sons in the Stony Brook administration there was an impression that the police were in some sympathy with the administration's perceptions of the difficulty of the campus drug problem, and that while the administration sought a solution, the police would exercise restraint.

However, while the Stony Brook administration looked upon counseling and education as the solution to the drug problem, police undercover agents —unbeknownst to the administration and posing as casual drop-ins—had been making drug purchases on campus over a period of several months. Clearly, with drug consumption as blatant as it was, they could have moved in at any time. (One faculty member commented, "I've been around, but I've never seen any drug 'scene' as wide open as the one here. Christ, you'd see bunches of kids 'turning on' in public lounges!")

Why the police chose to move when and as they did is their own secret. But it was on 3 January that the horn-locking between Police Commissioner Barry and County Executive Dennison took place. At issue was Barry's decision to become party to a lawsuit that a policemen's group had brought against Dennison and others in an effort to prevent a reduction of police services in certain parts of the county. On 9 January, following Dennison's allegations of insubordination by Barry, the police commissioner withdrew his name from the suit—amidst much local newspaper coverage that did little for the commissioner's public image. On the following day, Barry's undercover men went before the grand jury to present their evidence on Stony Brook. One week later the raid took place. And, though it is widely asserted that Dennison, as the county's top elective officer, is supposed to be informed beforehand of any unusual police activities, Barry pulled off the raid without telling Dennison—though he called all the local newspapers to invite reporters to accompany the raiders.

Barry, in an interview with *Science*, expressed surprise at the furor over the techniques used by the raiders. No, he said, there is no requirement that the county executive be notified of raids: sometimes we do, sometimes we don't. It all depends. As for notifying the campus authorities beforehand—well, why would we do that? They knew about the drugs, and they failed to do anything to stop it. We were just doing our job, the police commissioner explained. A predawn raid—198 policemen to round up 38 young suspects? Why not? We had felony indictments. It's standard procedure; no different, he said, "from the way we'd go after a bunch of burglars hiding in a motel." The public reaction, he explained, has been very good. Picking up a file of correspondence, the police commissioner pulled out a letter—typical of 35 or so that he had received within a few days after the raid. "More power to you," stated the letter, "and I hope, if necessary, we'll have more raids on campuses." Stated another, in reference to the university faculty, "Most of these long-haired unshaven idiots haven't the brains to hold such responsible jobs."

Following the raid, the Stony Brook administration announced that it has hired a drug specialist, who comes equipped with a former addict, to head up a new and forceful campaign against drugs on campus. The campaign will include counseling, security patrols to keep out casual drop-ins, and strict enforcement of drug regulations.

How the students perceive the events of recent weeks is difficult to assess, since they view them from many vantage points and with a variety of values. But a good many of them feel little but pure disgust for the performance of their elders. They know that the law proscribes drugs, but they regard the law as inane, and, furthermore, they wonder why, of all departures from law, the police single out the consumption of "pot" as the object of their crackdowns. "The mafia's running loose around this country," said one student, "Why don't they get the mafia?" Said another, "They say we can have alcohol, but we can't have marijuana. This university is made up of scientists; they know there's nothing in the literature that says 'pot' is harmful, but you can fill a library with solid findings on the harmfulness of liquor."

Meanwhile, those throughout the country who are responsible for the affairs of academe might note that (i) the drug situation at Stony Brook was not unique, and (ii), in view of the way a large part of the public feels toward what goes on in universities, this isn't a bad time for a policeman to make a reputation.—D. S. GREENBERG

Population Control: U. S. Aid Program Leaps Forward

Although the U.S. government's interest in helping the developing nations reduce their birth rates has been steadily rising since early in the Kennedy administration, the ratio of rhetoric to effective action has been high. Now, however, the Agency for International Development (AID), with strong congressional encouragement, is at last mounting a significant program to try to foster and assist "family planning" in nations where the Malthusian prophecy is written plainly on the wall.

Evidence of this is found chiefly in the fact that during fiscal 1968, which ends 30 June, AID expects to spend $35 million on its family planning program, as opposed to the $4.2 million it spent the previous year. Further signs of a major positive change in AID's population program are these: (i) The agency now has some 50 people working full time in this field, including 28 serving on the central staff. Next year the number will grow, though how much is uncertain. While not large, the number of those now in the program has increased more than threefold over the past year. (ii) AID policy, reflecting changes in public attitudes in the United States and a relaxation of the political constraints that have arisen in the past from religious and moral beliefs, now permits the distribution of contraceptives to developing nations. (iii) Changes in United States law, and in the attitudes of a number of aid-receiving nations, allow hope that some

of the U.S.-owned foreign currency generated by Food for Peace sales, which runs into huge sums, will be used for purposes of family planning. For example, AID and the Indian government are now considering a possible agreement whereby India would build, in its own factory, 5700 jeeps for its family planning program, using U.S.-owned rupees to cover 90 percent of the vehicles' cost.

