

## Opposition to War Put on Record

As protests against the war in Vietnam have widened, more universities have taken an official stand on the government's policy concerning the war. Following several weeks of controversy, the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences last week moved to end its traditional position of neutrality on political questions and adopted two antiwar resolutions sponsored by Harvard's department of biochemistry and molecular biology. One resolution recognizes a national war protest scheduled for 15 October and allows faculty members, at their own discretion, to suspend classes for the day. The other calls for the "prompt, rapid and complete withdrawal" of United States forces from Vietnam. In supporting the resolution, the faculty backed away from its traditional hands-off attitude toward officially criticizing government actions and leaned toward the position that the university has a responsibility to take a stand on outside political issues that affect it.

The resolution on the national war protest was introduced by Everett I. Mendelsohn, professor of the history of science, and was passed almost unanimously. The resolution calling for complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam was introduced by John Edsall, professor of biological chemistry, and met with considerable opposition from some faculty members. After a long debate, it passed 255 to 81, with 150 abstentions. The issue which sharply divided the faculty on this resolution was not the policy toward the war but the question of whether or not the university should take an official position on political issues outside the university. The faculty's liberal caucus argued that the university should take a stand on the war because it "poisons" academic life and helps to cause campus disturbances. Edsall told the faculty members, "The war has damaged the quality of life and work in the universities here and elsewhere. It works against the values of devoted scholarship and independent inquiry for which the university stands; it distracts and impedes us from our proper tasks." All 12 faculty members of the department of biochemistry and molecular biology, including Nobel prize winners Konrad Bloch and James D. Watson, endorsed Edsall's resolution.

Other members of the faculty, many of whom actually oppose the war, argued that the university would be abandoning its traditional position of neutrality if it took a political stand. A statement prepared by 150 professors who held this view argued that a formal faculty vote on the war issue would damage academic freedom within the university, make politics a consideration in faculty appointments, force the minority to accept the right of the majority to speak for them on matters of "politics and conscience," and set a precedent of allowing political matters to come regularly to the attention of the faculty. Signers of the statement included George B. Kistiakowsky, professor of chemistry and former Presidential science adviser, and Harvey Brooks, dean of the division of engineering and applied physics.

At other universities, antiwar protest plans and resolutions have also been approved. The Columbia University Senate, consisting of faculty members, students, and administrators, approved on 26 September a resolution opposing the war in Vietnam and recommending that "the most reasonable plan for peace is the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops." The trustees of Massachusetts Institute of Technology have voted to support the antiwar moratorium scheduled for October "as a day when all members of the MIT community are free" to follow "the dictates of their conscience."

On 12 October, university presidents of 79 private colleges sent a letter to President Nixon urging a "stepped-up timetable for withdrawal from Vietnam." They include Morris Abram, president of Brandeis; Andrew Cordier, president of Columbia; Robert Goheen, president of Princeton; Howard Johnson, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Edward Levi, president of the University of Chicago.—MARTI MUELLER

While talk of a new role for NATO is gratifying for its staff, there unfortunately is no money available for any of the new activities, nor is any money in sight. DuBridge said he was "gratified" by NATO's interest in environmental problems, but said little more on the subject. One financial possibility is that funds might be diverted from NATO's fellowship program, which has existed so long that annual national contributions have become an automatic reflex. It is probably a fairly plunderable fund, since rejected fellowship applicants are not a particularly troublesome bunch. However, it remains to be seen whether anything at all will come out of the proposal to give NATO a new job. One problem is that there is another organization that is also there—the Organization for European Cooperation and Development (OECD), which is said to be climbing the walls of its Paris chateau over Nixon's designation of NATO for this plum assignment. (Europe is studded with an assortment of well-staffed organizations that have hung on for years, sometimes decades, in the hope that, if political amalgamation takes place, they will become very important. These organizations watch each other very jealously, especially in such growth-industry fields as oceanography, pollution, and transportation.) DuBridge expressed the hope that NATO and OECD would hold conversations directed toward sorting out the contributions that each could make in the subjects under discussion.

As for the Belgians and the Dutch, DuBridge said they are both doing well industrially, both have sound and well-established scientific and technical relations with the United States, and no new programs seemed necessary.

In London, DuBridge gave half a dozen separate TV and radio interviews, and visited with British scientific, technical, and education leaders. Following his visit to the Minister of State for Education and Science, the British issued a statement which said, in part, "Discussion ranged over such topics as financial growth rates, manpower resources and requirements, development of major science facilities and allocation of funds to particular fields of research. In the talks, the U.K.'s growth rate in real terms in funds allocated to civil science was contrasted with an actual reduction over the last two years in the U.S.A."

At a press conference held on his last evening in London, DuBridge briefly stepped out of his role of adminis-