

Human Issues in Human Rights

The experience of the Committee on Human Rights of the National Academy of Sciences.

Robert W. Kates

To be active in defense of human rights is to confront human issues both disturbing and difficult. For almost 2 years a committee of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has sought to develop a sustained program of human rights activity appropriate to its membership and its tradition of concern for the rights of scientific workers.

The Academy Committee

The Committee on Human Rights was chartered by the council of the academy and is composed of seven members of the academy and three liaison members from the National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine (1). Ex-

undertaken of the fate of scientific workers in different areas.

When a case of severe repression has been identified, we begin a further process of inquiry that always involves consultations with a responsible spokesperson of the country where our colleague resides or is imprisoned and, where possible, with members of human rights organizations and scientific institutions, with a representative of the U.S. embassy in the country involved, and with the victim's family and friends. A great deal of care goes into these inquiries as we try to maintain the same standards of evidence, balance, and open-mindedness that characterize academy assessments on scientific matters.

When a clear-cut case has been devel-

Summary. The National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Human Rights and its 350 correspondent academy members seeks to ease the plight of individual scientists, engineers, and medical personnel suffering severe repression. It has engaged in a program of private inquiry, public remonstrance, and moral support in behalf of individuals from 11 countries. In developing this activity, members of the committee had to engage in a series of troubling issues related to the nature of human rights, the choice of cases, and the format of protest. But most troubling of all are the issues raised by the profound distortions of humanness, nationhood, and science that follow in the wake of repression.

ceptional support is given to it by the staff of the Commission on International Relations (2). The committee received financial support from the academy's endowment funds.

Our activity focuses on the plight of individual scientists, engineers, and medical personnel suffering severe repression. Such cases may originate in the files of Amnesty International, with the initiative of a member of the academy, in a letter from a victim's friend or family, or in the informal reviews that we have

opened—clear-cut in the sense that there is a strong basis to assume that an individual is, indeed, undergoing severe repression—we formulate a series of requests appropriate to the case and prepare a public statement. The statement and the requests are reviewed by the academy's 12 elected councillors; when approved, sometimes after revision, they are made public. Once this is done, our committee tries to undertake a sustained effort in behalf of the aggrieved individual, combining public remonstrance with appeals to the concerned government, their national academy if such exists, or other scientific institutions, and providing moral support to the individual and his or her family.

A major feature of the committee's effort is our correspondent network of some 350 members of the academy who have volunteered to receive communications from the committee and to act upon them. Thus, the efforts of the committee are amplified as correspondents write or cable governmental representatives, offer support to families, and call attention to the plight of individuals within their professional societies, at their workplace, or through their international contacts.

Currently, inquiries and other efforts are being directed in behalf of individuals in 11 countries, and public statements have been issued in behalf of 18 individuals: Federico Alvarez-Rojas, Claudio Santiago Bermann, Gabriela Carabelli, Juan Carlos Gallardo, Antonio Misetich, Eduardo Pasquini, and Elena Sevilla of Argentina; Vladimir Lastuvka and Ales Machacek of Czechoslovakia; José Luis Massera of Uruguay; Sergei A. Kovalev, Yuriy F. Orlov, and Antoliy B. Shchanskii of the U.S.S.R.; T. W. Kamil, I. Made Sutayasa, Bursono Wiwoho, and Kamaluddin Singih of Indonesia; and Ibrahima Ly of Mali.

The last five cases, which we have just formally adopted, can demonstrate some of the committee's process. The Indonesian scientists have each been held incommunicado from immediate families and relatives for long periods of time. They are representative of a much larger number of Indonesians (3) who also are being held, often without trial, without access to legal counsel, and without other opportunity to have their arrest and detention clarified or adjudicated.

T. W. Kamil, about 50 years old, is one of Indonesia's leading linguistic scholars from the University of Jakarta; he studied at the University of Michigan. He was arrested on 30 October 1965 and has been detained since that time. He is reported to be held at Nusakambangan prison.

I. Made Sutayasa, believed to be about 36 years old, was an archeologist employed at the National Research Center of Archeology until 1975 when he was arrested in Jakarta upon his return from a conference of archeologists in Australia. He has not been formally charged or tried; it is believed he is being held on the island of Bali. He is married and has four children and may have been a member of the Indonesian Communist Party before it was banned.

