

Senator NELSON. Mr. Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. Dr. Pillard, why hasn't there been more initiative on the part of the doctors to stop this type of promotion?

Dr. PILLARD. It has kind of come upon us insidiously over the years. As I say, psychopharmacology is a young field. I think many physicians now are very concerned. I think that our level of interest in this is now going to rise. Of course, there is also the possibility of such conflicts of interest—I noted with dismay that the editor of our professional journal, Dr. Francis Braceland, is also consulting editor for Medical World News. He is a distinguished physician, and I don't mean to criticize him, but I consider that a conflict of interest. Whether or not he is paid, his heart belongs to this journal, the American Journal of Psychiatry, the official journal of the American Psychiatric Association.

Senator NELSON. And what else was he?

Dr. PILLARD. Assistant editor on the editorial board of the Medical World News—the editorial advisory board.

Mr. GORDON. How can the individual doctor act along these lines? Wouldn't he have to be organized? Apparently the other organizations, the other existing medical organizations, don't seem to be doing anything about it. How do you think doctors can do this except to organize to achieve their objectives?

Dr. PILLARD. I think if they devote themselves strongly to the American Psychiatric Association or to their district medical societies something would be done. What dismays me is that we have so little voice—for example, in the American Medical Association there is no chance for the doctor even to vote on the delegates that he sends to the house of delegates. So I don't know what it is going to take to wake up those sleepwalkers.

Senator NELSON. I think you have made a number of excellent points. One of them, the objectivity of the editorial position of the magazine that is accepting drug advertising, I think, is demonstrated in a number of ways. We have not yet checked all the publications, but as was pointed out yesterday, the most comprehensive evaluation of prescription drugs ever done in the history of this country or any country was the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council efficacy study under the 1962 statute, the Kefauver amendment. Save for the New England Journal, which is the only medical publication we have found thus far that has made a comprehensive presentation of the National Academy's recommendation on fixed combination antibiotics—they printed it in full—we noticed that the medical press simply makes reference to it. Yet, in some of these publications we find letters from doctors attacking extensively the report of the National Academy.

It seems to me that there isn't any question as to what is happening. They don't want to run criticisms of drugs which they carry in their advertising. As a matter of fact, after the National Academy made the recommendation that all these fixed combinations of antibiotics be taken off the market, the Journal of the American Medical Association has continued carrying an ad for Panalba.

It seems to me, on its face, it raises a serious question about the objectivity of the journal.