

Vietnam and the Scientists: Appeal from the Left Bank

Paris. Frenchmen opposed to U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war have lately been expressing themselves with increased vigor in street demonstrations and have directed more personal appeals to American scientists and other intellectuals.

Early in February came release of an appeal by more than 400 French and Japanese scientists asking American university scientists to refuse to perform military research in their laboratories.

Then on 10 February, in a Left Bank press conference, several leading left-wing intellectuals called on American intellectuals to pass from opposition to the U.S. role in Vietnam to resistance. Of the spokesmen at the press conference, Jean-Paul Sartre and Laurent Schwartz, professor in the faculty of sciences at the University of Paris, are probably best known in the United States.

Among signers of the appeal to scientists were three Nobel prize winners in physics: Alfred Kastler of France and Sin-itiro Tomonaga and Hideki Yukawa of Japan.

The appeal said in part, "Scientists have vast ethical and professional responsibilities in the modern world. If they are to work for the benefit of humanity and the integrity of scholarship they should never willingly permit their discoveries to be exploited for destructive purposes."

Alluding to opposition to the "American war in Vietnam," the statement went on to say, "The continuation of military activities in American universities would inevitably lead to the determination of an ever-growing number of world scientists and universities to interrupt their relations with certain American universities engaged in military research, and this would be the ruin of international scientific exchanges which are the main source of scientific progress for us all."

The appeal attracted little attention in the French press, but in a comment appended to a 6-inch news story, the leading independent Paris daily, *Le Monde*, said, "It was surprising that the appeal signed by the French and

Japanese intellectuals did not condemn equally similar research in other countries, notably the Soviet Union and Great Britain and, naturally, France. It should be recognized that the Americans have published a certain amount of information on chemical and biological weapons which makes criticism easier if no less legitimate."

About 40 Japanese scientists signed the appeal, almost all of them professors or science administrators. More than 100 of the French signers are on the staff at Saclay, the government nuclear research laboratory near Paris. The rest were from the faculties of the universities of Paris and Orsay, and about two-thirds were junior faculty. Organizer of the appeal is Laurent Schwartz, who has been prominent in anti-Vietnam war activities. He is a leading figure in the National Vietnam Committee in France and was a member of the International War Crimes Tribunal which met in Stockholm last year on the urging of British philosopher Bertrand Russell. Schwartz is an internationally known mathematician and winner of the Field prize, an award which represents the summit of recognition in mathematics.

Schwartz's criticism of American policy in Vietnam follows the general lines of his opposition to French conduct during the Algerian War. His actions then earned him a suspension from his post in the quasi-military Ecole Polytechnique. He and other like-minded intellectuals tend to see Algeria, rather than the earlier French experience in Indo-China, as a precedent for the Vietnam situation. French conscripts fought in Algeria, and it was revulsion with the war at home and among the civilian soldiers—in part fomented by the intellectuals—rather than military defeat which led to French withdrawal. From this experience come the French intellectuals' calls for "resistance" by American intellectuals and soldiers.

The questions of whether Vietnam is turning French intellectuals anti-American, or whether endemic anti-Americanism is being expressed through criticism

of the Vietnam war, defy easy answer, since the French intellectual community is far from monolithic.

It is probably fair to say that the major split is between the "technocrats," products of the Grandes Ecoles, those specialized schools for professionals which are a unique feature of French higher education, on the one side, and the university graduates in the traditional disciplines, particularly philosophy and literature, on the other.

The technocrats, who are the French counterparts of administrators and managers in the United States and the Soviet Union, tend to be too absorbed in their jobs to be publicly active on such matters as the Vietnam war.

The literary intellectuals act in a tradition of criticism and dissent that is at least as old as Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau. French culture is to some degree isolated and inbred, but French intellectuals have always felt obliged to comment both as moralists and political observers on events in Europe and beyond. And the more eloquent have always found a forum in French journals and an audience, particularly among the young.

Resentment toward the U.S. does seem strongest among the young, especially students. There are probably more anti-U.S. signs on the walls in the Latin Quarter and workers' districts than at any time since the early 1950's when the French Left led riots and other protests against NATO.

Opinion on Vietnam is certainly not unanimous. The riot of the month occurred on 8 February when about 1500 Communist-led students turned up where right-wing students were meeting in support of the U.S. Vietnam policy. Most of the action occurred when a big detail of gendarmes and police used their customary forceful tactics to keep the two groups separated.

Opinion polls seem to show that Vietnam is not a burning issue with Frenchmen at large. Among those friendly to the United States, reactions are complex. One Deputy, a prominent member of a center group in the National Assembly, told this reporter that basic feelings toward the United States among an important but largely silent group of Frenchmen will probably be influenced most by what happens from now on in Vietnam.