The better than eightfold increase in AID's population-program budget occurs at a time when the overall foreign aid budget has been cut to its lowest level in 10 years. The increase is due in part to decisions by AID and the Johnson administration to step up family planning assistance, and in part to a decision by Congress to force the pace.

The agency had intended to spend $20 million this year on family planning, but Congress, impatient to see faster progress, authorized $35 million and gave AID a choice: either spend the full amount or have the unspent part cut from its budget and lost. (Congress took a similar action with respect to family planning activities in this country. The new Social Security Act amendments provide that, starting 1 July, at least 6 percent of all maternal and child welfare funds must be spent on family planning services. The amount available under this program for such services should gradually increase from $15 million next year to $21 million in 1973.)

The earmarking of funds for family planning or for any other specific kind of foreign assistance ran counter to AID principles. William S. Gaud, AID administrator, urged Congress not to earmark money for the population program, contending that such action would impair the agency's flexibility in deciding how to spend its limited funds wisely. But in the Population Service, which makes up part of the new War on Hunger Office, the prospect of having a substantial bloc of funds for which no other AID programs could compete was not displeasing. Officials such as R. T. Ravenholt, a 42-year-old specialist in public health and population dynamics who left the University of Washington medical faculty in 1966 to head AID's population program, had discovered that building an ambitious new activity under the conditions of a declining agency budget was not easy.

When Ravenholt took office, the family planning program had few people and little money, and, to make matters worse, it was not permitted to distribute contraceptives to nations which might request them. The story of the lifting of the ban on contraceptives and of the struggles preceding the earmarking of funds for the population program tells something of the political climate surrounding AID and the birth control issue. It also reveals the keen competition for money within the agency.

R. T. Ravenholt

In the summer of 1966 Ravenholt proposed that AID change its policy and make intrauterine devices (IUD's), condoms, and oral contraceptives available to nations that wanted them. Although the logic of including contraceptives in the family planning program was unassailable, Ravenholt was, nevertheless, not immediately successful. In part this was because AID, the most politically vulnerable of agencies, knew the birth control issue was sensitive. For example, Gaud and other AID officials could recall being closely and aggressively questioned on the subject by the Foreign Affairs Committee's ranking Democrat, Clement J. Zablocki, whose Milwaukee constituency includes many Catholic families. In the very recent past the mere suggestion that AID might distribute contraceptives would have stirred intense hostility in some congressional circles.

The proposal to help supply contraceptives to the underdeveloped world also was opposed because a program of this kind was sure to divert funds from other AID activities. Activities such as those in the fields of health, education, and economic development, all of which claim a part in reducing population growth, had advocates ready to resist fiscal incursions by the population program.

Ravenholt was eager for AID to make oral contraceptives available to India and other nations, for he had concluded that the pill was the important missing element in the developing nations' birth control programs. India was emphasizing use of the IUD, but, while this device clearly was of value, Ravenholt felt that it was not gaining the acceptance necessary to achieve the results expected. In his view, acceptance of the pill had exceeded expectations, although various surveys indicated a high rate of discontinuation for users of the pill as well as users of the IUD. Hazards associated with the pill were conceded to be slight, and, by comparison with the hazards of pregnancy and childbirth in the developing nations, they were small indeed. Cost had been a barrier to the pill's widespread use, but the price was dropping (the international competitive price is now less than 15 cents per monthly cycle).

From its habit of caution in the birth control field, AID had allowed itself to become more of a follower than a leader. As subsequent events showed, recognition by the public and by Congress of the worsening population crisis abroad had created a political demand for what the Population Service was proposing. President Johnson had spoken out on the need for population control on some two dozen occasions. In 1965 Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, had initiated a long series of hearings on the population explosion which generated widespread interest both within and outside Congress.

By January 1967 there were signs that AID was growing bolder. Gruening had written Gaud, asking whether AID intended to continue carrying contraceptives on the list of commodities which it would not send abroad. Gaud replied that, if AID received a request for contraceptives, he would consider honoring it. On 5 April, while Gaud was testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative Zablocki asked him whether any policy changes in the family planning field were contemplated.

