

of *Diseases of Children*, *Archives of Dermatology*, and *Archives of Internal Medicine*. The other seven operate at a loss, costing the AMA about \$575,000 a year. According to Hugh Hussey, editor of JAMA and chief of the association's journal-publishing endeavors, they are published "as a service to the profession." (JAMA, a weekly that goes to each of the AMA's members, brings in several million dollars in advertising revenues each year.)

Because of the end of free subscriptions, the fate of these ten specialty journals seems to be very much up in the air. None of the specialty editors reached by *Science* before this issue went to press had any clear notion of what the future holds. Nor did they know much about the business side of magazine publishing. "That is something I've just never had to worry about," one of them said, adding that no one expected his journal to go out

Table 1. AMA specialty journals and approximate circulations.

Journal	Circulation
<i>American Journal of Diseases of Children</i>	20,000
<i>Archives of Dermatology</i>	12,000
<i>Archives of Environmental Health</i>	9,000
<i>Archives of General Psychiatry</i>	18,000
<i>Archives of Internal Medicine</i>	53,000
<i>Archives of Neurology</i>	11,000
<i>Archives of Ophthalmology</i>	14,000
<i>Archives of Otolaryngology</i>	10,000
<i>Archives of Pathology</i>	10,000
<i>Archives of Surgery</i>	42,000

of existence right away, in any case. Each of the specialty journals has non-AMA subscribers who pay relatively low rates. One of them, for example, is only \$12 per year. In several cases, AMA members constitute 50 percent or more of the journal's readership.

According to AMA officials, there

will be a major drive to convert members who have been getting the journals free to subscribing readers, but no one really knows whether that will work. If about half of them are willing to support the pay-as-you-go plan, the AMA will break even.

The elimination of complimentary subscriptions to specialty journals naturally brings up the question of the AMA's commitment to its scientific mission and to the academic side of medicine. Some members see this move as a "denigration of medicine," in spite of official assurances to the contrary. There has been little reaction to the journal-cutting move so far, probably because most members have yet to be informed that it happened. Those who deplore this route to economy find it particularly hard to take in light of the fact that the AMA is about to publish a new magazine called *Prism*, a monthly that will be sent free to all dues-paying members.

NAS Members Appeal on Behalf of Soviet Colleagues

In a highly unusual, politically tinged gesture, members of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) have sent two letters to the president of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. urging that Soviet scientists be allowed to pursue their work, to travel to scientific meetings, and to emigrate without hindrance from their government.

One letter, addressed to Soviet academy president M. V. Keldysh, was sent on 24 October, soon after a meeting with Keldysh in Washington at which NAS president Philip Handler made a forceful presentation in behalf of the right of Soviet scientists to emigrate. The letter, composed by Rochester University chemist Jacob Bigeleisen, was circulated to the 950 members of the NAS. It was signed by 413 of them, and endorsements continue to come in, says Bigeleisen.

The other letter, sent on 31 October and signed by 42 NAS mathematicians, was designed to appeal to the professional instincts of Keldysh, who is himself a mathematician. Oscar Zariski, a Harvard University mathematician, initiated this effort on the urgings of colleagues in Israel.

Since the letters were not official NAS pronouncements, neither bore the signature of Handler, vice president George B. Kistiakowsky, or foreign secretary Harrison Brown.

Bigeleisen noted that the letters were "rather extraordinary" gestures for a group of NAS members to make. They are not unprecedented, however—members have also gotten together to express their views on the Vietnam war.

The letters reflect growing concern among U.S. scientists about the way the Soviet Union is treating those of

its scientists, most of them Jewish, who are trying to leave the country. The Bigeleisen letter was inspired particularly by the case of Soviet physicist V. G. Levich (*Science*, 23 June).

There has been some question as to whether noise from other countries would help or hurt the cause of beleaguered Russian intellectuals. Outsiders are convinced now that the Soviet government has become more sensitive to world opinion. To exploit this, Harrison Brown has been discussing with leaders of European scientific academies the possibility of launching an international appeal asking that Soviet scientists be allowed to travel and emigrate freely.

The following is the text of the letter to Keldysh signed by 413 academy members:

In your address to our Academy on 17 October 1972 you stressed the importance which you, the Soviet Academy, and the U.S.S.R. attach to international cooperation in science. The agreements reached in Washington will increase the exchange of scientific information and personnel between our countries.

Our goals are the free exchange of scientific information and personnel in all areas of science. To achieve these goals, scientists must be free to:

- 1) pursue scientific investigations,
- 2) publish the results of their investigations,
- 3) travel to scientific congresses,
- 4) emigrate from their country of residence when the above rights are encumbered.

We, the undersigned individuals, members of the United States National Academy of Sciences, uphold these rights of all scientists. We are deeply concerned that a number of Soviet scientists are currently being denied these rights and their freedom as scientists. We call upon you to transmit our concern to your government and to the members of your Academy. We call upon the members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences to support the four freedoms of science.—C.H.