Bursono Wiwoho, about 55 years old, was professor of educational psychology at Gadjah Mada University in Jogjakarta, Java. Professor Wiwoho had been a member of the National Planning

The author is University Professor and Professor of Geography at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610. This article is adapted from a paper presented on 17 February 1978 at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, D.C.

Board under the Sukarno government and at the time of his arrest in late 1965 was chairman of the Indonesian Association of Scientists. He is reported to be either in Jogjakarta prison or detained on Buru Island, the location of a permanent resettlement camp for untried political prisoners. He participated in the nationalist movement to gain independence from the Dutch, after which he studied in Prague from 1951 to 1954 where he earned a degree in psychology. He later headed the psychology department of Gadjah Mada University in Jogjakarta and was a founder of the Indonesian Scholars Association. He is reported to be in poor health.

Kamaluddin Singgih, age 47 years, was teaching in the department of mechanical engineering at the Technological Institute in Bandung when detained January 1966. Later that same year he was released to assist in flood control projects—only to be taken into custody again in January 1967. Originally imprisoned in Salmba prison in Jakarta, he is now on Buru Island. Singgih studied physics and engineering at Stuttgart between 1960 and 1965 and was reputed to be sympathetic to the Communist Party.

Our information concerning these Indonesian colleagues is thinner than for most of our cases. Three of them have been in detention for upwards of 12 years and their very isolation makes it difficult to obtain current information about them. Thus we have quietly and privately sought—so far without success—to obtain clarification as to their status from the government of Indonesia.

We know somewhat more about Ibrahim Ly, a Ph.D. in mathematics from Moscow State University and, until his arrest and imprisonment, a mathematics teacher at the École Normale Supérieure in Bamako, Mali. He was arrested in June 1976 along with 14 other persons who were accused of writing a political tract that urged Malians to vote “no” in a referendum called by the Malian government to approve a new constitution. He was subsequently brought to trial in April 1975 under charges of subversion against the government, found guilty, and sentenced to 4 years of imprisonment.

Our list of concerns does not always get longer. The scientific community can share in the satisfaction that Juan Carlos Gallardo of Argentina has been released and is again working in physics in the United States and that Elena Sevilla should follow shortly. And among those cases that were resolved during the course of our inquiries, we note that:

- Ismail Mohammed, who spoke out against segregationist policies in South Africa and was detained there in September 1976 and fired from his university post, is now practicing mathematics again at another university.

- Grigoriy Chudnovskiy, a gifted young Soviet mathematician, was permitted to leave the U.S.S.R. with his brother, David, who is also a mathematician, and his elderly parents; he is currently in the United States receiving treatment for myasthenia gravis.

- Taysir al Arouri, a Palestinian physicist, who was detained for 2 years without charge or trial by the Israeli government, has been released; it is hoped that he will return to his position at Bir Zeit University, teaching physics and mathematics.

- Professor “X,” an African mathematician, fearful of his life if he returns to his country, has had his visa extended to remain in the United States.

In all of these cases, our inquiries were some of many such efforts and remonstrances from scientific societies and individual scientists. We can all share in the satisfaction of their resolution.

But these are still the exceptions. Four Argentinian physicists (Alvarez-Rojas, Carabelli, Misetich, and Pasquini) are simply reported as “not registered” by the Argentinian government. Massera enters his third year in prison in Uruguay despite his willingness to leave the country and take up an offer of a post in Italy. Kovalev enters his fourth year in prison despite offers from Stanford and Cornell for visiting posts. In Czechoslovakia, the appeal by Machacek has been rejected and Lastuvka’s sentence has been reduced by 1 year by the Czechoslovakian Supreme Court. They still remain as the first imprisoned victims of the Charter 77 movement, a Czechoslovakian effort to monitor human rights. Orlov and Shcharanskiy have been summarily tried and found guilty in the U.S.S.R.

As we sought to develop our program in our initial year of activity, we faced three major issues:

Whose human rights?

Which human rights?

How do we act for human rights?

Whose Human Rights?

The issue of whose human rights we were concerned with touches on the essence of a basic question that we had to consider: “Are scientists special?” After some months of discussion and reading, the consensus of our committee was negative.

