski at the 2000 AAAS Annual Meeting. He was unable to attend in person because the Ukrainian government had confiscated his passport and he was could not leave the country. Now



Sergey Piontkovski (right) and Irving Lerch at the June reception.

- living in the United States, Dr. Piontkovski was recognized at the special reception in June at which he and his family were present.
- Also in June 2000, Program staff met with Dr. Moncef Marzouki, professor of community medicine in Tunisia. Dr. Marzouki briefed the staff about the current human rights situation in Tunisia. He acknowledged that when he returned home he faced certain harassment from the government. When asked if issuing an alert about his case could put him at risk, he replied, “I know from personal experience, danger comes when no one talks about you.”
- In July 2000, the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility co-signed letters with the American Political Science Association regarding the criminal defamation case against of Dr. Anton Pelinka, a political scientist in Austria. The letters, which were sent to Dr. Thomas Klestil, President of Austria and to the Special Commission on the Situation in Austria at the European Court of Human Rights, stated:

University based scholarly pursuits such as political science depend upon the protection of a scholar’s right to

free expression. If that commitment to free expression is to be sustained, it cannot be held captive to the ebbs and flows of the political moment. Dr. Pelinka's carefully chosen characterization of Jörg Haider was not directed at a private citizen but to a public figure whose performance and spoken words are, by their nature, open to public and scholarly scrutiny.

- In January 2001, the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility joined Human Rights Watch in protesting Tunisia's bid to host the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) 2003 World Information Society Summit (WISS). The CSFR letter to the ITU expressed concern about the Tunisian government's systematic violation of basic human rights such as freedom of expression and association. The letter stated:

According to your website, the proposed themes of the WISS include the promotion of "universal and equitable access to the information society" and exploring "relevant content reflecting cultural diversity and the right to communicate." It seems wrong to have a summit addressing these themes in Tunisia where the "right to communicate" is systematically denied to its own citizens.

- In February 2001, Mr. Joshua Handler, a doctoral candidate in public policy at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and Dr. Pavel Podvig, a Russian researcher and editor of "Russia's Strategic Nuclear Forces," briefed members of the scientific community about the espionage case against Dr. Igor Sutyagin, in a meeting held at AAAS.
- On 17 April 2001, AAAS co-sponsored a press conference about the detained scholars in China with the American Sociological Association, New York Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Rights, and Human Rights Watch Academic Freedom Program. Sage Russell, Senior Program Associate, represented the Program. At the press conference, a letter signed by 375 international China scholars protesting the detentions was released.
- On 17 May 2001, the Program conducted a one-day workshop on human rights casework and advocacy skills. Participants included scientists and scientific societies who currently work on behalf

of human rights within the context of their professional affiliations and scientists who are interested in starting human rights advocacy programs. The workshop focused on skills building and explored three topics: international human rights law, media strategies, and casework and advocacy skills. Beth Lyon, Practitioner-in-Residence at the Washington College of Law at American University, led the session on international human rights law. She



Attendees at the May workshop. From left to right: David Banks and Doug Samuelson, American Statistical Association; Irving Lerch, American Physical Society; and Rob Quinn, Scholars at Risk Network.

provided an overview of basic legal concepts and vocabulary and discussed ways that scientific societies can most effectively use legal instruments and international legal bodies to further their human rights work. Carroll Bogert, Communications Director at Human Rights Watch, led the second session, which focused on strategies and skills for working effectively with television and print media. She gave an overview of how news organizations operate and provided information on such skills as organizing a press conference, pitching a story to journalists, and some ways that electronic media can be used effectively in human rights advocacy work. Jonathan Pearson, Deputy Director of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, Amnesty/USA, led the third session. He presented an overview of casework-related skills, including how to plan specific issue campaigns, letter-writing strategies, and how to work effectively with other organizations.

Annual Science and Human Rights Reception

In addition to adopting the cases of individual scientists, the Program also holds a special reception at the AAAS Annual Meeting to honor a sci-

entist who, through action and example, has promoted human rights, usually at great personal risk. The reception provides an opportunity for members of the scientific community to learn more about the human rights work of scientific societies, the plight of persecuted scientists in other countries, and human rights issues that affect scientists worldwide.

In 2001, the Program honored Dr. Flora Brovina. Dr. Brovina, an ethnic Albanian from Pristina, Kosovo, is a pediatrician, poet, and human rights activist. She 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.



Flora Brovina at the Science and Human Rights Reception.

The Program honored Dr. Brovina for her humanitarian work in Kosovo before and during the armed conflict in the Spring of 1999; her fidelity to the human rights principles of nondiscrimination and nonviolence; and her courage during her detention, trial and imprisonment by the Serbian government.

Flora Brovina was released from prison in November 2000 on the orders of Vojislav Kostunica, the new president of Yugoslavia. She credited her release to the strong international attention to her case.

Below is a list of past honorees.

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 inter-

national 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 in 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

- Dr. 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 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. Dr. Alemayehu remains detained without charge or trial.
- Dr. 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. Asrat's commitment to non-violent activity. The charges against him appear to have been politically motivated. Dr. Asrat was released from prison in December 1998. He suffered from a heart condition and diabetes, conditions that were worsened by delays in providing

him with adequate medical attention. Dr. Asrat Woldeyes died on 14 May 1999, shortly after his release from prison.

1997

- Dr. 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 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 U.S. in April 1998.

1996

- Haluk Gerger, a former assistant professor at the University of Ankara, a well-known intellectual, and a respected writer on nuclear weapons strategy, has been repeatedly imprisoned for the peaceful expression of his opinion. Dr. Gerger is a founding member of the Turkish Human Rights Association. He is an ardent defender of Kurdish rights, although not a Kurd himself. His writings on the issue and his criticism of



Haluk Gerger

governmental policies in response to the armed conflict between Kurdish rebels and Turkish security forces in southeast 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.

- Dr. 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 "rebellious against the regime," and detained for ten years in prison without trial. Dr. Que was released from prison in 1988 and rearrested in 1990 for issuing an appeal to individuals and organizations in Vietnam calling for freedom, democracy, and political pluralism in that country. He was sentenced to twenty years of hard labor to be followed by five-years of house arrest. Dr. Que was released in an amnesty in 1998. Dr. Nguyen Dan Que lives in Hanoi, where he continues to advocate for democracy in Vietnam.

1995

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



Vil Mirzayanov

26 years. He was released from prison in March 1994 after U.S. 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 to himself and his family, Liu was forced to flee China. Liu Gang currently lives in New York.

Case Summaries

Austria

Name: Pelinka, Anton
Subject: Political Science Professor Fined
Case Number: AU0003.Pel
Issues: Freedom of Opinion and Expression; Academic and Scientific Freedom
Alert Date: 17 July 2000
Profession: Professor of Political Science

On 11 May 2000, Vienna's Criminal Court found University of Innsbruck political science professor Anton Pelinka guilty of "defaming the character" of former Freedom Party Leader Jörg Haider and fined him 60,000 Austrian schillings (about \$4,000).

Haider charged Dr. Pelinka with defamation following statements Pelinka made in an interview on Italian television in May 1999. During the interview, Dr. Pelinka stated, "In his career, Haider has repeatedly made statements which amount to trivializing National Socialism. Once he described death camps as penal camps. On the whole, Haider is responsible for making certain National Socialist positions and certain National Socialist remarks more politically acceptable."

Dr. Pelinka pointed out that his analysis was based on undisputed public records. He also contended that his role as a political scientist is to study and compare texts and analyze them in a historical context. Dr. Pelinka is an internationally respected authority on Austrian affairs.

Haider has brought lawsuits against several people for alleged defamation of character. In fact, Haider has another case pending against Dr. Pelinka for statements Pelinka made to CNN in the spring of 1999, comparing Haider's linking of Austria's level of unemployment with the number of foreigners in the country to the way the Nazis linked high unemployment rates to the size of the Jewish population.

There is concern that Haider is trying to use the court system to suppress political criticism. A major source of concern in these defamation cases is that Haider's former personal lawyer, Dieter Böhmdorfer, is currently serving as Austria's Minister of Justice. In fact, Böhmdorfer was Haider's original lawyer in the Pelinka case.

The far-right Freedom Party became part of the ruling coalition in Austria in 2000, which set off a series of domestic and international protests. The European Union voted to impose bilateral sanctions against Austria if the Freedom Party was allowed to become part of the government. Haider, who has made many controversial statements that directly and indirectly support Nazism, stepped down from his position as head of the Freedom Party in May 2000, but remains governor of the province of Carinthia.

