

depending on whether ads are grouped. Most society journals are stacked and all Throw Aways are interspersed.

Another prime reason for the popularity of Throw Aways with advertisers, is that they can understand the articles in them. In general non-scientists cannot believe that anyone would read articles written in Scholarly style which is perceived by advertisers as dull and uninteresting. One other selling advantage is the fact that society journals usually have drab and uncolorful formats while Throw Aways make ample use of graphics, color and artwork to make their journals more attractive. So it is easy to see that in the classic sense of providing the customer with what he wants, Throw Aways have done a much better job of giving the advertiser what he wants. Scholarly journals have concentrated on the other hand, on giving the scientific and medical community what it needs. It is interesting to note that in virtually every case, where Throw Aways are competing with society journals for advertising, the society journal was in existence long before the Throw Away. Usually, it was the Scholarly Journals' volume of advertising which accumulated because there were no other journals in the field, that attracted the Throw Away in the first place. History has shown that every time a controlled circulation enters a field served by a Learned Journal, it syphons off advertising.

In some cases this produces disastrous results. One respected chemical journal has lost over 50% of its advertising revenue to two Throw Aways. It is common practice in the Journal field to make scientists pay to have their papers published in a scientific journal. This is especially true in the case of journals having little or no advertising revenue. It is an interesting paradox that some scientists are paying to have their papers published while buying supplies and equipment from firms who support that journal's Throw Away competition. For the last 10 years, the business publishers have used their Association to put pressure on the Internal Revenue Service to force societies to pay tax on their advertising. In 1969, the IRS established new guide lines which have resulted in many societies having to pay taxes on advertising revenue.

Thus, the society uses money to pay taxes that otherwise would go to publish more scientific information. The paradox here is almost ludicrous. On the one hand, the government creates a non-profit status for scientific societies so that continued scientific excellence will be assured, and then turns around and takes away a substantial portion of its money in taxes. The business publishers have insisted that the tax free status of societies constitutes unfair competition. They say this even though the society was here first and, as we have seen, there is no way the Scholarly Journal can compete effectively against the Throw Away. In Dr. Crout's testimony, he listed for you twenty eight publications which have circulations of seventy thousand or more. Of these publications only two employed the Peer Review system. I have included in the appendix a list of the same publications, indicating also, the total advertising billings of these publications for the year 1975. These 28 Throw Away publications billed over \$60,000,000 in advertising revenue. One wonders how much important scientific information could have been published in Peer Review Journals with that amount of money.

It is time now for the Congress to address itself to this problem, for without legislative assistance, I believe that our system of Scholarly Publications may become extinct. Obviously, any legislative relief must be governed by our tradition of Freedom of the Press. However, I do not believe that such freedom was meant to be used where it so obviously adversely affects the best interests of our society. We must preserve the Peer Review system, if science is to survive. Here then are some remedies which this committee might consider:

1. Encourage the Congress to repeal the tax code provision which requires associations to pay tax on their advertising.
2. Require vendors of products used by scientists or medical doctors, who are buying such products with Federal Funds to confine the advertising of such products to publications employing Peer Review techniques. Such a regulation would not exclude commercial publications for the market place, for they also can use the Peer Review System.
3. Make it illegal for any publisher who distributes his publication to scientists or medical doctors working with Federal Funds to engage in the direct exchange of editorial coverage for advertising.

Thank you again for allowing me to present my views. I sincerely hope they will be helpful.