to print an article. They are handling that with different staffs and from different places. The effort is made to keep them totally separate.

Mr. SCHERAGO. Let me just say a word about the question that you asked relative to that.

Most of the business publishers who got into this business have lots of other publications in the trade area, that is, in skiing, restaurants, things like that. It is not considered unethical or out of the ordinary for advertisers to obtain editorial coverage in those journals, either by the publishing industry itself, or by the people who receive those publications. That is because the importance of accuracy is not as great as it is in the scientific or medical area. But these publishers pretty much see all advertising objectives as a trade area.

What has really happened is that they have made the scientific and medical field a trade area by their method of publishing. So, it depends on how you look at it as to whether or not it is bad publishing practice.

In other words, it is accepted in some areas, and, of course, in the scientific area it cannot be because unless you are assured that the material in there is accurate, there is no way that science can continue.

Mr. GORDON. What disturbs me is that a firm, a business firm, has to make money. If it advertises, you have to please the advertiser. So, if you are dependent to a large extent on advertising, how is it possible to be independent?

Mr. SCHERAGO. There are many commercial publishers who print and publish peer review journals. It is not a question of where the money comes from. It is a question of who controls the editorial. It is possible to place the control of that editorial in the hands of people who are not on the publication staff, who do not share in the revenue, and who do not have that incentive.

Mr. GORDON. You are saying that the old problem of "he who pays the piper calls the tune" does not apply?

Mr. SCHERAGO. Not in this case; not necessarily.

I am not saying that the opportunity for bribery, which is what we are talking about, is not always there. It is. But in the case of the societies, there are so many safeguards set up in peer review that it would be pretty difficult for that to happen. There is an editorial board which selects in general what types of articles go into the publication. So, you would have to get to them. That is usually—what—12 or 13 people? Then you would have to get to the reviewers which—again, I am not saying it could not happen. But I think it is much more unlikely that it would happen with the control of the editorial external from the publication.

Mr. GORDON. Well, look what happened to the New York Times.

Mr. SCHERAGO. You would give me an exception.

Mr. GORDON. Do you recall what happened to "The New York Times" as a result of printing something unfavorable to the industry?

As a result of publishing an article unfavorable to the drug industry, they lost $500,000 in advertising.

Senator NELSON. Their magazine only did. "The New York Times" did not.

Mr. GORDON. The New York Times Corporation did.

Senator NELSON. It was a publication owned by "The New York Times." "The New York Times" did not lose the advertising.