Scientists are not special, neither as victims nor as torturers do we deserve to be singled out. It is true, as the Ziman report (4) states, that science as an activity has certain characteristics—a reverence for truth that leads its practitioners to query and dissent, a process of verification that requires open dissemination and communication, a universality of discourse and goals whose common language and pursuits go beyond national borders—that may be readily seen as threatening to authoritarian regimes or even in conflict with nation-building goals. But the Sierra Chica prison in Argentina is filled not with scientists but with young workers and students. As Philip Handler put it in an interview in *BioScience* (5):

... tortured shoemakers hurt quite as hard as tortured scientists. Protesting only for scientists doesn’t quite fit with my own beliefs about all of this. Scientists happen to be a little bit more visible. The world knows about them. The shoemakers are taken off behind the barn and shot.

If we scientists are not special, though, why limit our human rights activities to our own—to scientists, engineers, and health personnel? Our answer is simply: they are our own. We hope that other groups—trade unions, bar associations, women’s groups, and shoemakers everywhere are equally or more active. But we will surely be more effective in identifying victims, in documenting their cases, and in supporting them, if we can appeal to that special quality of collegiality that we share and if we can use for such appeals the established avenues of scientific communication. In so doing, however, we know that in many, if not most cases, the nameless victims of repression have few if any scientists among them, and in some cases, scientists serve with the repressors.

Having chosen to limit our efforts to “our own” we were still left with some issues of definition: how far do we extend the concept of scientist and at what point in a career does an individual become a scientific colleague? Our answer, in keeping with the universality of science, was to seek a similar universality of outreach: not merely to the well-known and well-connected, not only to the ideologically similar, but to all victims in science, engineering, and medicine wherever they may be.

It is understandable that our academy officers have taken the strongest possible position in defense of Sakharov, a foreign associate of the academy; that as academicians who are well known and well connected we know and thus respond to the victims from our own ranks;

or even that some of us more readily respond to victims of our own personal ideological persuasion. But it cannot be, and it is not, the position of our committee to limit our efforts to such cases.

Thus we have spent a considerable portion of our collective energy on trying to extend our knowledge of the plight of individuals in the less-known areas of the world and to examine the situation in our own and other countries of similar ideological persuasion. We have done so even at the cost of limiting our efforts in behalf of better-known cases, often to the pique and annoyance of our own members and colleagues.

We are, of course, limited in just how well we extend ourselves. In many parts of the world, science is poorly developed and so are our contacts with those areas. And we surely miss or rationalize away some of the travesties of human rights in our own midst. But it is not for want of trying.

Which Human Rights?

In considering the second issue—Which human rights?—I urge a reading of the Ziman report (4). It makes one basic point and makes it well. Beginning in 1945 and up to the present, a major international shift took place in human rights activity. Human rights today are not merely moral rights, they are international legal rights. An internationally accepted code of human rights—economics, social, political, and religious—has been developed. Most nations have not ratified that code, fewer nations implement those rights, and in only one case, the Council of Europe, does an effective international appeals court exist (6). But almost all nations give lip service to it, and many nations have signed treaties that accept at least a portion of the evolved code. There is an international standard for human rights.

Using this standard is extremely helpful to us in our selection process. We do not have to sit in judgment of our colleagues now more than 12 years in Indonesian prison camps or 13 months in Lefertovo prison. When the Israeli government says that Taysir al Arouri “incited terrorist activities” or Uruguayan officials say that Massera was found guilty of “subversive association” (7) we do not need to make judgments that are clearly beyond our knowledge. It is sufficient to know that Al Arouri has been detained without being tried or charged under so-called Jordanian Administra-

tive Law (which is really the relic of the British Mandate Law and which ironically was used to imprison many pre-independence Israeli patriots). And to know that Massera probably has been tortured and has certainly suffered physical impairment, even though Uruguay has an established tradition of allowing opponents exile and there is a post in Italy for him and his wife (who is also imprisoned).

Thus we draft our requests—an end to torture, rights to trial, to representation, to visitation, to courtroom observers, to receive and send scientific literature, to exile (as opposed to continued detention), to humanitarian release (in case of hardship), and to extension of existing amnesty. All of these are rights implicit in the international code.

In requesting compliance with the international code, we need not underestimate the threats that nations perceive from dissidents: we live in a world where terrorism is a reality and not limited to national liberation or the overthrow of tyranny, where subversion and dissent may threaten all but the strongest and oldest of societies. Nonetheless, the prisons of the world would empty of prisoners of conscience if countries would adhere to the minimal rights of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and its successor documents.