Belarus

Name: Bandazhevsky, Yury
Subject: Scientist Imprisoned for Criticizing State's Health Policies
Case Number: BE0006.Ban
Issues: Freedom of Expression; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest; Academic and Scientific Freedom
Alert Date: 15 September 2000
Profession: Medical Doctor and Researcher

In July 1999, Dr. Yury Bandazhevsky was arrested in the middle of the night from his home in Gomel. According to the Belarusian security forces, the legal basis of his arrest fell under the presidential decree, "On Urgent Measures for the Combat of Terrorism and Other Especially Dangerous Violent Crimes," a measure that is usually used only for the arrest of violent criminals or terrorists. In August 1999, he was charged with taking bribes from students seeking admission to his research institute. A colleague of Dr. Bandazhevsky initially made the allegations of bribery against him, but subsequently withdrew the statement. This charge carries a sentence of five to fifteen years' imprisonment and confiscation of property. Dr. Bandazhevsky was released from pre-trial detention in December 1999 and allowed to return home to Gomel to await trial. A week before his trial, Dr. Bandazhevsky was detained for trying to cross the border into Ukraine with a false passport. On 18 June 2001, Dr. Bandazhevsky was sentenced to eight years in prison for taking bribes from his students. He was also stripped of his military rank. It is uncertain whether the Belarusian authorities have any evidence to support this charge, and human rights organizations have expressed concern as to whether he received a fair trial.

Throughout his detention, Dr. Bandazhevsky was denied basic rights. In addition to being held for a month without being charged, Dr. Banda-

zhevsky was not given access to a lawyer or allowed to see his family for three weeks. He was eventually allowed to contact his lawyer, but before the lawyer's first visit to see his client, Dr. Bandazhevsky was transferred to a prison in Mogilev 100 miles away. His lawyer continued to have trouble gaining access to consult with his client in Mogilev because Dr. Bandazhevsky was held in a temporary isolation cell for a month. Later, Dr. Bandazhevsky was transferred to a maximum-security prison in Minsk. While in prison, he suffered from a stomach condition. These are all harsh measures for someone charged with taking bribes at a private institution.

Dr. Bandazhevsky, the founder of the Gomel Medical Institute, is a well-respected medical specialist and an expert on the effects of radiation exposure. Dr. Bandazhevsky is also an outspoken critic of the Belarusian government's handling of the health risks caused by the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident. In 1999, Dr. Bandazhevsky wrote a report on research conducted at the Institute of Radiation Medicine, a research institution that is part of the Belarusian Ministry of Health. Dr. Bandazhevsky's report criticized the way the Ministry of Health was spending its resources and questioned the Institute's scientific findings. He contended that the Institute of Radiation Medicine had not properly researched the effects of radiation contamination. The Institute of Radiation Medicine supported a new Belarusian policy that removes restrictions on contaminated foods, leaving citizens to find their own precautions for avoiding possible health risks associated with eating contaminated foods. Dr. Bandazhevsky has been critical of this policy, charging that the Belarusian government has not spent enough resources researching the health hazards of radiation contamination and has not provided adequate information on this issue to the public either.

Dr. Bandazhevsky is highly regarded for his work in researching the effects of radiation. Belarus was one of the hardest hit areas after the accident at Chernobyl. Health problems have continued to plague the population and have been complicated by the nation's struggling economy. Dr. Bandazhevsky specifically chose to set up his medical institute in Gomel, which is in the center of the worst affected region in Belarus.

Burma/Myanmar

Name: Daw May Win Myint, Daw San San, Daw Shwe Bo, and Ma Khin Khin Leh
Subject: Female Scientists Imprisoned in Burma (Myanmar)
Case Number: BU0009.Daw

Issues: Freedom of Speech; Freedom of Association; Academic and Scientific Freedom; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; the Right to a Fair Trial
Alert Date: 5 December 2000
Professions: Medical Professional, Marine Biologist, Teacher

Burma (Myanmar) has been under military dictatorship since 1962. In September 1988, the armed forces brutally suppressed a massive pro-democracy movement. Since that time, a military junta, known as the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), has ruled by decree, without a constitution or legislature.

In the late 1980s, the SPDC made some concessions to the pro-democracy movement, including the right to form independent political parties. Burma held relatively open elections in 1990, during which voters overwhelmingly supported the opposition party, the National League for Democracy (NLD). The NLD won more than 60 percent of the popular vote and 80 percent of the parliamentary seats. However, the SPDC has not allowed the elected representatives to convene parliament.

Many women rose to prominent positions in the NLD party, including Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, who serves as the General Secretary of the NLD. Suu Kyi won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991 and is the best known of the Burmese dissidents. However, fifteen other women from the NLD party also won seats in the 485-member parliament. A number of the women who rose to prominent positions in the NLD are scientists.

Burma has an extremely poor human rights record. SPDC officials often arrest and detain individuals who express dissenting political views or advocate for democracy. Prison conditions are harsh, and torture, especially in the first few months of detention, is common. The government has specifically targeted members of the NLD. The stories of the following four women are just a few examples of the estimated 1,300 political prisoners in Burma today.

October 1997--Daw May Win Myint and Daw San San

On 28 October 1997, Daw May Win Myint and Daw San San were arrested with other prominent NLD members after attempting to hold a meeting with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in the Mayangone Township, a suburb of Rangoon (Yangon). The meeting was to discuss restructuring the local branch of the NLD youth party. Daw May Win Myint and Daw San San were elected to the parliament in the 1990 elections.

Daw May Win Myint is a medical doctor who worked in cooperative clinics, general hospitals, and a hospital for the disabled. On 5 December 1997, she was sentenced to six years' imprisonment under Section 5j of

the 1950 Emergency Provisions Act. Section 5j provides for the detention of anyone who attempts to “disrupt the morality or the behavior of a group of people ... or to disrupt the security or ... stability of the Union.” This provision is often used to imprison political activists.

Daw San San, 70, is a former marine biologist. She has been a long-time pro-democracy advocate. After the military government’s refusal to allow the democratically elected parliament to convene, Daw San San participated in discussions in Mandalay on forming a parallel government. She was arrested for her participation in these meetings in April 1991. She was released a year later under a decree that provided for the release of political prisoners who are not considered a threat to national security. As a condition of her release, the SPDC required her to sign an agreement that she would not be involved in any political activities. She was arrested briefly again in 1996 in a mass arrest of hundreds of NLD members who were attempting to convene a party congress. Following her arrest in October 1997 for her participation in the NLD youth meeting, Daw San San was held incommunicado for at least three months, without access to her family, doctors or lawyer.

Daw May Win Myint and Daw San San are currently being held in Insein Prison in Rangoon, where they share a cell. The human rights group Reporters Without Frontiers describes their cell as follows:

The roof of the cell is very low and there is only a tiny window, so that air cannot circulate normally. Prisoners sleep on bamboo mats on the ground. The toilet--a mud bowl in the corner of the room--is only cleared once a day. From 6 a.m., the women are forced to sit cross-legged on the ground with their heads bowed. Once a day, for 15 minutes, prisoners are taken to the “shower,” where they are allowed to talk.

July 1999--Daw Shwe Bo and Ma Khin Khin Leh

Between 19 and 24 July 1999, 19 people were arrested in Pegu, in central Burma. Authorities detained them on suspicion that they were planning a pro-democracy march scheduled for 19 July. Between 16 and 18 July, pamphlets were distributed that announced the march. Messages were also spray-painted on walls throughout the city that called for supporting the NLD, reducing prices of goods, and increasing civil servants’ salaries. The non-violent march was planned for Martyrs’ Day, commemorating the 52nd anniversary of General Aung San’s assassination. General Aung San fought for independence from the British after World War II and was the father of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. Amnesty International considers all of those detained to be prisoners of conscience.

Among those detained were Daw Shwe Bo and Ma Khin Khin Leh. Daw Shwe Bo, 50, was a township medical officer. For her involvement in NLD activities, the government reportedly required her to resign from her post.

Ma Khin Khin Leh, 34, is a history teacher. The local Military Intelligence arrested Ma Khin Khin Leh and her three-year-old daughter, Thaint Wunna Khin, after SPDC officials attempted to detain her husband, Kyaw Wunna, a political activist and one of the organizers of the 19 July march. When security authorities could not locate him, they arrested his wife and child. Thaint Wunna Khin, considered by Amnesty International to be the youngest prisoner of conscience, was released after five days of detention.

On 3 December 1999, a Special Court sentenced Daw Shwe Bo and Ma Khin Khin Leh to life imprisonment under the 1950 Emergency Provisions Act and the 1908 Unlawful Associations Act. According to the Amnesty International, these two laws are frequently used to imprison people for their peaceful political activities. Defendants are usually not represented by a lawyer and have little or no opportunity to speak in court.

In January 2000, Daw Shwe Bo and Ma Khin Khin Leh were transferred to an unknown location. Their current status is unknown.

China

Name: Gao Yaojie
Subject: Chinese Government Restricts Doctor's Right to Travel
Case Number: CH0107.YGao
Issues: Right to Travel and Freedom of Expression
Alert Date: 1 June 2001
Profession: Gynecologist and HIV/AIDS activist

On 31 May 2001, Dr. Gao Yaojie, 74, a retired gynecologist and HIV/AIDS activist, was scheduled to be in Washington, DC to receive the Jonathan Mann Health and Human Rights award. However, the Chinese government denied Dr. Gao permission to attend the ceremony. The Chinese government has often harassed Dr. Gao for her work and has accused her of working with "foreign, anti-Chinese forces." Because of these charges, Dr. Gao did not believe that she would be granted permission to leave China, but applied for her passport two weeks before her intended trip. The passport never arrived.