In his reply, Gaud went a bit further than he had in his response to Gruening. His "inclination," he said, would be to provide developing nations with contra-

ceptives if they requested them. His remark, once reported in the press, became tantamount to a new declaration of policy. For his part, Zablocki, after receiving an assurance that no nation would be pressed to adopt a birth control program as a condition for receiving U.S. economic and technical assistance, let the matter pass.

Agency-financed shipments of contraceptives began later in the year. In September Gaud announced that AID would furnish India $1.3 million worth of contraceptives, including enough birth control pills to supply 100,000 women during an 18-month pilot project. (India did not license oral contraceptives until 1966, and its attitude toward general use of the pill in the national family planning program remains cautious.)

The first move in Congress to earmark funds for family planning was made by Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. On 14 March Fulbright and 15 cosponsors introduced a bill to authorize an appropriation of $50 million for the population program. Fulbright noted that, in 1965, the National Citizens Commission on Population of the White House Conference on International Cooperation had said $300 million should be made available over the following 3 years. In later congressional hearings, William H. Draper, Jr., chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, and Richard N. Gardner, a professor of international law at Columbia and chairman of the Citizens Commission in 1965, strongly supported the earmarking of money for family planning.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, adopting its version of the Fulbright proposal as part of the foreign aid bill, specified that $50 million should be used for the population program and for that purpose alone. Subsequently, when the bill was under heavy attack on the House floor, the amount so earmarked was reduced to $20 million—the sum Gaud had said AID planned to spend.

But, before the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills finally emerged from Congress, the amount earmarked was compromised at $35 million. The agency, with a large bundle of extra family planning money thrust upon it, so far has spent or "obligated" less than a third of the $35 million and will be hard pressed to spend the remainder by 30 June.

However, the possibilities for using the money are numerous and large. For example, Ravenholt believes every developing nation recognizing a need for family planning should work toward what he feels are two readily attainable goals: to establish a family planning center in every maternity hospital, and to make sure that such centers have contraceptives available. Where funds are limited, he says, maximum use of existing facilities for family planning purposes should take precedence over more costly efforts to extend a nation's network of clinics and hospitals.

Twenty-three developing nations, having altogether more than a billion people, now have official action programs to extend family planning to their lower classes. In 22 other nations, organized family planning activities by voluntary groups are under way, even though little or nothing is being done by government. The increasing interest of the developing nations in family planning allows AID to do much more in this field today than it could have accomplished a few years ago, no matter how much money Congress might have made available.

The agency will help these nations both directly and indirectly—indirectly through the International Planned Parenthood Federation and other voluntary agencies and through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Centers for research and training in population work, such as those at Johns Hopkins and the University of North Carolina, also will receive support. In short, although $35 million is not a huge sum in view of the need, AID is becoming, almost overnight, by far the largest single supporter in the advanced nations of efforts to check population growth in the underdeveloped world.—LUTHER J. CARTER

British Budget: Tight Funding To Continue in Research Field

London. The cuts in public spending by the British government made as a sequel to devaluation inflicted no mortal wounds on major science or science education programs. These cuts, however, did continue a process of trimming and tightening which began before devaluation and is likely to affect British science for some time.

In most cases the government chose to reduce or forego future increments in spending rather than cut back current programs. The main target of the economy knife is the military budget, and the largest slice is the cancellation of an order for 50 American F-111 aircraft. Total savings over 10 years will be about £400 million; direct dollar savings are estimated at $700 million. The F-111 cancellation is part of a package of cuts made possible by a significant change in Britain's "East of Suez" policy. Withdrawal from most bases in the Far East and Persian Gulf has been moved up to 1971. Britain's aircraft carrier force will be phased out sooner than had been previously planned, fewer hunter-killer nuclear submarines are to be built, and reductions in military manpower are to be speeded up. At home, Britain's civil defense program will be reduced to a "care and maintenance" basis, and civil defense voluntary service will be disbanded. Ultimate savings are put at £20 million a year.

Outside the military sphere the most controversial government actions were reimposition of charges for medical prescriptions and postponement of the planned raising of the age (from 15 to 16) at which students leave secondary school. The approximately 30-cent charge on each prescription is expected to bring in the equivalent of $60 million a year. Exemptions from the charge for children, the elderly, expectant and nursing mothers, and the chronically ill, and refunds for the needy, are planned. But the exemptions are not easy to