If we take international rights seriously and try to use them effectively to refute the charge of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, we cannot choose them selectively. We Americans have an ideological bent that selectively equates human rights with certain civil and political rights, ignoring many other rights embodied in those covenants. Those who would dispute our right to speak out raise this issue repeatedly with us. Here are three examples. A member of an American scientific society who was born in Argentina, writes an open letter to the society's president condemning his action to protest the repression of Argentinian colleagues:

You [the President] have called attention to nefarious practices in Argentina. Well, I must tell you that the average citizen there has more freedom in some aspects than we have here. Have you heard . . . that hundreds of thousands of elderly people, and some not so elderly, in certain areas of the United States are locking themselves up and starving because of the fear of street violence. Our American cities are filled with men and women like the elderly couple in New York who committed double suicide recently for fear of going out and being mugged again. Have you . . . written letters to President Carter about this shameful problem . . . [a] problem unknown in Argentina? (8).

The Iranian representative to the World Bank writes:

In spite of some 30 years of debate over this complex issue in the United Nations, American and Western libertarian philosophy still regards “human rights” in a very narrow context: as essentially political, universal and timeless.

But as far as the third world is concerned, they are largely one-sided, passive and abstract. They reflect political rights for the redress of grievances, personal immunity for unlawful or unnecessary search and seizure, habeas corpus privileges, due process of law for incarceration or imposition of fines, the absence of cruel and inhuman punishment, and a host of other individual freedoms of action.

But they are silent about the society's obligation toward the individual; they say little about the right to employment, the right to obtain a meaningful education, the right to enjoy a minimum of life's amenities. These “active” and “positive” sides (that is, society's obligations) are either ignored or considered as secondary in the roster of Western “human rights” (9).

A Soviet legal expert echoes these sentiments:

When they discuss human rights, many Western ideologists emphasize not socioeconomic problems but the freedom of the individual. Without question [these are] an essential element of democracy.

All these are not enough, however, in our view. We believe that society must also guarantee the individual the right to education, to work, and to material security. . . . There are now 17 million unemployed in the industrialized capitalist countries . . . we have no unemployment [in the USSR] since the beginning of the thirties (10).

I have the impression that many human rights activists respond to these concerns as if they were red herrings to be ignored or a rationalization for repression and not to be credited with serious attention. In my opinion, this would be in error. To justify a sentence for Kovaliev or Orlov by the fact that we tolerate a high unemployment rate in the United States or to excuse the thousands of kidnappings in Argentina on the basis of the muggings that occur in the United States would clearly be nonsense. But to ignore the substance of these challenges would be a serious mistake.

The international codification of human rights provides for economic and social rights as well as political rights. To use one of the examples cited: it is indeed shameful that in the richest nation on earth 6 to 7 percent of the work force is almost always out of work, and 30 to 40 percent of black youth seem permanently unemployed. Our most rational goals for unemployment range from 4 to 6 percent; in contrast, not only in socialist countries, but in many Western

European countries, a 1 percent rate is considered a national calamity.

Let us welcome a genuine dialogue. As we point out to our Soviet colleagues that their remarkable employment record is not enhanced by denying dissidents the right to work, let us also consider ways in which we in science and technology may work to enhance the right of all to work, to have security in our cities, and to meet basic human needs.

There is another view as to which human rights can be asserted. It is the view of Sir Andrew Huxley and other British scientists within the Royal Society. He distinguishes between defense of the political rights of dissident scientists and the defense of scientific rights in the face of intrusion of the state. He notes:

The persecutions of the present day are not directed against scientific doctrines or against scientific enquiry as such; they are directed against individual citizens who have had the courage to speak up against oppressive features of the regimes under which they live. Among these brave individuals there are, for example, writers and medical men as well as scientists. The appropriate reaction therefore comes from us not as scientists but as citizens; if we wish to join in some corporate protest, it should be through one whose prime concern is with science. If a scientific body publicly takes a step whose justification is political and not scientific, it will lose the right to claim that it is acting purely in the defense of science on some future occasion when it wishes to speak out against, say, a repetition of the Lysenko affair (11).

