

14414 COMPETITIVE PROBLEMS IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY

We have all witnessed with dismay the spectacle of important new scientific information falling on deaf ears -- or, worse, remaining unspoken at all. Time and time again, the objective of research -- benefit to the consumer public -- has been frustrated as the communications abort. The disparity between our operant knowledge of communications and its application is crippling and, finally, intolerable. You are well aware of the frustrations of the congress as it surveyed H. E. W. 's efforts in technology transfer.

That is why I ventured into the world of communications to see if there were elements we have been overlooking in our efforts to implement the health information we possess. The answer to my inquiry is resoundingly positive. A brief overview of the technology transfer process of biomedical research communications points them up.

There seem to be two factors which necessitate taking a fresh look at how effectively biomedical communications (technology transfer) are conducted. One is the fact of the sheer volume of information now being generated -- many thousands of discrete items per year. The other is the fact that many of these findings now require the active cooperation, often times necessitating a reversal of long-term practice, attitudes and behavior, not only of health professionals but of the public at large in order to become beneficial. A pair of communications tasks are then manifest: sensitive priorities and persuasive messages. The two tasks are inextricably intertwined, at each of three stages of communication between 1) scientist and scientist; 2) scientist and practitioner; 3) and scientist/practitioner and the public.