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Was There Really a Popular Science “Boom”?

Bruce V. Lewenstein

Two popular science magazines died in the summer of 1986: Science 86 and Science Digest. Along with a host of contemporaries founded around 1979 and 1980, these magazines regularly drew the attention of scientists and journalists concerned about the “public understanding of science.” As the magazines suffered their death throes, commentators both mourned the demise and anguished over the cause of death. The proximate cause was usually identified as a lack of advertising support—but this diagnosis does not do justice to the richness of the record surrounding the birth, life, and death of the “science boom” of the early 1980s.

In this essay, I will sketch the outlines of a history of “popular science” in this period—that is, those newspapers, magazines, and television shows directed at audiences without a professional need for information about science. For such productions, entertainment is a major goal. They also tend to be non-discriminatory in their selection of topics—including technology, applied science, medicine, and health all under the rubric of “science.”

My goal in writing this account is to point to several recurring themes and areas needing further research. My research is based primarily on published sources and telephone interviews up through Fall 1986. Future scholars will have access to a much richer documentary record, and subsequent events may have further elaborated my story.

The Rise of the “Science Boom”

Was there a science boom? As the figures in Tables 1, 2, and 3 show, 15 magazines, 18 newspaper sections, and 17 television shows devoted to popular science first appeared between 1977 and 1984. Although similar publications and television shows did exist before 1977, this seemed an unprecedented number of new productions, especially in the newspaper and television fields.

Contemporary observers—focusing on the new magazines—early defined the activity as a “boom.” Daniel Greenberg, wrote in Science et al. Government Report in 1979 that “Scientific magazines [are] bursting out all over.” Time, in a 1980 cover story on Carl Sagan, said that “ennui” about popular science “has turned into enthusiasm.” A 1980 newsletter from the Scientists’ Institute for Public Information SIPIscope, carried the front-page headline “Suddenly, it’s science!” Columbia Journalism Review observed in 1981 “Science hits the newsstand.” Even academic journals (such as Science, Technology, and Human Values) published special issues “on public communication of science and technology.”

Most exciting to the observers—and most important for understanding cries about the ultimate “collapse” of the science boom—several of the new ventures breached the wall between productions directed at specific audiences (such as the members of the New York Academy of Sciences, or aficionados of astronomy) and ones intended for mass consumption by a general audience whose members held nothing in common but their supposed interest in science. On CBS, “Walter Cronkite’s Universe,” for example, brought a series of science shows (instead of one-time specials) to prime-time commercial network television, and
Table 1. Television series, ongoing in the United States.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>First shown</th>
<th>Last shown</th>
<th>Where shown</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL TELEVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>cable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mister Wizard's World</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>cable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omni</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>550,000 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>CNN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Walter Cronkite’s Universe”</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC TELEVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>WNET/PBS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Peace with Nature</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>WKRC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specials</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton’s Apple</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWL/TV</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planet Earth</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Notes</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>KQED</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian World</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1 Contact</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEAVILY SUBSIDIZED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How About . . .</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>syndicated</td>
<td>10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Scene</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>syndicated</td>
<td>5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science TV Report</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>syndicated</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The following tables include magazines, television shows, the newspaper sections devoted to popular science. The lists are intended to be inclusive though not exhaustive; I have tried to list most things that might reasonably be considered part of the popular science boom. I have left out magazines and television shows devoted solely to medicine and health. Sources: Ayer’s/IMS Guide to Periodicals and Standard Rate and Data Service, Consumer Magazine and Agri-Media, various editions; Jerome, “Suddenly, it’s science!” p. 4; Jerome, “Newspaper Science Sections,” p. 10; Fred Jerome, ed., “Science in the video age,” SIPScope 14 (January–February 1986): 1–13, esp. insert between pp. 8 and 9. For additional information, see Jerome, “Science in the media”; Jerome, “Death of the Universe”; and “Science in the mass media: A selected guide,” in Friedman et al., Scientists and Journalists. [n/a = data not available]

attracted an audience of tens of millions; media commentators hailed the rescue of science from the relative ghetto of public television. The American Association for the Advancement of Science’s Science 80, Time Inc.’s Discover, and the Hearst Corporation’s Science Digest all targeted general consumers—the people that advertisers selling cars, electronic equipment, books, liquor, and other so-called “high ticket” items most wanted to reach. One study called the science magazines “the general interest magazines of a new age.”