In choosing the clear-cut case of Lysenko and the role of some political dissidents, Sir Andrew has the advantage of posing the extreme cases to support his opinion. Unfortunately, we find it more difficult to grapple with the continuum of repression, to determine just what is scientific and what is political. To cite just two examples:

- Some Argentine scientists appear to have been denounced, killed, or imprisoned because they differed on scientific policy with the military or were actively reformist in the governance of their institute or university.

- Many Soviet scientists who are clearly political dissidents are punished by manipulating the institutions and even the literature of science: they are denied work, advancement, and degrees, and their works are even excised from the literature. Pressure is brought on their colleagues to acquiesce to or carry out these acts.

Drawing lines in science and human rights is difficult. We presume little righteousness in the way we have drawn ours, but we fail to see the incongruity of

a scientific society concerning itself with the human condition of fellow scientists as well as with their scientific doctrine.

How Do We Act for Human Rights?

Having chosen to speak to the internationally agreed-upon human rights of individual scientists, the issue of method still remains. How do we act in behalf of those rights?

Our major effort has been to develop an approach that matches patience with persistence. Our committee began work a year prior to President Carter's initiatives, and the academy's human rights activities date back to 1956. But we are sufficiently wise, or cynical, to note how cyclic and fluctuating public and government interest in current issues seem to be. Ours is a nation given to hyperbole; we fear that the crusade for human rights may go the way of the "great society" or the "war against poverty." It is irresponsible for members of human rights groups to raise the hopes of victims for redress and then turn to some other seemingly more current or pressing issue. Thus we have tried to develop a capability for patient, sustained, and persistent inquiry and support.

At the same time we have had to face (and continue to face) various tactical issues. From time to time we have been pressed by academy members and friends toward quite differing views. One member stated his dilemma as follows:

I applaud Carter's statements on human rights as an aspect of national policy. Will a letter from a lowly academic and civil servant, even though a member of NAS, really add anything to Carter's forceful statements and the NAS Committee declaration? Whatever it does, will it also be at the cost of the cordial working relations, indeed friendships, that I have managed to open up over the last decade with a number of Soviet scientists not to mention the matter of field access? Or worse, will it get my Soviet friends in trouble? It is easy to be for human rights when you're not personally threatened by their loss (8).

After much thought, this member did write one of the most moving letters I have encountered, expressing to Soviet authorities that it was the very respect and affection he had for their country and for his scientific colleagues that impelled him to appeal in behalf of an imprisoned colleague.

A very different view is expressed by a participant in the exchange program organized by the academy:

Our experience at a meeting in the USSR shows that generalized protest is almost useless, but specific threats and promises can accomplish a lot.

My protest is against the Academy's decision to exert no actual pressure on the Soviets. Therefore since the Academy is useless on this issue, individuals and groups of American scientists have to protest against the Academy as well as against Soviet behavior (8).

In response to this and similar concerns, our position continues to be to hold to the universality principle, to not restrict the channels of scientific communication in the name of trying to maintain and extend them. This is our institutional position and it is my own. But it is not necessarily the position of all individual scientists. Scientific communication is in the last analysis a voluntary act, like so much we do. Increasingly, more and more scientists may withhold their participation in exchanges with individuals or groups they feel are unresponsive or even complicit in repressing colleagues. This has clearly been the response in the wake of the Orlov conviction in the U.S.S.R. His heavy sentence, closed trial, and the apparent treatment of his family and friends dismayed much of the scientific community. Individuals and groups, many with deep personal commitment to scientific exchange with the Soviet Union, canceled or delayed their planned trips, seminars, and meetings.

The Distortions of Humanity, Nations, and Science

How we allow the pain of the victim and the cacophony of protest to enter the quiet and generally well-mannered house of international science is a question that will persist and recur. But lurking in the nether darkness of questions asked but not answered are the most troubling of all issues, those raised by the profound distortions of humanness, nationhood, and science that follow in the wake of repression.

Torture is widespread. According to Amnesty International it occurs in some 60 nations. It is not limited to the Idi Amins or to the secret police of the world.

Our own country was accused by responsible observers of countenancing the use of torture and serious violations of human rights in South Vietnam and of permitting the teaching of highly questionable interrogation techniques in countries receiving assistance in the training of domestic police. Because of the European Covenant on Human Rights, Britain has compensated victims of inhuman and degrading techniques used in Northern Ireland.

