it is fully entitled to disband the entire space program tomorrow if it so chooses. It of course is not going to do anything of the sort, but it is increasingly sensitive to the fact that it has no one but itself to blame, in this and other instances, when it complains that decision making at the executive level is eroding the legislative function and turning Capitol Hill into nothing but a ratifier of White House programs.

The result is that the members of both houses are now far less inclined than formerly to accept the judgments of their respective space committees, which, if anything, have heretofore been more pro-space than even NASA. And they are beginning to rebel against the rather well founded argument that cuts in the NASA budget would not be reassigned to welfare programs. Kennedy, for example, argued at a press conference, "some people say that we should take the money we are putting into space and put it into housing or education. We set up a very extensive educational program. My judgment is that what would happen would be that they would cut the space program and you would not get additional funds for education. We have enough resources, in my opinion, to do what needs to be done in the field, for example of education, and to do what needs to be done in space."

This is the standing response to the "earthly needs first" argument, and a good case can be made for its validity. But even this position is now coming under attack, and from some of the administration's best friends in Congress. Earlier this month, in delivering the annual Clayton lectures at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Senator William Fulbright (D.-Ark.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, expressed his influential doubts.

"It is contended," he said, "that we did not spend enough money on these worthwhile [education, welfare, and economic development] purposes before we had a space program and that there is no assurance that we would increase our efforts in these areas if the space program were abandoned or reduced. This seems to me partly but not entirely accurate. The Congress has come close on several occasions to adopting a meaningful program of federal aid to education and it is quite possible that the reduction of costs in other areas such as space would provide the necessary impetus for the enactment of an education bill. In any case, I find the negative argument that we would not in any case use funds that now go into space for other constructive purposes a singularly unconvincing reason for the expenditure of vast sums of public money. This argument itself, in my opinion, strengthens the case for greater efforts in education."

(Fulbright then assailed the prestige-race argument by recounting the story of the Soviet pupil who was told of plans to land a Russian on the moon. The pupil agreed that this was fine, but asked, "When may we go to Vienna?")

In defense of its request for $5.7 billion, an increase of $2 billion over its current budget, NASA has argued that it is seeking no more than is necessary for carrying out the program just this side of a "crash" basis. The program, Webb has said, is a "fast-paced" one, employing resources at a high level but not going to the extreme of working around the clock. Any cutback, he warned, would stretch out the timetable for landing Americans on the moon, and returning them safely, before the end of this decade. It would also, he has told employment-minded Congressmen, result in a reduction of existing jobs under NASA contracts. Since no one wants to take the blame for letting the Russians get to the moon first, or for reducing employment, it is extremely doubtful that NASA is going to emerge from the appropriations mill minus any critical amounts of money. And it is worth remembering that since the space budget defies comprehension on anything but a career basis, what comes out of one page can often be compensated for on another. But it seems that NASA has reached the point in its career where it is going to have to run the gauntlet of a critical Congress—an activity in which the National Institutes of Health is now becoming experienced. Congress no longer takes NIH, or space, on faith, and while it is deeply committed to a policy of generosity for both, it is no longer surrendering its judgment to the executive.—D. S. GREENBERG

Birth Control: Catholic Opinion Varies Widely on Rock's New Book

Catholic reviewers, lay and clerical, have now had an opportunity to say their piece on John Rock's recently published book, *The Time Has Come: A Catholic Doctor's Proposals To End the Battle over Birth Control* (Knopf, New York, 1963. 204 pp. $3.95).

Their reactions are as interesting as the book, which is indeed an interesting one, and provide some illuminating examples of the intellectual ferment which exists in the supposedly monolithic Church.

Rock, who organized the field trials for the now widely used progesterone oral contraceptive, retired as clinical professor of gynecology in 1956 after a 34-year association with Harvard Medical School. Now, at age 73, he is director of the Rock Reproductive Clinic and one of the most active and articulate public campaigners for family planning.

Rock's thesis, briefly, is that Catholics and non-Catholics are fundamentally in agreement on the usefulness of limiting family size; the difference occurs on the question of method. To resolve this difference, he suggests, ample funds should be made available for research that would provide more certainty for all methods, including the rhythm method, which is alone acceptable to Catholics; at the same time, public funds should be made available for providing birth control counseling acceptable to all faiths. Catholics, for example, would be counseled exclusively on the rhythm method.

As for the pill, Rock concedes that it is not now acceptable to the Church, but he contends that Church leaders should reconsider their position. When progesterone is naturally secreted, he argues, it induces the "safe" period of the rhythm method, and, during pregnancy, it protects the fertilized ovum against a competing conception.

If it is theologically acceptable to utilize this naturally induced sterility to avoid conception, he writes, why would it not be equally acceptable to utilize a sterility that is rationally decided upon and produced by a duplicate of the natural agent—namely, the pill?

The most influential answer was provided by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, in a review published in the Boston *Pilot*. The Cardinal first rapped Rock's knuckles lightly for having failed to abide by the Church law that, as Cushing put it, "requires every Catholic who writes on a subject pertaining to faith or morality [to] submit his manuscript to Church authority for a so-called 'imprimatur'." (Rock explained at a press conference in Washington last week that he was unaware of this requirement.)

