the Hiroshima bomb) to the 20 kiloton level.

A Missing Factor

The weakness of the hearings was brought into the open with the unexpected appearance of Nobel Prize Winner Harold Urey at the panel discussion the committee held among the scientists on the third morning of the hearings.

Even before Urey spoke, suggestions arose that the network of seismic stations might not be the only source of information on clandestine tests. Seismologist Roland Beers told an allegory about a mining operator who was unable to find a profitable strike despite a tremendous investment in the latest scientific equipment. He found what he was after, nevertheless, because one day a lucky old prospector wandered into his office and offered to show him what he was looking for.

Senator Wallace Bennett (R-Vt.) amplified this by noting that the story reminded him of the bridge motto, "one peek is worth two finesses."

But it was not until Urey got the chance to speak that anyone, in so many words, expressed the opinion that, granting the weaknesses of the proposed network of seismic stations, it would be extremely difficult for the Russians or anyone else to hold atomic tests without some rival power's intelligence system getting wind of them.

So, although the committee succeeded in putting on record a convincing picture of the technical difficulties of detecting underground tests, the question of how great a risk there is of the Russians' actually carrying on testing after a ban remained essentially unanswered.

And the ultimate question of how great a risk the U.S. should be willing to undertake in return for the various advantages of a test ban was not dealt with at all.

The Drug Hearings: Kefauver Continues His Campaign

Senator Kefauver's lengthy exposé of the drug industry, now in its fifth month, continues to roll along.

Since December the senator has looked into the production and marketing of steroid hormones and tranquilizers, with time out to listen to critics, and occasionally defenders, of the industry at large. This week he was concentrating his attention on oral antidiabetics. Next month he plans to set to work on antibiotics.

The hearings have certainly been politically useful to Kefauver, who is up for re-election this year, and it can be assumed that they will be arranged to reach some sort of climax in June or July, whenever the senator feels the publicity will help him most in his 4 August primary, tantamount to election in Tennessee.

But, conceding this political usefulness, it is still difficult to dismiss the investigation as nothing more than an elaborate publicity stunt. Kefauver has won the support of the people who would normally have little in common with his politics, including, for example, such an eminent and widely respected exponent of free enterprise as Sen. Frank Lausche of Ohio. And, as a result of the hearings, the industry has drawn the critical attention of several of the leading magazines, beginning with a piece in *Life* ["Big pill to swallow" (15 Feb. 1960)].

A measure of the industry's uneasiness was indicated when *F-D-C- Reports* ("The Pink Sheet"), a confidential Washington newsletter serving the drug and cosmetics industries, took the unusual step of offering its subscribers a daily report on what Kefauver is doing. A good part of the weekly newsletter's space, recently, has been devoted to what it calls the "fallout" from the Kefauver hearings, most notably the empaneling of a grand jury in New York to look for antitrust violations within the industry. The grand jury investigation, according to the New York *Times*, "stems from testimony given in recent hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly" (that is, from the Kefauver Committee).

A One Man Show

The show is entirely Kefauver's. The senator, his hair now speckled with gray, is generally the only one of the eight committee members present at the hearings. He sits, virtually alone at the long committee table, a white knight supported by the committee's husky chief council, Paul Dixon, sitting at his right. Dixon asks most of the questions, with Kefauver stepping in occasionally, almost always to the discomfort of the witness if he is from the industry. (Representatives of the industry at large, or of individual companies, are clearly regarded as enemy, from whom the truth must be torn.)

Profits and Promotion

Except for possible antitrust violations, and even the most reputable companies occasionally run afoul of these laws, no one has suggested any serious wrong-doing on the part of the drug companies. The basic issue, rarely stated clearly by either side, seems to be whether the industry should be allowed to run itself as a normal business, or whether its special position justifies the federal government's taking steps to see that it is run as a public service.

The leading companies stand accused by the committee of making excessive profits (fourth highest among American industries, more than double the 11 percent average of all industries); of spending most of their heavy investment in research on studies that are of commercial rather than scientific value (that is, of putting most of their effort into developing profitable variations of available drugs as opposed to developing really new medicines); and of brainwashing the physicians by spending enormous amounts of money on promotion.

To take full advantage of their promotional effort and of their carefully cultivated, and normally thoroughly deserved, reputation for excellent quality control, the companies use a peculiar system of branding which successfully encourages doctors to write their prescriptions using individual company's trade name for a drug rather than the generic name. Few nonmedical readers would recognize a drug called meprobamate. But almost everyone has heard of Miltown and Equinil, which are the trade names under which Carter, the patent holder, and Wyeth, a licensee, sell meprobamate.

The public ends by paying, according to testimony before the committee, often three times or more money for a prescription specifying the trade name of a product than it would pay for the same prescription specifying only the generic name. In the case of patentable medicines, the price would be the same for the medicine under either the generic or trade name, since even if the patent holder licenses other companies to make the medicine there usually seems to be a tacit agreement to charge the same (high) price.