Dr. Gao's work focuses on the HIV infection rate among poor farmers in Henan Province. Throughout the last decade, farmers in that region have sold their blood at special blood collection centers. Many poor villagers found that selling blood was the only way to supplement their meager salaries. At many of the centers, blood dealers would illegally obtain the blood specimens and resell 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 high rate of cross infection. In Henan Province, many villages have an HIV infection rate as high as 65%.

Dr. Gao began her work in 1996 and became a central source of information and treatment for the villagers of Henan Province. Although she was retired at the time, she used her small pension to mount an HIV education campaign, distributing informational materials and giving lectures. In many of the places she has visited, she has been the only source of information about HIV/AIDS.

The Chinese government began harassing Dr. Gao after she spoke to international reporters about the HIV/AIDS problems in China. The government is particularly sensitive about Henan Province's infection rate because provincial authorities organized the blood collection. In fact, it is because of the government's involvement that the virus has spread so systematically throughout the region. Henan's provincial government has not acknowledged its role in the blood collection nor the extent of the problem. Local reporters have been warned not to report on the issue.

The Global Health Council sponsors the Jonathan Mann Award for Health and Human Rights, which honors the memory of Jonathan Mann, an epidemiologist and AIDS activist who organized the World Health Organization's first program on AIDS. He died in a plane crash in 1998. The award, which has a cash prize of \$20,000, is intended to provide its recipients with recognition for their contributions in the area of health and human rights and with financial freedom to continue their work. This is the third time the award has been granted. The past winners include Dr. Cynthia Maung, a Burmese doctor who works with victims of human rights abuses, and Dr. Flora Brovina and Dr. Vjosa Dobruna, two doctors in Kosovo who address the psychosocial needs of women and children who are victims of war crimes. The Science and Human Rights Program also honored Dr. Brovina during the Science and Human Rights Reception at the 2001 AAAS Annual Meeting.

Dr. Gao Yaojie has stated that she intends to use the award money to print copies of an AIDS prevention guide for villagers. She has also

stated that she fears the government would prevent her from receiving the money.

China

Name: Gao Zhan
Subject: Sociologist Detained in China
Case Number: CH0103.Gao
Issues: Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Academic and Scientific Freedom
Alert Dates: 27 July 2001, 27 March 2001
Profession: Sociologist

On 11 February 2001, Chinese police arrested and detained a U.S.-based scholar, Dr. Gao Zhan, her husband, Xue Donghua, and their five-year old son at the Beijing airport. Dr. Gao and her family were about to board a plane after a three-week visit to China to celebrate the Chinese New Year with their families. Both Mr. Xue and Dr. Gao were permanent U.S. residents, and had begun the process of applying for U.S. citizenship; their son was already a U.S. citizen. After 26 days in detention, Mr. Xue was allowed to return to the U.S. with his son but without his wife. According to Mr. Xue, Chinese authorities warned him not to tell anyone about what had happened to his family or his wife's life would be in danger.



Gao Zhan

Dr. Gao was reportedly being held for investigation under Chinese national security provisions. The Chinese Foreign Ministry stated that she “was involved in activities damaging state security, and relevant authorities are investigating her according to China’s criminal code.” On 22 March 2001, a Chinese spokesman told reporters that Dr. Gao had “openly confessed her crimes.” There is concern that Dr. Gao was coerced into making a confession. Chinese officials stated, “Evidence has shown that Gao Zhan accepted missions from overseas intelligence agencies and took funds for spying activities in mainland China.” The case against Dr. Gao appeared to turn on copies of speeches, book excerpts and magazine arti-

cles on Taiwan that she gave to another detained scholar, Dr. Li Shaomin. No further details to support these charges were made available, and the Chinese government continued to deny Dr. Gao access to legal representation until 10 July 2001, just days before her trial. Dr. Gao's lawyers maintained that the material was not sensitive, was not marked secret, and did not damage China's national security as alleged by prosecutors.

On 24 July 2001, Gao Zhan was convicted of espionage, or more specifically, collecting "intelligence for spy agencies in Taiwan, causing a serious threat to China's national security," according to the official New China News Agency. Mr. Xue was denied a visa to travel to China to attend Dr. Gao's trial, and U.S. consular officials were also unable to observe the trial. Human Rights Watch and others are concerned that Dr. Gao's trial did not meet international standards of fairness. On 25 July 2001, after 166 days of detention, Chinese authorities released Dr. Gao on medical parole, as is sometimes granted to politically sensitive prisoners. Upon her arrival in the United States the next day, Dr. Gao stated that Chinese authorities warned her not to speak of her detention. Dr. Gao has indicated that she will not be silent but that she also fears for the safety of her parents and in-laws, who remain in China.

Dr. Gao, a sociologist, is a faculty fellow in the School of International Service at American University (AU) in Washington, D.C. In her unpaid position, she conducts research and participates in the academic life of the university. Her research focuses on women's issues and economic reforms in China. She has written several articles about students who return to China after completing their degrees at foreign universities. AU President Benjamin Ladner stated, "As an institution of higher learning, we are concerned if a scholar is being detained for any reason that might be related to legitimate inquiry or research." U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell also called for the release of Gao Zhan on humanitarian grounds and criticized the People's Republic of China for holding Gao Zhan's five-year-old son, a U.S. citizen, without notifying the American Embassy in Beijing as required by treaty. Mr. Xue became a U.S. citizen on 30 March 2001, and Dr. Gao is in the process of obtaining her U.S. citizenship.

China

Name:	Li Shaomin
Subject:	A Second Professor Detained in China
Case Number:	CH0105.Sha
Issues:	Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention and Academic Freedom

Alert Dates: 27 July 2001, 11 July 2001, and 2 April 2001
Profession: Sociologist and Professor of Marketing

On 25 February 2001, Chinese security forces detained Dr. Li Shaomin, a business professor at the City University of Hong Kong, after he crossed the border into mainland China to visit a friend. His wife, Liu Yingli, reported her husband's disappearance to the police when the friend called and said that Dr. Li had never arrived. She learned about her husband's detention the next day when an official from the American Embassy called her. Although Chinese authorities did not immediately indicate where Dr. Li was being held, they did inform the U.S. consular officials because Dr. Li is a naturalized U.S. citizen.

Dr. Li received his Ph.D. in sociology from Princeton University in 1988 and has also taught at Beijing University. Dr. Li's academic interests have centered on China's economic development and "e-commerce." He has written extensively on the impact of privatization and market reforms on the performance of foreign enterprises conducting business in China.



Li Shaomin

Dr. Li had traveled frequently to mainland China and had never encountered any incidents with Chinese authorities prior to his detention. There was speculation that his detention may have been related to Dr. Li's father, Li Honglin, who was a prominent liberal scholar. The elder Li was detained for ten months in 1989 after signing a petition that supported the pro-democracy protesters of Tiananmen Square. However, it appears from information presented at the trial that Dr. Li may have been detained because of an academic relationship with Dr. Gao Zhan. Dr. Gao had given Dr. Li photocopied articles about Taiwan-China relations. Lawyers for Dr. Gao have denied that any of these materials contained sensitive information.

Dr. Li was convicted of spying on 15 July 2001, and was ordered to be expelled from China. On 25 July 2001, Dr. Li was deported to the United States where he visited with relatives before returning to his post in Hong Kong.

China

Name: Lin Hai
Subject: Engineer Released
Case Number: CH9810.Hai

Issues: Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Freedom of Opinion and Expression; Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association
Alert Dates: 25 May 2000, 11 February 1999, 28 January 1999, 10 December 1998, and 19 August 1998
Profession: Engineer

In September 1999, a full six months before the scheduled end of his sentence, Chinese authorities released Lin Hai, a Chinese software engineer, who was sentenced to two years in prison for providing 30,000 Chinese e-mail addresses to a US-based, pro-democracy newsletter. His release was not widely reported. It appears that a condition of his release was that he remain out of the public eye. Lin Hai currently lives in New York.



Lin Hai

Lin Hai is believed to be the first person in China to be imprisoned for using the Internet to promote democracy. He was charged with “inciting to overthrow state power” in a trial conducted secretly in Shanghai on 4 December 1998. He admitted to supplying the addresses but said he did so for commercial purposes and was not aware of their final use. The site that received the e-mail addresses was VIP Reference, a Chinese-language pro-democracy newsletter that operates out of the United States and reports on dissident activities, human rights, and other issues.

The Chinese government has enacted strict laws formalizing government control over the flow of information over the Internet. The regulations prohibit transmission of news that is not officially sanctioned by the government.

China

Names: Several Scientists in China
Subject: Scientists Among Detained and at Risk in Falun Gong Crackdown
Case Number: CH0008.Fal
Issues: Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom of Religion; Freedom of Association; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Date: 15 November 2000

Profession: Scientists, Engineers

Since 1999, the Chinese government has led a brutal crackdown on followers of the Falun Gong, a non-violent spiritual practice that is based on an ancient Chinese form of meditation and special exercises.

