

"implementing equally unique control solutions not authorized by Congress." Problems of illegal diversion were the responsibility of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), it added.

FDA general counsel Peter Hutt says the court's decision is just plain "wrong." He says the court ignored the fact that nothing in the 1970 law is supposed to be construed to limit the FDA's authority under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, which clearly allows the FDA to set conditions for the safe use of a drug.

If FDA's appeal of the ruling fails, the agency could keep its regulations intact by withdrawing approval for methadone as an analgesic. In any case, Hutt doesn't think problems of diversion could again become as serious as they were because of new monitoring procedures and tighter enforcement of existing laws. Also, an amendment added in May to the Controlled Substances Act (which applies to methadone) gives the DEA more muscle in enforcing prohibitions against illegal prescription-writing by requiring that doctors dealing with drugs for detoxification and maintenance undergo special separate registration with the DEA. When methadone is used for analgesia, it is prescribed in far smaller dosages than those for heroin addicts; therefore, any unregistered doctor writing prescriptions for massive amounts of methadone would stand out like a sore thumb. Perito points out, though, that tracking down violations as they occur is far more inefficient than preventing them in the first place.

For the APhA, though, the matter is chiefly one of principle—"Peter's principle," according to its executive director William H. Apple (referring to Hutt)—which goes as follows: "Anything Congress has not said the FDA can't do they can do."

The APhA's position is that violations of the law are the responsibility of law enforcement and not of regulatory agencies, and it regards attempts by the FDA to prevent illegal drug use through administrative rulings as a serious threat to the rights of doctors and pharmacists to exercise their professional discretion. The FDA asserts it has clear responsibility to impose such limitations in cases where drugs could be subjected to unsafe use.

Until the extent of FDA's jurisdiction is clarified, which may have to be done by congressional action, it looks as though that agency is in for a protracted era of conflict with the pharmacists.—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Briefing

Federation of Scientists Plans "Great Leap Forward"

The 28-year-old Federation of American Scientists (FAS), which calls itself the country's only scientific lobbying society, is planning a "great leap forward," according to its director Jeremy Stone. In addition to its traditional preoccupation with the arms race, and its more recent concern with the rights of scientists, the FAS intends to develop staff expertise in three new areas: environment-energy, medicine-public health, and development-population-food supply. The society also wants to build its 3-year-old educational arm, the FAS Fund, into an in-depth source of information for scientists on matters relating to science and society.

To make all this possible, Stone needs \$1 million for the Fund. To get it, he plans to travel around the country this summer talking to millionaires. The money is to be used to endow a modestly paid position in each of the three new fields, to be occupied by three retired scientists.

The FAS has already bought a new house with aid from its members, and plans to expand its three-person staff to around 10, including a scientist-lawyer. The FAS is concerned with scientists' rights to speak their minds without fear of reprisals from their employers, says Stone. If it is going to encourage scientists in this direction, the society also wants to be able to offer them legal advice and protection.

The FAS now puts out two newsletters, its *Public Interest Report* (part of the lobbying arm), and its *Professional Bulletin*. The latter will eventually be expanded into a monthly magazine. Stone even talks of acquiring the financially beleaguered *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*.

The FAS spends some \$90,000 a year on lobbying activities. Stone wants to hire three more lobbyists in the environment, health, and food areas who can approach Congress and government agencies with expertise comparable to that which Stone himself possesses in defense matters. If the endowment is successfully accumulated, the FAS Fund will be able to spend a comparable sum on its educational activities. Thus will the FAS achieve a true comple-

mentarity, says Stone, with lobbying pursuits acting as a "transmission belt" of information from the scientific community to Congress, and the Fund supplying an equally active belt carrying informed analyses of federal goings-on back to scientists.—C.H.

Soviet Seminar Visas Denied: Moscow Organizers Arrested

The Soviet government appears to be using the crude tactic of locking up or threatening dissident scientists who are planning a scientific seminar which will coincide with President Nixon's visit to Moscow this week (*Science*, 28 June). Alexander Voronel, who is the principal organizer of the meeting scheduled to begin 1 July, has been arrested and released twice by Soviet plainclothes police. Usually reliable sources also report that other seminar organizers, most of whom have lost their official scientific jobs after applying to emigrate to Israel, have been arrested: Mark Azbel, Victor Brailovsky, Alexander Lerner, Alexander Lunts, and Dmitri Ram. Another seminar organizer, Vitaly Rubin, has been threatened with prosecution for treason if he continues to organize the seminar, which is apparently still scheduled. Authorities also locked up dissenters during the President's 1972 Moscow visit, but these latest arrests are described by Western correspondents in Moscow as more extensive than those of 1972.

Meanwhile, both American and British scientists who had applied to go to Moscow for the dissident scientists' seminar have learned that the Soviet government has effectively denied their visa applications. To protest this, a group of American scientists, including some Nobel laureates, tried unsuccessfully to see Henry Kissinger during his Washington stopover.

More protests are being launched: the tone of them was indicated by Sylvan Schweber of Brandeis University who said in a statement: "[A]rbitrary Soviet actions . . . will surely affect the willingness of Western scientists to attend scientific conferences in Soviet Russia and to enter into cooperative scientific enterprises with the USSR."

—D.S.