It is not clear how much technical skill is needed to employ the electric shock apparatus used in basement cells. And one cannot imagine the professional standards of the doctors who patch up the victims in silence or of the psychiatrists who prescribe "treatment" for the dissidents they label insane. But surely they demonstrate that our scientific ethic is not universal and that it fails us now, as it did when horrors were perpetrated in scientifically run concentration camps.

For scientists to be active in defense of human rights is to learn and relearn what Rabelais knew in 1532: "Science without conscience spells but destruction of the spirit" (12).

References and Notes

1. Christian Anfinsen, Lipman Bers, Clifford Geertz, Franklin Long, John Ross, and Berta V. Scharrer serve with me from the academy. Daniel Drucker and William Slichter are the liaison members of the National Academy of Engineering, and Adam Yarmolinsky is the liaison member for the Institute of Medicine.
2. Murray Todd serves as Executive Secretary, assisted by Jay Davenport, Sandra Erb, and Gerson Sher.
3. Estimated by the Indonesian government to number 29,000, of whom 10,000 were to be released in December 1977 and the remainder by the end of 1978. These estimates are contested by Amnesty International and some Indonesian human rights releases and purported leaders who place the number in excess of 50,000.
4. Our most valuable reading was the report of a committee chaired by J. Ziman: The Council for Science and Society in collaboration with the British Institute of Human Rights, *Scholarly Freedom and Human Rights* (Rose, London, 1977).
5. E. M. Leeper, interview with Philip Handler, "Academy shifts emphases to keep up with the times," *BioScience* 27, 244 (April 1977).

6. For a less optimistic view and excellent review of the status of implementing these rights, see William Korey, "U.N. human rights: Illusion and reality," *Freedom at Issue* 42, 27 (September-October 1977).
7. Communications to the Committee on Human Rights (1977).
8. Communication to the Committee on Human Rights, paraphrased slightly to preserve anonymity (1977).
9. Jahangir Amuzegar, "Rights and wrongs," *New York Times* (29 January 1978), section IV, p. 17.
10. Interview with Vladimir Kudryavtsev, "Human rights: How they are understood in the U.S.S.R.," *Soviet Life* (July 1977).
11. Excerpt from an address by Andrew Huxley to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, August 1977. Reprinted in *Chemical and Engineering News* (26 September 1977), p. 5.
12. François Rabelais, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, book II, chapter 8 (1532) (Heritage Press, New York, 1942).
13. I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of M. Berberian, C. Gediman, E. Grohman, and the staff and members of the Committee on Human Rights in the preparation of this article.

NEWS AND COMMENT

Andrus in Alaska: A Tour of the Wild Estate

Anchorage, Alaska. The scenery and wildlife spectacles afforded by Alaska, the "Great Land," are impressive and varied enough to evoke a strong response from many who come here. Indeed, Representative John Seiberling of Ohio, a key supporter of the Alaska lands legislation now pending in Congress, has returned from each of his

several trips to Alaska enthralled. "Alaska," Seiberling has said, "is Yosemite, the Grand Tetons, Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, Glacier National Park, and the Serengeti Plains all rolled into one."

This state recently received another important Washington visitor who is also enormously impressed by Alaska. It was

Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus, who is leading the Carter Administration's efforts to have Congress complete action this year on the Alaska lands bill and thereby have nearly 40 percent of Alaska's vast land area of 375 million acres assured special protected status as part of the "four systems"—that is, the four national systems of parks, wildlife refuges, forests, and wild and scenic rivers.

The bill was approved by the House of Representatives in May by the overwhelming margin of 277 to 31. Now, however, the measure faces substantial opposition in the Senate. The hard-rock mining and oil and gas industries object to the fact that substantial resources would indisputably be put off limits to exploration and development (*Science*, 4 November 1977). In the industry view, the nation can ill afford to "lock up" resources which, it is argued, will surely be needed in the future to stave off critical shortages.

Moreover, most nonnative Alaskans and their elected officials are opposing the bill as it is now written. Alaskans typically are holding the flag of state's rights high and demanding that much the greater part of the public lands be open to a variety of uses and largely unrestricted access. More specifically, the two Alaska senators, Mike Gravel and Ted Stevens, Democrat and Republican, respectively, want the acreages that would go into the conservation systems to be much smaller than what the Administration has proposed; they also want provision to be liberally made for well-defined transportation and utility corridors. In addition, the senators hope to see a program of joint federal-state land management established for regions