Scientists, engineers, and health professionals have been among the thousands detained and persecuted by the Chinese government for peacefully exercising their internationally recognized rights to freedom of belief, expression and association by practicing Falun Gong.

On 4 November 2000, Zou Songtao, 28, a biology professor at Qingdao Maritime University in eastern Shandong province, died in the Number Three Shandong Reform Through Education Camp in Zibo City, China. Chinese officials arrested Zou, a 1995 graduate of Nanjing University, on 18 July 2000, and sentenced him to three years' detention for protesting in Beijing against the ban on Falun Gong. Officials at the detention center informed Zou's family that he had committed suicide. Zou's wife was not allowed to see the body to verify this claim. His cremated remains were returned to the family on 5 November 2000. His family expressed doubts that Zou would have killed himself, especially because his wife had recently given birth to their child.

China has blocked most information about the number of people who have been arrested or have died while in custody. International human rights groups and news reports estimate that 268 Falun Gong practitioners have died since the government started its crackdown in 1999.

The following are a few cases of human rights violations that have been reported to the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program regarding practitioners of Falun Gong:

Cao Kai, twenty-nine, a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Developmental Biology of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, was detained in June 2000. Although later released Cao was detained again on 27 February 2001. He is currently being held in the Qinghe Detention Center, Haidian District, Beijing.

Su Gang, 32, a software engineer at Qilu Petrochemical Company in Zibo City of Shangdong Province, was detained in May 2000 for one month and died shortly after his release on 10 June 2000.

Hong Jirong, 62, a professor at Sichuan University, was sentenced to three years at a labor camp because of his suspected involvement in drafting and signing an appeal letter to United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan from Falun Gong practitioners in Sichuan.

Li Fujun, 37, an assistant professor at Xinxiang Medical College in central Henan province, was sentenced to four years in prison after posting an article on the Internet discussing the health benefits of Falun Gong.

Kong Fanfen, a researcher at the Institute of Chemistry and Metallurgy and a member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, was sentenced to forced labor. Her health suffered greatly while in detention and she was hospitalized. When discharged from the hospital, she was remanded to the forced labor camp for one year despite a medical recommendation that she not be further detained.

The Chinese government began its crackdown on Falun Gong on 22 July 1999, when the Ministry of Public Security publicly outlawed the organization. The government banned advertisements and distribution of the movement's materials and forbade practitioners from gathering and performing exercises and meditations. The government also issued statements prohibiting any organized protest against the restrictions. The repression of citizens who are exercising their internationally recognized freedom of belief has intensified since that time. In October 1999, the Supreme People's Court defined Falun Gong as a cult and therefore punishable under Article 300 of the Criminal Law. The minimum sentence for violating Article 300 is seven years and penalties can run as high as life imprisonment or execution.

Despite the fear of harsh penalties, members of Falun Gong have mounted protests in the last year, the largest of which occurred on 1 October 2000, the 51st anniversary of communist rule in China. Tens of thousands of people protested in Beijing's Tiananmen Square. It is estimated that more than 1,000 people were detained. China has officially admitted to the arrest of 150 leaders of the spiritual organization. Chinese human rights groups put that figure higher, with 450 members receiving sentences of eighteen years or more, 600 members sent to mental institutes, 10,000 members sent to labor camps, and 20,000 in temporary detention centers. The Chinese government continues to persecute Falun Gong practitioners.

Cuba

Names: Félix A. Bonné Carcases, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, and Vladimiro Roca Antunez
Subject: Three of the "Group of Four" Cuban Dissidents Released
Case Number: CU9804.Bea, CU931.Bonne, CU9813.Ant

Issues: Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention, and Exile; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Dates: 24 May 2000, 5 October 1998, 20 May 1998, 14 April 1998
Professions: Economist, Engineer, and Physicist

On 12 May, 15 May, and 23 May, respectively, Félix A. Bonné Carcases, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, and René Gómez Manzano were released with “conditional liberty.” Félix Bonné, Marta Roque and René Gómez, along with economist Vladimiro Roca Antunez, were arrested for their role as leaders of the Internal Dissidents’ Working Group for the Analysis of the Cuban Socio-Economic Situation. They were arrested in 1997 for writing a pro-democracy document entitled, “The Homeland Belongs to All.”

The releases may have been part of the Cuban government’s response to the U.N. Human Rights Commission’s April 2000 vote to censure Cuba for its human rights record, which specifically mentioned the Internal Dissidents’ Working Group, and called upon the Government to “release all persons detained or imprisoned for peacefully expressing their political, religious and social views and for exercising their rights to full and equal participation in public affairs.”

Prior to the sentencing, the four were detained for 15 months without charge or trial. They were eventually charged with sedition on 15 October 1998. According to the Cuban criminal code, sedition includes nonviolent opposition to the government. Roque was sentenced to three and a half years, Bonné and Gómez to four years, and Roca to five.

Vladimiro Roca Antunez remains in jail. In addition to receiving the longest sentence, he has also been serving his time in solitary confinement, the most severe treatment, because of his perceived role as the leader of the group.

Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello suffers from liver problems and low hemoglobin after a 52-day hunger strike while in prison. Félix A. Bonné Carcases stated that he was not treated badly while in custody, but he was hospitalized for 15 days for an asthma attack before his release. He thanked the strong international support of their cause.

Egypt

Name: Ibrahim, Saad Eddin
Subject: Sociologist Sentenced, Will Appeal Decision

Case Number: EG0004.Ibr
Issues: Freedom of Opinion and Expression; Academic and Scientific Freedom
Alert Dates: 26 February 2001, 21 November 2000, 11 August 2000, 10 July 2000
Profession: Sociologist, Professor of Sociology

On 19 February 2001, prosecutors ended their arguments in the trial of Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim. The prosecution, characterizing Dr. Ibrahim and the 27 other defendants in the trial as “criminals ready to sell their nation and people for money,” requested a 15-year sentence for Dr. Ibrahim. During the trial, prosecutors also stated that Dr. Ibrahim is “using his intelligence to jeopardize this country’s stability and sow the seeds of disunity.” The court adjourned until 14 April 2001 to give the defense time to prepare its response. On 21 May 2001, Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim, after standing in a barred cage for hours during trial, was sentenced to seven years in prison. His 27 co-defendants, also in cages, were also sentenced to prison terms ranging from one to five years. Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim thanked all those who wrote letters to Egyptian officials about his case. He wrote, “Thousands of you had never met me or any of my associates at Ibn Khaldun. But you supported the principles and values for which we stand in this part of the world: democracy, human rights, peace, and development for all. We are determined to continue our struggle, and hope that you will continue your support.” Dr. Ibrahim plans to appeal his case.



Saad Eddin Ibrahim

Dr. Saad Eddin Ibrahim is a sociology professor at the American University in Cairo and founder and director of the Ibn Khaldun Center for Developmental Studies. Dr. Ibrahim, who is a dual U.S. and Egyptian citizen, received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Wisconsin. He was arrested on 30 June 2000. State security forces raided his house and the Ibn Khaldun Center, confiscating some of the Center’s account files, computer disks, computers, a safe, pamphlets and personal documents. He was charged with accepting donor funds from the European Union without official permission, deliberately disseminating false information and malicious rumors about the internal affairs of the state, and harming the image of the state abroad.

The Ibn Khaldun Center used the funds, about \$160,000 from the European Commission, for a project to increase public awareness on voting rights in Egypt. The project included a short documentary film that

mentioned past alleged instances of electoral fraud in Egypt. The Center has been very active in calling for an independent judicial review of elections in Egypt and had planned to serve as election monitors in last year's parliamentary elections. In addition to its work for free and fair elections, the Center also conducts research on democracy, civil society, and minority rights in Egypt.

There is concern that Dr. Ibrahim did not receive a fair trial. The trial was conducted in the High State Security Court, which was established as a legal institution under the state security law of 1980. The laws created a parallel court system, consisting of security courts and military courts. These special courts operate outside the civil court system. The security courts have power to suspend some of the usual rights and protections guaranteed in the civil court system. The law also grants officials far-reaching powers to detain individuals without indictment or trial. Most politically sensitive criminal cases are tried in the special security courts. However, Egypt has recently modified its special security court policy to include the right to appeal. Dr. Ibrahim made the following statement outside the court: "I am sure I will be cleared. I am just a sociologist. I observe, document, analyze, and I try to make some recommendations."

Ethiopia

Names: Wolde-Marian, Mesfin; Nega, Berhanu; and several students,
Subject: Government Kills 41 Students during Student Academic Freedom Protests
Case Number: ET0106.AAU
Issues: Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention, Freedom of Opinion and Expression, Academic Freedom
Alert Dates: 11 June 2001 and 22 May 2001
Professions: Economist, and university students

On 11 April 2001, Ethiopian security forces attacked students who were holding a protest at Addis Ababa University. During the raid, more than fifty students were injured and one student later died at a hospital. The government cracked down on protesters again on 17-18 April 2001, and reportedly fired live ammunition at hundreds of student and teachers. Human Rights Watch reports, "Witnesses state that the riot police beat civilians with batons though they offered no resistance, and then turned on bystanders, including women and children. Students were dragged out of

local churches and mosques, where they had sought refuge, and taken into detention.”