Presumably some lessening in the physicians' tendency to prescribe by

trade name will come as a result of the publicity generated by the hearings and the magazine articles. A modest move in this direction was even made by the AMA at its last convention, when a resolution was passed suggesting that doctors use generic names when prescribing for indigent patients.

A number of suggestions of what should be done have been made before the committee. The two that seem most likely to drastically change the situation are these:

1) Passage of a law giving the government effective supervision over drug manufacture, similar to that which has existed for many years in the meat packing industry. This, proponents say, would make doctors much more willing to prescribe by generic rather than brand name, since they would no longer have to rely on the specific company's reputation as the only clear guarantee of the potency and safety of its products.

2) Establishment of a program, perhaps run jointly by the Food and Drug Administration and the American Medical Association, to keep physicians informed on the relative value and price of new drugs. As things are now the physicians have no convenient index of information that would allow them to sort out the misleading from the meaningful messages among the barrage of promotion to which they are subject (about a pound of mail a day plus regular visits from the companies' "detail men").

The idea behind these and similar proposals is that they would bring about a decline in the purportedly excessive profits, pseudo research, and promotion, since the economic situation that brought these things into existence would be sharply altered.

There is not enough time left in this session of Congress to push through any strong legislation, even if Kefauver should offer such proposals, which he has not yet done.

Whatever legislation is offered, this year or later, will have to face determined opposition from the industry, probably supported by the American Medical Association, which has always worked very closely with the drug industry on legislative matters. Testifying before the committee last week, Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, never sounded more confident than when he assured Kefauver that when representatives of the AMA were called as witnesses they would endorse the industry's point of view.

In the past the AMA has tended to regard almost any increase in the government's activity in the medical field as another step on the road to socialized medicine. And the ultimate lines in this controversy can most usefully be drawn not between those who think drug prices are too high and those who do not, but between those who would be willing to see a substantial increase of federal activity in the medical field and those who are not so willing.

Regulations for Selection of Fulbright Scholars Changed

Last year's public concern about the standards and procedures for the selection of Fulbright scholars has resulted in significant changes in the rules promulgated by the President's Board of Foreign Scholarships. The regulations which caused difficulty and those that have replaced them are discussed in an article by Louis Joughin of the staff of the American Association of University Professors that appears in the spring issue of the *AAUP Bulletin.*

The new regulations provide that all evidence relating to the possible disloyalty of a candidate shall be turned over to law enforcement agencies for treatment similar to that given evidence relating to any other kind of possible felony. The board has thus denied itself opportunity to make informal inquiry about disloyalty and to apply, in this area, vague standards without responsibility under law.

Another procedural innovation relates to rejections, by the board's subcommittee on appointments, of candidates approved by the screening committees of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, who make the actual nominations. Henceforth a reversal of this sort will automatically result in review by the whole Board of Foreign Scholarships to consider all the facts.

Last year's rejection of Darwin specialist Bert Loewenberg of Sarah Lawrence College for a Fulbright lectureship particularly disturbed some of this country's scholars because his application had been highly endorsed and because a request had been received from scholars of Leeds University, in England, for his services during the Darwin centennial year. The Board of Foreign Scholarships, in response to public inquiry, said that disloyalty had not been a factor in its decision but gave no other explanation.

The article in the *AAUP Bulletin* points out three problems which have not been fully solved. First, the Board of Foreign Scholarships remains free to select candidates on the basis of their "potential contribution to the objectives of the program," as set forth in the board's policy statements. This vague standard permits the consideration of any kind of evidence that the board may regard as relevant, including evidence which is not academic, and even including some which might relate to "loyalty."

Second, the board continues to reserve the right to consider secret evidence which the screening committees have not seen. Third, since the function of the board is to make decisions about scholarly matters, it would seem desirable that its membership consist chiefly of persons who qualify in the first instance as distinguished scholars in the several fields of learning; this has not recently been the case, Joughin says.

In commenting on the situation, Joughin points out that his article could not have been written without the cooperation of officials in the State Department and the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, who made possible full and frank criticism of the program they administer.

AAAS Socio-Psychological Prize

Through the generosity of an anonymous donor, the AAAS offers an annual prize of $1000 for a meritorious essay in socio-psychological inquiry. Previous winners of this prize and the titles of their essays have been: Arnold M. Rose, "A theory of social organization and disorganization"; Yehudi A. Cohen, "Food and its vicissitudes: a cross-cultural study of sharing and nonsharing in sixty folk societies"; Herbert C. Kelman, "Compliance, identification, and internalization: a theoretical and experimental approach to the study of social influence"; Irving A. Taylor, "Similarities in the structure of extreme social attitudes"; and Stanley Schachter, "The psychology of affiliation."

Conditions of Competition

The conditions of competition for the prize to be awarded at the 1960 annual meeting, New York City, 26–31 December, are as follows:

1) The contribution should further