

tration had requested \$20.7 million and \$7 million respectively for those programmes, thus Congress has decreed that an extra \$4.3 million must be found for them. But, at the same time, the final version of the appropriations bill has reduced the total request for RANN from \$80 million to \$72 million, which is only \$2 million more than it received last year. Again, the upshot is that RANN programmes unprotected by minimum spending levels must suffer a reduction of \$12.3 million.

The authorisations bill has already been completely agreed to by Congress and signed into law, thus it cannot be altered. As for the appropriations bill, it is highly unlikely that it can be altered at this stage. Although the bill has not yet finally cleared Congress, the figures for the NSF have been agreed to by both the Senate and the House and they will not be reopened to debate.

One remedy, of course, would be for the Administration to do exactly what it has in the past—ignore its Congressional mandate by impounding the extra funds voted for the education programmes and spread the \$13 million reduction as it sees fit. But the Administration is already facing some 50 court challenges of its power to impound funds which have been appropriated by Congress in the normal way, and it would be skating on very thin legal ice if it attempts to withhold money to which Congress has attached a minimum spending requirement.

SOVIET UNION

Support for Dissent

by our Washington Correspondent
SOVIET physicist Andrei D. Sakharov and other dissident intellectuals in the USSR received their first official support from the United States Congress last week. A resolution, roundly condemning the "campaign of the Soviet government to intimidate those who have spoken out against repression of political and intellectual dissent", was attached to the State Department Appropriations Bill and passed by the Senate without opposition. Although it expresses only the Senate's concern about the matter and is not binding on the Administration, the resolution also calls on President Nixon to "use the medium of current negotiations with the Soviet Union, as well as informal contacts with Soviet officials, in an effort to secure an end to repression of dissent".

Sponsored by Senator Walter F. Mondale, a liberal Democrat from Minnesota, the resolution provides fair indication of the outlook for other, more hard hitting, measures designed to force internal change within the Soviet Union that are looming on the legislative horizon in the United States. Those measures, if enacted, could cast a cloud

over the growing detente between the United States and the USSR, a significant part of which is the wide range of scientific and technical agreements recently negotiated.

The most prominent of such measures is the so-called Jackson Amendment to the Trade Bill, which is an attempt to use the Soviet government's desire for expanded trade with the United States to force it to liberalise its attitude toward dissenters and to allow Jews and others the freedom to emigrate. The amendment, sponsored by Senator Henry M. Jackson in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives by Wilbur D. Mills, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and by Charles Vanik, would prevent the administration from relaxing tariff barriers and extending credit to the Soviet Union until the Soviet government grants its citizens freedom to emigrate.

The outlook for the amendment in the House is difficult to predict, but it seems clear that some such restrictive measure will be attached to the Trade Bill. The Jackson Amendment has already gathered 77 co-sponsors in the Senate, and with the lack of opposition to Mondale's resolution, it would be surprising if it did not pass easily. Attention at present is focussed on the House Ways and Means Committee, which has the bill under consideration—it is a legislative quirk that all trade bills must be passed by the House before they can be taken up by the Senate—and the committee is under pressure from an odd assortment of bed-fellows.

Arguing in favour of the Jackson Amendment is a coalition of liberals, conservatives and Jews, while the Administration and large corporations are taking the line that the United States has no right to interfere in the internal politics of the countries with which it trades. But one of the most prominent supporters of the Jackson Amendment is Sakharov himself. He wrote an open letter to the United States Congress on September 14, which has subsequently appeared as a full-page advertisement in several prominent United States newspapers, in which he argued that the amendment "is made even more significant by the fact that the World is only just entering on a new course of detente and it is therefore essential that the proper direction be followed at the outset. This is a fundamental issue, extending far beyond the question of emigration". Sakharov's letter ended with a plea that the United States Congress "will realize its historical responsibility before mankind and will find the strength to rise above temporary partisan considerations of commercialism and prestige".

Three chief scenarios are being discussed. The first is that the Jackson

Amendment will be passed by both the House and the Senate. The second is passage of a less restrictive amendment, which would allow liberalization of trading regulations with the Soviet Union if there is reasonable progress in the USSR toward free emigration. And the third is that the provisions relating to tariff barriers with the USSR will be dropped entirely from the House version of the Trade Bill, that the Jackson Amendment will be passed by the Senate, and a compromise will be worked out in a conference committee. At present, however, it seems that straight passage of the amendment is the most likely alternative.

What effect is all this having on scientific relations between the two countries? Earlier this month, the National Academy of Sciences sent a warning to Soviet officials that further harassment of Sakharov will jeopardize the scientific agreements between the two countries, and last week two other scientific organisations issued statements on the matter. The first, drawn up by the Committee of Concerned Scientists, signed by 23 prominent United States scientists and delivered to Dr Keldysh, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences by Dr Edward Stern of Washington University, warns that "it will become increasingly more difficult to continue scientific and technological cooperation with the Soviet Union as long as the Soviet authorities persist in their present repressive policies".

The other statement was put out by the Federation of American Scientists, an intellectually powerful lobbying organisation which has persistently argued for arms control. The FAS statement calls on United States scientists to work for liberalisation of the internal policies of the USSR, arguing that the present military accord between the United States and the USSR is only a "temporary and fragile" solution to the arms race, which is too easily reversible in the absence of internal criticism.

But as far as implementation of the joint scientific and technical agreements is concerned, the State Department's office of international scientific affairs has so far received no letters or telegrams protesting about the agreements, and has not yet encountered any lack of enthusiasm for implementing them. Moreover, there seems to be no reaction—either direct or indirect—from Soviet officials to the NAS protest, and arrangements are proceeding without hindrance for the second meeting of the international Joint Commission which is set to meet in Moscow in November. But one State Department official acknowledged last week that the possible effect of the Jackson amendment on the scientific and technological accords is difficult to predict.