During the raid, riot police beat to death or shot 41 individuals, mostly students. Fifty-five students were hospitalized with injuries. The police detained about 2,500 students during the raid, most of whom were later released. Students who were suspected of having leadership roles in the university student council were held incommunicado for several more weeks. The unrest spread to at least ten other universities and several high schools in Ethiopia, including Alemaya University of Agriculture and Bahir-Dar Polytechnic Institute.

The students were protesting several university policies that limit academic freedom in Ethiopian universities. Students at Addis Ababa University had been engaged in negotiations with the government concerning the government’s control over the campus. In February 2001, the government banned student unions and adopted a new charter for the University, ending student participation in the university Senate and several oversight committees. Of particular concern has been the increased presence of security forces on campus. Ethiopia is reported to be the only country in sub-Saharan Africa where a government has set up a police station on campus for the purposes of controlling dissenting students and professors. The recent charter made this police presence legal and permanent.

Although the negotiations between the students and government had made some progress, the government would not agree to remove security forces from the universities. The students continued to press for the removal of the forces by waging large-scale boycotts and peaceful protests. The government issued an ultimatum that threatened to deploy police against students who did not return to classes. The standoff between the government and students set off the series of clashes that turned violent at Addis Ababa University.

The government used the unrest on campuses as a justification to round up political activists and journalists who have been critical of the government. On 8 May 2001, security forces arrested two prominent civil society activists, Professor Mesfin Wolde Mariam and Dr. Berhanu Nega. Professor Wolde Mariam, 71, is a founder of the Ethiopian Human Rights Council. Dr. Nega, an economist, is the President of the Ethiopian Economic Association, a non-governmental organization in Addis Ababa. Authorities claimed that Professor Wolde Mariam and Dr. Nega instigated the recent student protests.

Professor Wolde Mariam and Dr. Nega were released from custody on bail on 5 June 2001. Both are awaiting a formal trial on charges of inciting the riots. Both men admit to speaking with students during the protests.

However, they state they were not guilty of inciting students to riot, but were informing students of their human and academic freedom rights.

Guatemala

Name: Gutiérrez Hernández, Mayra Angelina
Subject: Psychology Professor Disappeared
Case Number: GUA0002.gut
Issues: Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention, and Exile; Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Date: 27 June 2000
Profession: Psychology Professor

Mayra Angelina Gutiérrez Hernández, a psychology professor at the Rafael Landívar University in Huehuetenango, Guatemala, was last seen 7 April 2000. Family and colleagues believe that she has been “disappeared.” Mayra Gutiérrez was an active member of the Women’s Commission at the University of San Carlos (USAC), which conducts research on issues relating to women’s rights. Three years ago, she published a research paper about illegal adoption in Guatemala that implicated several lawyers.

In the early part of 2000, two students and an administrator from USAC were also killed. Local human rights experts suspect that her disappearance may have been part of a political campaign against the University.

Israel

Names: Several Medical Professionals in Israel and the Occupied Territories
Subject: Violations of Medical Neutrality in Israel/Occupied Territories
Case Number: IS0007.Med
Issues: Protection of Medical and Religious Personnel; Protection of Medical Units and Transports; Medical Neutrality
Alert Date: 17 October 2000
Profession: Medical Professionals

In October 2000, the Program issued an alert about violations of medical neutrality that occurred during the early days of fighting in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The alert focused on events that occurred in September and October 2000 and on the specific issue of violations of medical neutrality. Since that time, the conflict has sharply escalated with numerous casualties on both the Israeli and Palestinian sides. This update to the original alert provides more detailed information on the specific issue of violations of medical neutrality that have become available since the alert was issued in mid-October 2000.

The Program received reports from international human rights organizations that during the early days of fighting in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, in September and October 2000, of several violations of medical neutrality, as ambulances and clearly marked health professionals were attacked. The International Committee of the Red Cross reported that “dozens of ambulances from the Palestine Red Crescent Society (PRCS) and the Magen David Adom in Israel (MDA) have been attacked.” Bassam Fayez al-Bilbaisi, a 45 year-old emergency medical technician for the PRCS and ambulance driver from Gaza City, was killed on 30 September. He was shot while in the passenger seat of the ambulance. Shots were fired at a second ambulance driver who arrived on the scene to aid Mr. Bassam. Two other Palestinian paramedics, Amjad Daraghmi, 22, and Mahir ‘Abid, 22, were also killed. Both individuals were clearly identified as medical personnel.

The PRCS reports that, as of 16 November 2000, 42 PRCS ambulances had been damaged and 51 personnel wounded or killed. These actions violate international standards for medical neutrality. As Article 21 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (hereinafter “Geneva Convention”) states, “Convoys of vehicles or hospital trains on land..., conveying wounded and sick civilians, the infirm and maternity cases, shall be respected and protected in the same manner as the hospitals provided for in Article 18,” which states that they “may in no circumstances be the object of attack, but shall at all times be respected and protected by the Parties to the conflict.”

The Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) have alleged that Palestinian ambulances have been used to carry arms. The IDF stated on 1 November 2000 that a PRCS ambulance fired on the settler community of Psagot. However, human rights organizations, such as Amnesty International, Physicians for Human Rights, and Human Rights Watch obtained no independent evidence to corroborate these allegations.

There have also been reported attacks by Palestinian civilians against MDA vehicles and personnel. Four MDA medical personnel were injured

and 23 ambulances are reported to have been damaged during the first few months of the conflict by Palestinian civilians throwing stones.

The majority of the attacks on ambulances and personnel appear to have resulted from Israeli military action, and in some cases, action by individual Israeli settlers against Palestinian targets. According to a Physicians for Human Rights USA report, IDF officials admitted that violations of medical neutrality had occurred during the early weeks of the conflict. IDF officials stated that orders had been reissued from headquarters for officers to respect the principles of medical neutrality.

However, checkpoints and road closures enforced by the IDF have also contributed to violations of medical neutrality standards. In particular, the IDF has been responsible for impeding access of patients and health personnel to hospitals, blocking the movement of medical supplies, and preventing the injured from leaving to receive treatment abroad. Health and human rights organizations report that the IDF blocked access to the Augusta Victoria and the Makassed Hospitals in Jerusalem. On 14 November 2000, a Palestinian woman, Taqrit Asuri, was forced to give birth in a taxi after Israeli troops prevented her from passing a checkpoint to reach the closest hospital. Even though Asuri was obviously in labor, soldiers refused her entry to Ramallah, which had been closed off the previous day after Palestinian gunmen killed four Israelis. Ambulances have been held up at checkpoints, in some cases for ten minutes or more, preventing medical personnel from transporting the wounded to hospitals. Several of the ambulance delays have been responsible for the worsened conditions or, in some cases, deaths of the wounded. This conduct violates Article 17 of the Geneva Convention, which states, "The Parties to the conflict shall endeavor to conclude local agreements for the removal from besieged or encircled areas, of wounded, sick, infirm, and aged persons, children and maternity cases, and for the passage of ministers of all religions, medical personnel and medical equipment on their way to such areas."

Israeli closure or restriction of the Gaza airport many times since 29 September 2000 has also impeded the inward flow of goods, including medical supplies, and the outward travel of wounded individuals seeking treatment abroad. Furthermore, land transport across borders has been blocked. Israeli border forces have refused passage of humanitarian and medical aid, destined for Palestinian hospitals, from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, Jordan, Egypt, Oman, and Saudi Arabia. The closure and restriction of Gaza airport violates Article 23 of the Geneva Convention, which states, "Each High Contracting Party shall allow the free passage of all consignments of medical and hospital stores and objects

necessary for religious worship intended only for civilians of another High Contracting Party, even if the latter is its adversary. It shall likewise permit the free passage of all consignments of essential foodstuffs, clothing and tonics intended for children under fifteen, expectant mothers and maternity cases.”

The Science and Human Rights Program deplores the intense violence that is occurring in the region. The Program joins with other international human rights organizations in calling on both the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority to respect the Geneva Convention and to take appropriate steps to stop the violence.

Liberia

Names: University Students in Liberia
Subject: Dozens of University Students Beaten
Case Number: LI0104.Std
Issues: Freedom from Harassment and Intimidation; Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom of Association; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Date: 30 March 2001
Profession: University Students

On 21 March 2001, the Liberian Special Operation Division (SOD), a unit of the security forces often implicated in human rights violations, including torture, beat dozens of university students during a protest rally in Monrovia. The students were peacefully protesting the continued detention of four independent journalists arrested in February 2001, and charged with espionage after publishing an article that was critical of the government. The article specifically criticized the government for spending money on spare parts for helicopters while delaying paying months of wages for civil servants. Amnesty International considers the journalists to be prisoners of conscience, and has called for their immediate and unconditional release.

