



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MONDAY, JULY 10 1978

CONTACT: BILL KATS
202-224-8947

DOLE CALLS FOR SUSPENSION OF SALT TALKS, HELSINKI REEVALUATION

WASHINGTON -- Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.) today called for suspension of the upcoming SALT negotiations and all bilateral scientific and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union, and a reevaluation of U.S. participation in the Helsinki Agreement, pending the outcome of the trials of Soviet dissidents Anatoly Scharansky and Alexander Ginzburg.

Dole's resolution calls for the President to immediately take action in response to continued human rights violations within the Soviet Union.

Following is the text of Sen. Dole's floor statement:

Mr. President, history will judge us more by our actions than by our words. In a statement issued last week, the Carter Administration said that the outcome of the Scharansky-Ginzburg trials must be treated as an "important indicator" of American Soviet relations. In full agreement with the President's statement I am introducing, today, a resolution directing the President to begin an intensive effort aimed at suspending all bilateral scientific and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union, reevaluating our participation in the Helsinki Agreement, and suspending indefinitely SALT negotiations until the outcome of the trials of the Soviet dissidents is known.

Six weeks ago, following the conviction of Yuri Orlov for selling "slanderous material to the West," I introduced a Senate resolution condemning the abortion of justice and the unconscionable personal abuse of Orlov's wife and family by the Soviet authorities. As disgusting as the Orlov trial was, I warned my colleagues in my statement to the Senate, that "Orlov's trial would pale in comparison to the trials being prepared for Scharansky and Ginzburg." And to avert still another travesty, I urged that the Senate call on President Carter to "begin an intensive and careful evaluation of international conferences and exchanges of scientists with the Soviet Union . . . and such an evaluation should continue until the government of the Soviet Union expresses its willingness to comply with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords."

I cannot claim that my proposal aroused a great deal of support in the Administration nor elsewhere. The Washington Post, for example, objected to my resolution feeling it was not the time to bring the U.S. Government into the act.

On June 28, less than two weeks ago, on the floor of the Senate, I again pointed out that time was running out for Scharansky and Ginzburg, that our attempts to reason with the Soviet Union in the area of human rights were falling on deaf ears, that the time had come for the U.S. to respond decisively in terms the Soviets could understand.

In light of the campaign of terror directed at so many Soviet scientists, I felt it was time for us to put the Soviets on notice that the scientific exchanges it values so much are in jeopardy. In an amendment to the authorization bill for the National Science Foundation, I proposed that scientific collaborative activities with the Soviet Union and other countries should not be subsidized by the NSF with taxpayers' dollars when the human rights of potential participants are known to have been violated. Under the circumstances, I saw no reason for our Government to sponsor these bilateral exchanges when it is well-known that we give away so much and receive so little.



NEWS from

U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

Although I knew the amendment had little chance of passage, I wanted to bring these issues to the attention of the Senate. By introducing the amendment, I hoped to raise the sensitivity of all Americans to the plight of Scharansky and Ginzburg and all the oppressed people in the Soviet Union.

I was shocked to learn of the intensive efforts of the Administration to defeat the amendment. Without knowing the specific contents of the amendment and without attempting to contact my office, the White House Science Advisor mounted a large scale campaign opposing the amendment. The next day, on the desk of each Senator, there appeared a letter signed by Dr. Frank Press, in which he expressed his personal opposition to the measure, arguing that it would preclude contacts between Soviet dissidents and visiting U.S. scientists. Additional opposition to the amendment, I learned, was coming from segments of the organized scientific community as well as agencies of the Government, including the NSF and NIH.

Naturally I was disappointed that several agencies of government and part of the scientific community did not support the amendment. And respecting the views of Senators Javits and Ribicoff that the measure would be counter-productive to the interests of the Soviet dissidents, I reluctantly withdrew the amendment.

Here we are, less than two weeks later, witnessing the culmination--or perhaps the commencement--of the Soviet Union's calculated policy directed at trampling the very existence of a small band of men, women, and children, many of whom are of Jewish ancestry, whose only crime has been to express unpopular opinions or to ask to emigrate.

Now moved by the horror of the Scharansky-Ginzburg trials, the Administration has finally begun to take a definitive position. Indeed, as I understand it, the Administration is implementing the very policies I advocated six weeks ago. Two scientific visits, including one by Dr. Press, have been cancelled by the Secretary of State. And, we are told, the Administration is initiating a review of all bilateral agreements with the Soviet Union.

While I strongly support the Administration's action, I cannot help but wonder if, six weeks ago, we had clearly spelled out for the Soviets the repercussions of their human rights violations, the atrocity we are now witnessing could have been averted. Probably not, but we will never know.

History has taught us the futility of failing to deal directly with oppression. In the past, we have been reluctant to become involved with events that, at first blush, appear not to affect us directly, for fear of intervening in the "internal affairs" of another country. But I say to you that, so long as there is such blatant disregard of human rights, none of us can hide behind national borders. The Holocaust was a case in point. Today, in the Soviet Union, we are witnessing another such event.

Today in Lebanon, there is abundant evidence of the senseless slaughter of civilian Lebanese Christians by occupying Arab forces. The response of the Israelis to this massacre should not go unnoticed. For six days last week, defenseless Christians in Beirut were subjected to unrelenting shelling as the free world was quietly watching the events unfold. Unable to find a single country willing to speak out in opposition to these useless killings, Israel, risking its very existence, demonstrated graphically that it would not stand by and watch its Christian brothers slowly eliminated. Is the United States going to bear silent witness to the demise of the courageous dissidents in their hour of need?

To turn away from the suffering of the unfortunate dissidents in the Soviet Union, in their greatest moment of need, is to defile the memory of those who have perished for similar acts of courage. Now is the moment to register our revulsion in no uncertain terms. To those who say now is not the time to jeopardize detente, I say, "If not now, when?" History will judge us more by our actions than by our words.