

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 wit-

nesses 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 non-sharing 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