



journals less valid than your desire to publish more manuscripts? Is my inability to add yet another journal any more culpable than your decision to set aside a good manuscript because your printing budget won't allow it? Editors of new journals may not have this problem. The editor of any established journal ought to be concerned if he doesn't.

Some of our editorial board members prefer that we wait two years before we cover a new journal in CC. They argue that it is usually easy for a new journal to pick up a few good papers for inaugural issues. Later it becomes tougher to maintain high quality. If the new journal maintains quality or achieves significance its articles will be cited. Under ordinary circumstances, we should find evidence of this in our *Journal Citation Reports*. If the journal's quality is poor, it generally won't get cited.

But will good material really be cited, whether or not it's covered in CC? If yes, then why is CC coverage so imperative? Thus begins a vicious circle. We really don't know whether citation by workers on the immediate research front is affected by CC listings. (Evidence for self-citation within an invisible college should become evident in *JCR*<sup>™</sup>). Nor do we know whether wide reprint distribution, because of CC listing, affects long-term citation patterns. One Latin-American journal editor has informed me that it does, since previously his authors were not cited. We might someday do a controlled experiment to measure the citation impact of a journal before and after its addition to CC. It might lend support to the intuition that wide reprint distribution does indeed increase use and citation.

But all such discussion inevitably returns to the question of economics. One does not have to be a die-hard

Marxist to admit the importance of economics in history. Unless the scientific community assigns its highest priority to scientific information, publication, dissemination, etc., we shall continue to be forced to make choices based in part on economics. The "inevitability" of the 14% increase predicted by Anderla demands even greater selectivity. Information without selection or control will be a mere chaos of facts.

I do not like the power that has been vested, or imputed, to me to "control" the destiny of journals, especially small and new ones, because of CC's success. It imposes an unwelcome responsibility.

If you hear that CC has "buckled in" and responded to the pleas of some editor who has been willing to defray the coverage and indexing costs for a limited period of time, do not conclude that we have in any way lessened our standards of selection. Our policy on these "less important" journals remains to ask for a subsidy for a limited time, after which we will cover the journal as any other. We reserve the right to drop any journal, or to switch its coverage to a more appropriate edition of CC. While some of you may not realize it, the latter decision simply means we have shifted the burden of added costs to you the subscriber. Our subscribers pay for CC coverage. We can make their payment as equitable as possible by enlisting more subscribers or increasing our efficiency of production. I think there is evidence that we have consistently done both.

1. Anonymous. Big growth ahead in technical information. *C&E News*, 23 April 1973, p. 7.
2. Garfield, E. The new *ISI*® *Journal Citation Reports* should significantly affect the future course of scientific publication. *Current Contents*® No. 33, 15 August 73, p. 5-6.