The attitude of President de Gaulle is well known. It is worth noting, however, that the government refused a permit for a parade on 13 February in the American Embassy area. There

had been trouble there last year during a visit by Vice President Humphrey. This time the demonstrators were told to confine themselves to the old Leftist stamping grounds in eastern Paris, and

the embassy neighborhood was thronged with what seemed to be a regiment of riot police wearing steel helmets and armed, not with the usual clubs, but with carbines. It was clear that the

government would not permit any big anti-American demonstration in the Place de la Concorde that evening, nor did it wish to see the embassy or any Americans roughed up.—JOHN WALSH

Kistiakowsky Cuts Defense Department Ties over Vietnam

George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, who for over a decade has been one of the federal government's most influential science advisers, has quietly severed his connections with the Department of Defense (DOD) because of his opposition to the administration's Vietnam policies.

Kistiakowsky told *Science* that he would not discuss any aspect of the matter. In response to an inquiry from *Science*, John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, would not discuss Kistiakowsky's recent actions but said only that "Kistiakowsky has not been a member of any Defense advisory group for some time." But against a background of worsening relations between the academic world and the military, Kistiakowsky's action has at least great symbolic significance—and possibly more. For if there is a "scientific establishment," Kistiakowsky is at the very heart of it, and it may be speculated that if Kistiakowsky, noted for his prudence and conservatism, is disaffected over Vietnam, disaffection may be massive indeed in the senior councils of science.

A physical chemist and authority on explosives, Kistiakowsky was a key figure in the World War II atomic bomb project. He became an adviser on missile propulsion and other military technology during the Korean War, served for 2 years as full-time science adviser to President Eisenhower, was an organizer of Scientists and Engineers for Johnson in the 1964 election, and is currently vice president of the National Academy of Sciences. His departure from high Defense councils not only removes one of the Department's most seasoned and respected advisers but also contributes to a problem that DOD prefers not to talk about—namely, the increasing difficulty that it is having in attracting top-level scientific talent to work on military matters. Elder statesmen, such as Kistiakowsky, have generally confined their efforts to providing high-level policy advice, but also they often serve as talent scouts for bringing bright young men into defense research. And even when they don't do that, their very presence in the Defense advisory network provides a luster and prestige that DOD finds useful.

Science has learned that, early this year, Kistiakowsky wrote to Foster to express his concerns about the administration's course of action in Vietnam and, at approximately the same time, resigned from a secret Defense Department committee that had been created to provide advice on the construction of an anti-infiltration barrier in Vietnam. Last year Kistiakowsky was in Washington full time for long periods over several months, for work related to the barrier. In his letter to Foster, it is understood, Kistiakowsky stated that he had accepted the committee assignment because he felt that the barrier

would contribute to a de-escalation of the fighting in Vietnam. It is said, however, that he since has become disillusioned about the intentions of the Johnson administration, and that in his letter to Foster he stated that he wished to devote himself to activities that he felt would be more fruitful for reducing the conflict. Subsequently there were allegations that Kistiakowsky had attempted to inspire resignations by other DOD advisers, but close associates of his say there is no basis to these reports and that Kistiakowsky, with considerable anger, has taken steps to dispel the reports. He continues to serve as a member-at-large of the President's Science Advisory Committee and is also a member of the General Advisory Committee of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Following his resignation from the Defense Department committee, Kistiakowsky is understood to have written letters to several dozen colleagues to express his concern about the war in Vietnam and the effects it was having on the availability of resources for dealing with domestic problems. He also publicly manifested his concerns about Vietnam by signing the so-called Bermuda Statement, an appeal by a group of distinguished, politically moderate citizens, which called upon the administration to de-escalate the war and intensify efforts for negotiations.

Kistiakowsky's disengagement from the administration's military policies is also said to have increased the chill that has existed between him and Academy president Frederick Seitz concerning the relationship between the Academy and the Defense Department. Seitz, who, on the subject of Vietnam, is widely considered to be one of the more militant members of the scientific leadership, has taken the position that the Academy should not hesitate to make itself available to serve DOD's needs. Kistiakowsky, on the other hand, is reported to have argued that the Academy and Research Council are too heavily engaged in defense-related activities and should strive for greater independence from government, especially military, activities.

Unlike several of his Cambridge colleagues, Kistiakowsky has not translated his Vietnam concerns into support of the candidacy of Senator Eugene McCarthy. He is said to be hoping and waiting for the emergence of Nelson Rockefeller as the alternative he would support. There is a report that Kistiakowsky was discreetly approached recently on the question of whether he would play a role in reviving Scientists and Engineers for Johnson in the forthcoming election. It is known that he declined, but in this matter, as in the case of his resignation from the DOD committee, Kistiakowsky refused to make any comment to *Science*.—D. S. GREENBERG