



## EDITORIALS

### FUND RAISING

Elsewhere in this issue appear two Committee reports that contain seemingly conflicting recommendations. The report of the Committee on Policies recommends that the Council reaffirm its opposition to general public fund raising by the national organization and its affiliates. Unanimous acceptance of this report by the Council on June 3, 1955, established this recommendation as the official, continuing policy of the American Diabetes Association.

The report of the Committee on Finance, on the other hand, recommends by majority vote favorable consideration of general public fund raising. This recommendation, when presented to the Council on June 3, 1955, was neither rejected nor accepted but referred instead to the Executive Committee for further study.

Failure of the Council to reject outright the recommendation of the Committee on Finance, which it logically might have done in view of its previous action, reveals that, while the majority are still opposed to general public fund raising, opinion is by no means unanimous.

The basic issue is whether a program of limited fund raising among "diabetics, their families and friends," approved by the Council in 1954, can provide the Association with even the modest financial resources that its activities require. The Council, for the present, is committed to this approach, and means of implementing it are being developed as rapidly as possible. If it fails, the movement toward general public fund raising, with its far-reaching implications for the future of this Association, will doubtless be accelerated. The subject will continue to receive the closest attention of the Council and its Committees with the help and advice of the Affiliates.

HENRY T. RICKETTS, M.D., *President*  
American Diabetes Association

### READER INTEREST SURVEY

DIABETES, *The Journal of the American Diabetes Association*, has now completed four years of publication. As with all new publications, it has had its share of trials and tribulations, but nevertheless steady progress and improvement have been made, and it is the con-

sensus of the publications committee and the editorial board that the *Journal* is a success. It has established itself as a publication which admirably meets the special needs of the members of the Association in whose interest it was conceived.

In order to make a broadly-based estimate of the progress of DIABETES and to re-evaluate its objectives and accomplishments, the Reader Interest Survey Questionnaire was mailed to all subscribers, both members and nonmembers of the American Diabetes Association. An unusually large and gratifying number of replies—almost 900—were received and have been carefully analyzed by a professional statistician. In addition, there have been innumerable suggestions for improvement of the *Journal*, including requests for special articles and departments. The many constructive criticisms received from members have been of great value to the committee and editors in planning the future course and development of the *Journal*.

Over 82 per cent of all readers who answered the questionnaire considered the *Journal* "good" to "excellent" in quality, with only 16 per cent rating it "average" or "poor." More readers think it is "good" than "excellent," however, 46 per cent scoring it "good" and 36 per cent "excellent." Over half the readers considered the balance about right between articles dealing with practical clinical matters and those concerned with experimental laboratory procedures and investigations. Over one-fourth of the readers complained that there were too many reports on experimental laboratory work, 28 per cent voting in this category. Only 3 per cent stated that the contents favored too many clinical problems. Four-fifths (81 per cent) considered the style satisfactory.

The department "Diabetes Abstracts" received the general vote of "good" from 40 per cent of the voters and 37 per cent regard it as "excellent"; 41 per cent voted editorials generally "good," and 37 per cent rated them "excellent." Biographical historical notes received a vote of "good" from 36 per cent and "excellent" from 27 per cent. Statistics were rated "good" by 36 per cent, with 21 per cent of the voters considering them "excellent." The organization section was rated "good" by 36 per cent, and "excellent" by 19 per