While breaking up the rally, the SOD indiscriminately whipped and beat students and professors, injuring several. The SOD reportedly stripped some of the female students. Security officers beat a journalist who was covering the event, and tried to seize his camera. At least 20 students were arrested and taken to National Police Headquarters. They were subsequently released without charge.

Amnesty International reports that some of the students were taken away by an elite unit of the security forces, the Anti-Terrorist Unit (ATU).

The ATU has frequently been implicated in political killings and cases of torture and operates with impunity. Four of the students taken to a local ATU base were released after a local priest intervened. There is concern that other students may still be held incommunicado by the ATU.

The Liberian government has stepped up a campaign of intimidation against those who question its policies and practices. Students and other civil society groups who are critical of the government, including the media, human rights defenders, and political opponents, have been subject to increasing internal repression in Liberia, and verbal and physical attacks against them are becoming increasingly common.

Several students protested police brutality during the March protest rally and affirmed their right to association and assembly. In retaliation for speaking out, the university board of trustees suspended the student leaders of the University of Liberia Student Union (ULSU). The decision to suspend the student leaders drew criticism from faculty members, including one who resigned. Students planned to organize a rally against the suspensions. The Minister of Justice issued a ban on all rallies and threatened to arrest any student who defied the ban.

In May 2001, ULSU president, Alphonso Nimene and fourteen of his colleagues fled Liberia in fear for their lives after receiving “credible information that they would be eliminated” by state agents. Nimene and other student leaders in the ULSU had been arrested the previous year for making public statements critical of the Liberian government. While in detention, the students were severely beaten by members of the SOD. The students were subsequently released without charge. Police denied allegations of torture. After six days of cutting through dense forests, Nimene and his colleagues reportedly crossed the border into Côte d’Ivoire without hindrance.

Palestinian Authority

Name:	Qassem, Abdulsittar
Subject:	Dr. Abdulsittar Qassem Released
Case Number:	PA9915
Issues:	Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Dates:	11 August 2000, 29 December 1999, 2 December 1999
Profession:	Professor of Political Science

Dr. Abdulsittar Qassem, professor of political science at An Najah University, (alternate spellings include Abd al-Sattar Qassem and Abdul Sattar Qasem) was released unconditionally from Nablus prison on 28 July 2000.

Dr. Qassem was first arrested on 28 November 1999, along with several other academics, in retaliation for signing a petition criticizing the Palestinian Authority and alleging corruption in the government. The other detainees were also released in late 1999.

Dr. Qassem and Dr. Ahmad Shaker Doobeen, a schoolteacher from Hebron, were released from prison on 6 January 2000. Each was required to sign a document stating that he promised to appear in court, if requested, and to pay 50,000 Jordanian dinars (about \$75,000 US dollars) if he failed to appear.

The Palestinian Authority arrested Dr. Qassem again on 18 February 2000 and held him in Nablus prison without charge or trial. An order for his release was issued by the Palestinian High Court on 6 July 2000. He was released on 28 July 2000.

Russia

Name:	Nikitin, Alexander
Subject:	Nikitin's Legal Battle Now Over; Attempt to Re-open Nikitin Case Denied
Case Number:	RU9602.Nik
Issues:	Threat of long-term Imprisonment or Capital Punishment; Denial of the Right to Security of the Person, Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Academic and Scientific Freedom; and Freedom of Expression
Alert Dates:	14 September 2000, 17 April 2000, 21 March 2000, 29 December 1999, 9 September 1999, 6 July 1999, 19 February 1999, 6 February 1998, 30 December 1996, 15 May 1996, 22 February 1996
Profession:	Engineer

On 12 September 2000, the Presidium of Russia's Supreme Court dismissed the Prosecutor General's appeal against the earlier acquittal of Alexander Nikitin. There is every indication that Nikitin's five-year legal nightmare is finally over.

Those who have followed the case may remember that many times before it has seemed that the case against Nikitin was finally over. Niki-

tin was accused of espionage in 1996, as a result of a report he wrote for the Norwegian Bellona Foundation about the serious environmental risks caused by nuclear waste from the Russian Northern Fleet. The Federal Security Bureau (FSB), the successor to the KGB, claimed that Nikitin's report contained classified information. Nikitin and the Bellona Foundation maintained consistently that all the information in the report came from publicly available sources. In December 1999, a St. Petersburg City Court acquitted Nikitin of all charges of espionage. The Prosecutor General appealed the ruling to the Supreme Court, which upheld the acquittal. The Supreme Court's decision was celebrated as a victory for the rule of law in Russia, and it was widely expected that the prosecution would not appeal the decision.

However, the prosecution did try one last attempt to reverse the decision, and filed an appeal, claiming that it wished to reopen the case in order to remedy possible violations of Nikitin's rights in the previous court cases. The Supreme Court denied this last attempt. Its ruling is final and cannot be overturned.



Alexander Nikitin

Nikitin and members of the Bellona Foundation expressed their joy and great relief that the legal battle is now over. In a reception celebrating the verdict, Bellona legal advisor Jon Gauslaa toasted not only the defense team and Nikitin's supporters, but also the Russian courts stating, "It may have taken them too long a time to determine the case, but that does not make the victory less sweet."

The case became an international *cause célèbre*. Nikitin received widespread recognition and praise for bringing to public attention the environmental dangers posed by the aging Russian nuclear fleet and for his steadfastness in withstanding unremitting pressure for four long years. He received a number of significant environmental and human rights awards. In 1997, Nikitin received a Goldman Prize, sometimes referred to as a "Nobel Prize" for environmental issues. The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program recognized his courage on behalf of human rights at the 1999 AAAS Annual Meeting, and in February 2000 he received the AAAS Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award, for his "outstanding efforts to protect human health and environmental integrity."

Nikitin stated that now that the court case is finally over, he will focus on his environmental work again. He is continuing his work with the Bellona Foundation.

Russia

Name: Sutyagin, Igor
Subject: Russian Researcher's Trial to Begin
Case Number: RU0005.Sut
Issues: Freedom of Expression, Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest, Academic Freedom
Alert Dates: 2 July 2001, 5 February 2001, 11 August 2000
Profession: Researcher

On 17 July 2001, the espionage trial of Dr. Igor Sutyagin, 35, resumed after several postponements in Kaluga Oblast. Dr. Sutyagin is chief of the section on military technology research at the Institute of USA and Canada Studies. His case began on 27 October 1999, when Federal Security Service (FSB) conducted searches of his home and office. Other staff members at the Institute, including an American Ph.D. student from Princeton University, were also subjected to a detailed search by the FSB. Dr. Sutyagin was brought to the FSB office in Obninsk for questioning. At that time, he was not charged formally, but was “strongly discouraged from leaving” the FSB station, in what appeared to be an attempt by the FSB to keep him from contacting a lawyer. Under Russian law a person has no right to a lawyer until he or she has been formally charged. On the evening of 29 October 1999, Dr. Sutyagin was officially arrested. Seven days later, he was formally charged with espionage and high treason, charges that carry a penalty of 12 to 20 years in prison.



Igor Sutyagin with his daughter

At the beginning of the FSB investigation it appeared that Dr. Sutyagin was being targeted for research that he conducted for the USA-Canada Institute, a respected Moscow think tank. The research in question focused on the evolving civilian-military relationship in twelve post-Communist countries, including Russia. It now appears more likely that the charges stem from research Dr. Sutyagin conducted for a London-based company called Alternative Futures. The research involved summarizing and analyzing articles that appeared in the Russian press. The Russian government is contending that the London-based organization is a front for Western spies. The head of the FSB counterintelligence office publicly stated that he believes Alternative Futures to be “an organization set up by the

intelligence service of one of the NATO countries.” However, the FSB presented no evidence to support this claim.

Dr. Sutyagin’s defense team has been unable to contact Alternative Futures. The company appears to have closed and left no forwarding address. Sutyagin’s defense lawyer, Anna Stavitskaya, believes there could be numerous reasons why the company closed its offices, including fears of having its name involved in a Russian spy case.

Dr. Sutyagin is a civilian researcher with no military clearance. Therefore, he has never had access to any classified materials. He conducted his scientific research using only publicly available material. In the October 1999 search of his home and office, no classified military information was found. In fact, the prosecution is not denying that Dr. Sutyagin did not have access to classified materials. Instead, they are claiming that while analyzing unclassified resources, Dr. Sutyagin was able to deduct secret information. The FSB has openly referred to Dr. Sutyagin’s case as “academic work espionage.”

There has been continued concern that the trial will not meet international standards for fairness. The FSB guards restricted Dr. Sutyagin’s access to his lawyers before the court case began. In addition, the court limited his ability to talk to his lawyers during the trial. His attorneys must formally ask for approval from the presiding judge each time they wish to speak to their client.

