

Sorenson's \$50,000 annual travel allowance is also being halved. A memo prepared by a lawyer for the center indicates that the "restructuring" of the film center is a way for the Smithsonian to divert more money into the Museum of Man, which Congress has refused to fund.

Matthew Huxley, secretary to the film center's national advisory council, calls the development a "total disaster" which will make it impossible to film many Third World cultures before they are engulfed by modern civilization. He blames the problem on "short-sightedness" of Smithsonian management and intramural jealousies as well as a certain lack of political finesse on the part of Sorenson, who prefers being out in the field to staying home and building up his constituency. Huxley adds "if we can't get Smithsonian support we're going to have a hell of a time trying to raise money" for filming.

Despite the unhappiness at the center, Smithsonian Under secretary Phillip S. Hughes, the principal figure in pushing the reorganization, says most people favor the new arrangement. He told *Science* there has been an imbalance between filming and archival activity and more resources need to be put in the archival side, which includes locating and preserving old films. He believes the current filming activities will not be adversely affected and says that Sorenson has expressed confidence that he will be able to supplement his budget with increased private donations. Sorenson, off on an 8-month filming project in India, was unavailable for comment.—**Constance Holden**

NSF Finally Gets a Budget for FY 1982

On 10 December, the House of Representatives agreed to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment number 4 of the appropriations bill for the National Science Foundation (NSF). So, after months of uncertainty, NSF's budget for fiscal year (FY) 1982—it began 3 months ago—finally cleared the Congress. But even at this stage, about all that can be said with certainty is that

NSF's budget has been cut, though not by as much as the Reagan Administration wanted.

The bill provides about \$1.03 billion for NSF, which is virtually the same as the foundation spent in FY 1981. But, under the threat of a presidential veto, Congress agreed to let the Administration cut up to 4 percent from the total, and it permitted the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to decide within certain limits, where to apply the knife. This, in effect, means that NSF will end up with about \$994 million, a considerable reduction from last year's level after inflation is factored in. Reagan, however, had requested a budget of only \$909 million.

Congress refused to go along with the Reagan Administration's proposal to phase out NSF's science education activities, but it did prune them severely. The bill contains \$21 million for science education, a drop of \$50 million from last year's total. Most of what is left will be taken up by NSF's fellowship programs.

NSF officials are now negotiating with OMB over how the 4 percent reduction will be applied, and they expect the final totals for each program will be settled by early January.—**Colin Norman**

American Scientists Protest Polish Actions

American scientific organizations have reacted to arrests of Polish scientists and scholars by registering formal protests with Polish authorities and seeking information on the welfare of persons reported detained.

Details of the number of arrests and the identities of those held has been unobtainable in this country. However, reports through unofficial channels from Poland indicate that hundreds of Polish citizens have been taken into custody since martial law was imposed and that a number of scientists and scholars are included.

It is known that on 14 December Polish police and military entered the building of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw and arrested members of the academy staff. The assumption here is that authorities sought persons active in Solidarity,

the independent national union, or those known to be politically active.

In a message directed to his counterpart in the Polish academy, U.S. National Academy of Sciences President Frank Press alluded to actions against "fellow workers at the Polish Academy in Warsaw," and said "as president of the National Academy of Sciences, I wish to express on behalf of myself, on behalf of this institution, and on behalf of the American academic community whom we serve and represent, our collective horror at the flagrant violation of the human rights of our colleagues in Poland, and our sincere desire to see these wrongs redressed."

Similar messages were sent in behalf of the AAAS and Federation of American Scientists. On 23 December AAAS staff members presented a letter to Polish embassy officials in Washington which included the names of nine Polish scholars reported to be in custody. The list was obtained through the offices of NAS and is thought to be reliable. Included on the list were the names of B. Geremek, who is a historian at Warsaw University and is known as leader of a faction of Solidarity, and E. Lipinski, 93, a retired economist. Lipinski was a founding member of the Committee for Social Self Defense (KOR), an active human rights group formed in 1976, and had recently been outspoken in his criticism of the Polish regime. There have been reports of detainees being held in conditions of severe physical hardship.

The AAAS letter, signed by executive officer William D. Carey, was addressed to the head of the Polish government, Wojciech Jaruzelski, and expressed the hope that the government will respect "the rights of all persons to due process and fair trial as stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." The letter also requested specific information about the welfare of the persons listed.

An official of the Polish Embassy told AAAS staff that the arrests at the Polish academy occurred when a meeting took place there in violation of emergency restrictions barring such gatherings. The official said that for many in custody, detention is expected to be temporary, ending when the immediate situation eases. Only those charged with specific offenses would be held.

—**John Walsh**