The Cardinal then went on to say that "In this book there is much that

is good. . . . [Rock] has clearly demonstrated that the Church is not opposed to birth control as such but to the artificial means to control births. . . . He presents many cogent arguments for the formation of a public policy on birth control, and some of his suggestions could contribute to the establishment of domestic peace in our pluralistic society. With reason, he calls to task those who are unwilling to face the implications of the much publicized population explosion. He also makes an eloquent, and much needed, plea, for Federal grants to perfect the so-called Rhythm System so that it might become a means of controlling births which is not only morally acceptable but also scientifically accurate."

The reviewer then made it clear, however, that he felt that Rock's theology was not up to his medicine. The book, he said, "contains several statements which are theologically incorrect and certainly misleading. When he [Rock] speaks on the formation of the Catholic conscience, he fails to take into consideration the true complexity of this problem and so commits in the field of theology the same mistake he urges against the theologians in the field of reproductive physiology. . . . In his defense of the 'natural' and, to his mind, 'lawful' use of the progestational steroids as contraceptive devices, Dr. Rock does not meet the incisive arguments against his position which have been continually voiced by Catholic moral theologians. . . . Theologians," the Cardinal concluded, "must recognize the competence of Dr. Rock in the field of reproductive physiology but he must recognize their competence in the field of Catholic moral teaching. Fair-minded people will appreciate that such cooperation in no way curtails the doctor's scientific freedom. It would rather aid him in his dedicated pursuit of the ultimate truth in this matter, the defense and formulation of which in theological terms is not the task of the individual but that of the whole teaching Church."

A more critical attitude toward the Rock thesis was offered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John Knott, director of the family life bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in a review in the Washington *Post*. "The cause of honest discussion would be better served," Father Knott wrote, "if Dr. Rock and all Americans were to face the reality of the Catholic position on contraceptives. It has not changed and will not change. This may be an unpalatable fact of life to many people, but it serves no purpose to ignore or obfuscate it."

Finally, *Commonweal*, a liberal Catholic journal, noted editorially that the debate stirred by Rock's book was less a testimonial to the book's virtues than a reflection of the Church's reluctance to accept a re-examination of its position on birth control. "Is it any wonder, then, that a book as inadequate as Dr. Rock's should receive publicity out of all proportion to its merits and soundness. Where most Catholics tread with muffled shoes and theologians keep their doubts to themselves, anyone who speaks frankly is bound to be made a hero or a villain. . . . The time has come—not to praise Dr. Rock's book, but for the Church and its theologians to confront anew the issues which he raises."—D.S.G.

AID: Almost Everyone Favors Research on Development Problems But Going Has Not Been Smooth

In the first 15 years after World War II, while the United States was spending a sum approaching $100 billion on military and economic aid to other countries, virtually none of this money went into research to determine what should be done and whether what had been done was effective.

Then in 1961, in the latest in a long series of reorganizations, the foreign aid program was transmogrified into the Agency for International Development (with the convenient acronym AID), and a research unit with separate identity and a budget of its own was provided for the first time.

At the end of its first year of existence, this research unit came under scathing criticism from a congressional investigating committee for poor management of contracting operations.

Now, 7 months later, the effects of this investigation quite evidently linger on. Almost everyone seems to agree that the problems of development require a serious and well-organized research effort, but for reasons in part traceable to the investigation, AID's research operation has been living in limbo.

Lately, one Congressman has raised questions about the status of an AID employee involved in a case that attracted the special attention of the investigating subcommittee and this has brought the matter to the fore again within the agency. Word of the incident has circulated among other agencies and has been nervously interpreted by some people as raising a threat of direct congressional interference with personnel and research.

The failure of the foreign aid agency to carry out a systematic research program over the years can in part be explained by a factor which also contributes to the agency's sense of insecurity: foreign aid has always been viewed as a temporary program. From its beginning, almost the only thing permanent about the agency has been change—in purpose and organization.

What began as a program specifically aimed at the economic rehabilitation of the war-ravaged nations of Western Europe and of Japan has evolved into an effort to promote modernization in the underdeveloped nations. Military assistance, which once had a major stress in the foreign aid program, is now given primarily to countries bordering Communist countries.

In industrialized Europe and Japan the aims of the aid program could be furthered fairly effectively through economic aid in the form of grants, loans, and technical assistance. In the underdeveloped nations, it soon became clear, problems of health education and general administration stood in the way of material progress. The foreign aid program therefore had to be modified to meet these new and more complex conditions, even to the extent of our espousing social progress as we have done most avowedly in the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

In recent years a feeling has grown that the problems of development would yield to research, but it has also been noted that scientists and technologists of the Western world were not working very hard on these problems.

While George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard was serving as President Eisenhower's science adviser, a start was made in planning a research office for the foreign aid agency, and Jerome Wiesner, who became science adviser to President Kennedy, pressed ahead with the idea. The development assistance panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee wrote the report which provided the basis for the research office included in the reorganization of the aid agency in 1961. The chairman of this panel is Walsh McDermott, chairman of the department