The FSB has held Dr. Sutyagin in the Kaluga jail since his arrest in October 1999. Prison conditions are harsh, and Dr. Sutyagin is being held in an extremely overcrowded cell. Dr. Sutyagin’s health has been deteriorating during the 18 months he has spent in prison. The court recently prohibited Dr. Sutyagin’s lawyers from continuing to give him vitamins and medicine.

Sudan

Name:	Nagmeldin, Nagib
Subject:	Doctor Arrested in Sudan
Case Number:	SU0101.Neg
Issues:	Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Freedom of Opinion and Expression; Freedom to Practice One’s Profession
Alert Date:	19 March 2001
Profession:	Medical Doctor

On 11 March 2001, Sudanese security forces detained Dr. Nagib Nagmeldin, Director of the Amal Center for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Torture and Violence in Khartoum. Two of his colleagues from the Amal Center, Mr. Fatih Abdel Rahman and Mrs. Zienab Omer Ahmed, were also arrested and interrogated for several hours. Both Mr. Abdel and Mrs. Omer were not released until close to midnight that evening. Sudanese security forces held Dr. Nagmeldin at their office in Khartoum until 12 March 2001, when he was transferred to the Kober Prison, also in Khartoum. The reason for his arrest is not clear, and he was not formally charged. Amnesty International reported that Dr. Nagmeldin was scheduled to meet with the UN Special Rapporteur for Human Rights, Mr. Gerhard Baum, on 13 March, only two days after his arrest. Dr. Nagmeldin was released on 29 March. He confirmed that he had not been ill-treated in detention.

According to reports received from the El-Nadim Center for the Management & Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence in Cairo, security forces entered the Amal Center and confiscated computers and confidential clients' medical records. As of this writing, none of the medical records have been returned to the Amal Center.

The Amal Center, which was established in November 2000, provides free medical treatment and counseling for victims of human rights abuses and is the first of its kind to be established in Sudan. In addition to his work at the Center, Dr. Nagmeldin is a former secretary of the Sudanese Doctors' Union, a professional organization that the Sudanese government has banned. He has been detained several times since 1989 in response to his political activism. During previous detentions, Dr. Nagmeldin has been tortured in custody.

Human Rights Watch considers Sudan a "gross human rights abuser." In government-controlled areas, there is great repression of freedom of expression and association. Sudanese security forces have waged a campaign of harassment, intimidation, and persecution against human rights defenders. Arbitrary searches and arrests are common. Human rights activists like Dr. Nagmeldin are often subject to protracted arbitrary detention without judicial review. According to Amnesty International, detainees do not have the right to challenge detentions of less than 93 days. In addition, at the discretion of the authorities, the detention period can be renewed for a further three months. In effect, detainees can be held for an indefinite period of time without being charged.

Tunisia

Name: Cherif, Khadija
Subject: Attack Against Sociology Professor in Tunisia
Case Number: TU0102.Che
Issues: Freedom from Harassment and Intimidation; Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom of Association; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Date: 23 March 2001
Profession: Sociology Professor

On 1 March 2001, Professor Khadija Cherif was attacked as she was attempting to attend an informal meeting at the former headquarters of the National Council on Liberties in Tunisia (CNLT in the French acronym). Professor Cherif is a sociology professor at the University of Tunis and President of the Tunisian Association of Democratic Women. A group of men in civilian clothes surrounded Professor Cherif's car. As she attempted to turn her car around, the men reached through the open windows and repeatedly slapped Professor Cherif in the face, and beat her on the neck, head, and breasts while screaming obscenities at her. Eye-witnesses identified her attackers as plainclothes police officers. A photograph taken during the attack appears to identify one of the attackers as the chief of police in the Medina section of Tunis.

Several other individuals were also attacked as they attempted to attend the CNLT meeting, including Professor Abdel Kader Ben Khemis, a professor at the University of Sousse, and Sihem Bensedrine, a prominent journalist and the secretary general of the CNLT. The attackers prevented the meeting from taking place. Professor Cherif and Professor Ben Khemis filed a complaint with the local prosecutor's office, but have not received any response from the officials about their complaint.

On 10 March 2001, Professor Cherif was attacked again on the step of a courthouse in Tunis. She was attending a court hearing to express her solidarity with Mokhtar Tarif. Tarif is the President of the League of Human Rights in Tunisia (LTDH in the French acronym) and was appearing before a judge on charges connected to his human rights work with LTDH. As Professor Cherif was leaving the building, an unidentified man in civilian clothing attacked her, throwing her to the ground and trying to take a dossier that contained the details of the complaint she filed concerning the 1 March 2001 attack. She attempted to resist, but the man succeeded in prying the dossier from her hands and ran away.

Despite Tunisia’s claim of a strong commitment to supporting human rights, the government suppresses dissent and sharply restricts freedom of expression and association. Human rights organizations must register with the government and are closely monitored. They are subject to media blackouts unless their declarations are favorable to the government. Individuals who speak out against the government and its repressive practices are often at risk of harassment, the denial of the right to travel, loss of work, or arrest. Common charges are “defaming the public order” or “spreading false information intended to disturb the public order.”

The attack on Professor Cherif is emblematic of the escalating level of repression against human rights defenders in Tunisia. In the last six months, several other human rights defenders have been subject to physical attack by Tunisian government authorities, including one against Lassad Joughri, a former political prisoner. Mr. Joughri, who uses crutches to walk, was attacked on his way to the CNLT. On 28 February, Naziha Boudhib, a member of the Association of Young Lawyers, was attacked in the street and a file was taken from her possession.

Tunisia

Name: Marzouki, Moncef
Subject: Dr. Marzouki Sentenced, Refusing to Appeal
Case Number: TU9409.Mar
Issues: Freedom of Opinion and Expression; Freedom of Association; Academic and Scientific Freedom; Freedom to Practice One’s Profession
Alert Dates: 9 January 2001, 28 December 2000, 4 August 2000, 26 July 1995, 19 April 1995, 6 April 1994
Profession: Professor of Public Health

Dr. Moncef Marzouki, one of Tunisia’s leading human rights defenders, has been the subject of numerous AAASHRAN alerts since 1994, when the Science and Human Rights Program first took up his case. In August 2000, the Program issued an alert after Dr. Marzouki received a tersely worded letter from the Tunisian Ministry of Health informing him that he had been permanently dismissed from his position as Professor of Public Health at the University of Sousse. He was charged with violating university policy by traveling without permission. Dr. Marzouki received the letter one day after President Zine el Abidine Ben Ali denounced individuals who spoke out against the government abroad as “traitors” and “mercenaries.”

Human Rights Watch, Middle East & North Africa Division, believes that the disproportionate action of permanent dismissal demonstrates the extent to which the government uses Tunisian universities to enforce its repressive policies. It appears that Dr. Marzouki was being punished because he traveled to the United States during the summer of 2000, where he spoke to the press and several human rights organizations, including the Science and Human Rights Program, about continued repression in Tunisia.

In addition, on 30 December 2000, a Tunis criminal court sentenced Dr. Moncef Marzouki to twelve months in jail. Dr. Marzouki was condemned to eight months for maintaining an outlawed organization, the National Council on Liberties (CNLT) and four months for “spreading false information.”

The charges came after Dr. Marzouki circulated a private paper that was critical of Tunisia’s human rights practices during a regional meeting of human rights defenders in Morocco in October 2000. Despite Tunisia’s claim of a strong commitment to supporting human rights, the government suppresses dissent and sharply restricts freedom of expression and association. Human rights organizations must register with the government and are closely monitored. They are subject to media blackouts unless their declarations are favorable to the government. Individuals who speak out against the government and its repressive practices often face personal risk, including harassment, the denial of the right to travel, loss of work, or arrest. Common charges are “defaming the public order” or “spreading false information intended to disturb the public order.”

Dr. Marzouki is the former president of the Tunisian League for Human Rights (1989-1994) and current spokesperson for the CNLT. Throughout the 1990s, Dr. Marzouki was subject to various forms of harassment, including denial of the right to travel. In 1994, after declaring himself the opposition candidate to President Ben Ali, he was arrested for four months. Dr. Marzouki has been followed by the police, his home phone and fax have been repeatedly cut, and his incoming mail arrives opened or not at all. His family has also been subject to frequent harassment, including his brother, who has been jailed three times. Fearing the threats made against the family, Dr. Marzouki’s wife and two daughters moved to Europe.

Dr. Marzouki remains at liberty pending an appeal of the sentence. He announced that he would not seek an appeal. In a written statement, Dr. Marzouki declared:

The political process in Tunisia, since independence, has had only one outcome: condemnation. In a dictatorship, the executive branch only

allows the judicial function to clothe with a veil of legality, political repression or vengeance. That is why, after considerable reflection, I have decided not to appeal the judgment of December 30. It is high time to state clearly the two fundamental problems causing the dysfunction of our judicial system: its manipulation by the executive power and the collusion of some judges who are willing to be simply the instruments of this power.

It appears that international attention to the case has prevented the government from carrying out this sentence, but Dr. Marzouki has been prevented from leaving Tunisia to travel to France where he has obtained a teaching position.

