

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