Turkey

Name: Birdal, Akin
Subject: Human Rights Activist Released
Case Number: TU9805.Bir
Issues: Right to Life, Liberty, and Security of Person; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Dates: 26 September 2000, 13 May 1998
Profession: Human rights defender

Prominent human rights activist Akin Birdal, 51, was released from prison on 23 September 2000.

Birdal is the former president of Turkey's Human Rights Association and vice-president of the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues. He was convicted and imprisoned in June 1998 for "inciting people to hatred and enmity on the basis of class, race or regional difference." The charge stemmed from his repeated calls for an end to Turkey's 16-year war against Kurdish rebels and the use of the phrase "the Kurdish people" in speeches he made at public meetings in 1995 and 1996.

Turkish officials have arrested and imprisoned several activists and writers who have written articles or given speeches that the authorities viewed as sympathetic to Kurdish rebels. Turkey does not recognize its 12 million Kurds as a minority and rejected cease-fire announcements by the rebels last year.

In May 1998, two armed men attacked Birdal in his offices, shooting him six times in the chest and legs. Despite his serious injuries, Birdal was imprisoned the following month. Birdal suffered greatly during his imprisonment. While in jail, his health continued to deteriorate. He was released from prison for health reasons in September 1998, but he was re-

imprisoned in March 2000 despite medical reports that his injuries continued to pose a serious risk to his health.

Local activists arranged a “sea of flowers” near the prison as a gesture in support of Akin Birdal’s release and a statement of solidarity with other prisoners of conscience still jailed in Turkey.

Ukraine

Name: Piontkovski, Sergey
Subject: Marine Biologist Leaves Ukraine
Case Number: UK9912.Pio
Issues: Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Academic and Scientific Freedom; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Dates: 12 April 2000, 17 March 2000, 4 November 1999
Profession: Marine Biologist

After an ordeal that lasted five months, Sergey Piontkovski and his family left Ukraine in March 2000 and currently live in the United States. Dr. Piontkovski, formerly a marine biologist at the Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas in Sevastopol, Ukraine, was facing trial on charges of financial improprieties, stemming from grants he received from INTAS, a European organization supporting international scientific cooperation, and from a British government agency. The local prosecutor in Sevastopol dropped all charges and returned Dr. Piontkovski’s passport on 25 February, two weeks after representatives from INTAS traveled to Ukraine to protest the government’s treatment of him.



Sergey Piontkovski

This case attracted widespread international concern and advocacy on Dr. Piontkovski’s behalf. Sergey Piontkovski credits the strong and steady advocacy of the international scientific community, and the worldwide attention it focused on this case, with bringing about the positive outcome.

Vietnam

Name: Ha Si Phu
Subject: Biologist Arrested

Case Number: VI0001.Phu
Issues: Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person; Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention, and Exile; Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Alert Date: 2 June 2000
Profession: Biologist

Ha Si Phu was placed under house arrest on 12 May 2000 with the charge of treason under Article 72 of Vietnam's Criminal Code. Authorities believe that he may be one of the authors of an open appeal for greater democracy in Vietnam. After finding a letter from Ha Si Phu and a copy of a statement calling for greater democracy in Vietnam in the house of another leading dissident, Mai Thai Linh, the police searched Ha Si Phu's house on 28 April 2000 and confiscated his computer, printer and diskettes. On 12 May 2000, the police issued written statements that he was to be placed under house arrest and that he would be tried for treason under Article 72 of the Vietnam Criminal Code, which carries a possible sentence ranging from seven years in prison to the death penalty. A condition of the house arrest was that Ha Si Phu report to police headquarters in Dalat, Lam Dong Province daily. Released from house arrest in January 2001, Ha Si Phu was again placed under house arrest on 8 February 2001. Police reinstated Ha Si Phu's house arrest because they say he made "contact with reactionaries living abroad to sabotage Vietnam," according to the official media.

Ha Si Phu is the pen name of Nguyen Xuan Tu, a biologist who completed his post-graduate work in Czechoslovakia. After completing his degree, he worked at the Vietnam Institute of Science, eventually holding the post of Vice-Director. However, when he refused to join the Communist Party, he was forced out of the Institute.

According to friends, he created a mini-laboratory in his small apartment. As his finances worsened, he turned his scientific knowledge into a small business, growing mushrooms for the market and brewing home-made beer.

Ha Si Phu is a member of a group of intellectual dissidents in Dalat, Vietnam. In 1988, he wrote a document entitled, "Hand In Hand We Go Under the (Direction of) Intelligence" which criticized the communist state of Vietnam. The document was published internationally in 1993. He also wrote several other critiques in the subsequent years, including his most well known, "Farewell to Ideology," in 1995.

Ha Si Phu had been detained once before for speaking out against the government. In 1995, he was charged with "stealing state secrets" for his

possession of a copy of then-Prime Minister Vo Van Kiet's letter to the Vietnamese Communist Party, a letter that was well known in Vietnam and widely published abroad. He was imprisoned without trial from December 1995 to August 1996. He was given a brief, closed-door trial in August 1996, at which he was sentenced to one year in prison. Amnesty International considered him a prisoner of conscience. In response to the international pressure calling for his release, Vietnamese officials released him in December 1996. After his release, he remained under unofficial house arrest with his telephone lines monitored and his house under security surveillance.

Appendix A:

Guidelines for Adoption of Cases of Concern

The Science and Human Rights Program of the AAAS focuses its case action 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 the AAAS is appropriate, scientists are defined as those who are members of any of the disciplines meeting the criteria for affiliation with AAAS. This includes those assisting in scientific initiatives and health care workers.

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

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

4. Scientific groups should not seek any special rights for scientists outside of those general rights embodied in international law.
5. Scientific groups have a special interest in responding to violations involving individual scientists, groups of scientists, or scientific organizations or institutions because we have a special collegial identity with scientists, not because scientists are more deserving than any other group of individuals whose rights might be violated.
6. The role of scientists in society is a priority of AAAS. Scientific groups have a responsibility to speak out against government policies that require scientists to participate in the execution of policies that result in human rights violations or that use science to carry out human rights violations.
7. Groups should support their international counterparts who are vulnerable to governmental restrictions and abuses because they engage in research that may be perceived as having negative political implications.
8. Scientific societies should support individual scientists, groups of scientists, or scientific organizations or institutions in countries where governmental policies may conflict with established professional ethics.
9. Cases of human rights violations frequently occur in conditions of widespread political repression, the elimination of which is likely to be a long-term process. Nevertheless, pressure from public bodies outside the country concerned can be effective in these cases (for example, in securing the release of a political prisoner, helping to protect the safety of someone whose life has been threatened, or ensuring respect for scientific freedom and responsibility).

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

The Program adopts individual cases on the basis of information provided by authoritative international human rights organizations and, where suitably documented, by human rights groups or scientific associations in the country concerned. The goal is to deal with all cases meeting AAAS criteria as soon as possible after the particular violation has occurred. The

Program also attempts to keep old cases under review, and to periodically renew complaints or inquiries until a satisfactory resolution is achieved.

Sources of Information

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

- American Chemical Society Human Rights Committee
- American Political Science Association
- American Physical Society Committee on International Freedom of Scientists
- American Sociological Association
- Amnesty International
- Association of European Universities
- Bellona Foundation
- B'Tselem
- Burma Information Group
- Campaign for Human Rights in Tunisia
- The Committee to Protect Journalists
- Cuba Press
- Democratic Movement in China
- Derechos Human Rights
- Digital Freedom Network
- Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
- El-Nadim Center for the Management & Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence
- Ethiopian Democratic Action League
- Falun Gong Info Center
- Free Burma Coalition
- Free Vietnam Alliance
- Global Health Council
- Guatemala Human Rights Commission
- Human Rights Foundation of Turkey
- Human Rights in China
- Human Rights Watch
- Human Rights Watch, Academic Freedom Program
- Human Rights Watch Middle East & North Africa Division
- Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies
- Information Center for Human Rights

The International Federation of Health and Human Rights Organizations
International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX)
International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights
International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims
LAW - The Palestinian Society for the Protection of Human Rights and the Environment
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights
League of Human Rights in Tunisia
National Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Rights
National Council on Liberties in Tunisia
National Security Archive
Network of Concerned Historians
Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders
Palestinian Human Rights Monitoring Group
Physicians for Human Rights-Israel
Physicians for Human Rights-United States
United Ethiopian Civic Organizations
World Organisation Against Torture (WOAT)

Supporting information came from news and articles published in major US newspapers and journals; information supplied by individual scientists, family members, and friends; scientific societies; US embassies; and the US Department of State.

Appendix B:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

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

Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, therefore, The General Assembly,

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect

for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1

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

Article 2

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

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

Article 3

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

Article 4

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

Article 5

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

Article 6

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

Article 7

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

Article 8

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

Article 9

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

Article 10

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

Article 11

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

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

Article 12

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

Article 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.

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

Article 16

1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

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

Article 19

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

Article 20

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

Article 21

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

Article 22

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

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human

dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social 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.