Why did popular science break through to this new audience in the late 1970s? Although a definite answer will require a more detailed historical analysis, I can suggest a few points to consider. First, there was a general, social precondition: the maturing of the World War II baby boom. As the first generation of middle- and upper-class workers uniformly educated in science and technology, the baby-boomers provided a ready audience for popular science. “This generation,” said Allen Hammond, founder and editor of Science 80 (later 81, 82, etc.), “having grown up with Sputnik, the environmental movement, the War on Cancer, the Space Program and the energy crisis, has come upon an information vacuum. The result is an explosive hunger for more information on science and technology.” Other publishers, concerned
more with the opportunities that the popular science magazines presented for selling advertising, put the same point slightly differently: "Boy, we're going to get this great elite market of young, upwardly mobile people who are interested in science." 

Second, magazine publishers and advertising agencies were seeking all types of magazines that appealed to well-defined audiences. The 1970s had seen the rise of "specialty" magazines, targeted at specific groups. Such magazines as *Sail*, *Ski*, and the various "city" or "regional" magazines (Philadelphia, *The Washingtonian*, Texas Monthly, etc.) provided advertisers with a means of getting the most effective exposure for their sales pitches; they allowed companies to direct advertising at the audiences most likely to be interested in their products. The science magazines, it was presumed, would offer another such audience, although few publishers considered precisely what products might be sold uniquely to the readers of science magazines.

And, finally, "pack journalism" may have played a role. A regular theme in journalism literature is the frequency with which journalists, whose cultural values include a commitment to independence and inquiry, follow each other around to the same stories. This tendency has been especially noted among science journalists. Boyce Rensberger, an award-winning science writer who has worked for *The New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and *Science* 83, wrote that "the current surge of media attention to science is the result of a bandwagon effect." Rae Goodell, writing in 1981, argued that the new television series were "inspired in part by the early success of the new science magazines." A string of newspaper editors cited *The New York Times* "Science Times" section and the early successes of the science magazines to justify their own new science sections.

Science journalists themselves recognized that they were in some ways responsible for the perception of a "boom." Edward Edelson, New York *Daily News* science editor, noted that "science writers have always been intense examiners of their own navels. Now they have large numbers of observers looking over their shoulders to help in the examination." 

In addition to these general trends, two specific items seem worth mentioning. First, several major news stories of the last decade were "science" stories—for example, the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, *The Progressive Magazine*'s attempt to publish an article on the construction of an H-bomb, Mount St. Helens, Love Canal, and the "superfund" for environmental clean-up. Second, many of the new ventures were started by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Date started</th>
<th>Circulation av. (1984)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
<td>Sci-Tech</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Tribune</td>
<td>Tomorrow</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Post</td>
<td>Newsience</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Citizen-Journal</td>
<td>Medico One</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Dispatch</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Appeal [Memphis]</td>
<td>Future Currents</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>281,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Morning News</td>
<td>Discoveries</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>328,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td>Science/New Tech</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>635,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit News</td>
<td>Science/Computers</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>651,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe and Mail [Toronto]</td>
<td>Science/Medicine</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal-News [Rockland County, NY]</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
<td>Science/Medicine</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>Science Times</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsday</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregonian [Portland]</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Dealer [Cleveland]</td>
<td>Science-Health</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>493,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Mercury News</td>
<td>Science &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Science and technology magazines published in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date founded</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1981</th>
<th>1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASS CIRCULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>8,990,341</td>
<td>10,560,885</td>
<td>10,449,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Popular Science</td>
<td>1,780,330</td>
<td>1,913,879</td>
<td>1,804,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Psychology Today</td>
<td>1,026,872</td>
<td>1,171,362</td>
<td>862,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
<td>867,620</td>
<td>1,890,466</td>
<td>2,172,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>954,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Human Nature</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Human Behavior</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Omni</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>865,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Science &amp; Living Tomorrow</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Science 80/86</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>720,419 (cp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Science Digest</td>
<td>150,611</td>
<td>152,583</td>
<td>590,634 (cp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Science News</td>
<td>97,297</td>
<td>177,505</td>
<td>160,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Sciences [The]</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Scientific American</td>
<td>612,920</td>
<td>705,124</td>
<td>654,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>82,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>104,919</td>
<td>135,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>31,213</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>SciQuest</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Sky &amp; Telescope</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>High Technology</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Technology Illustrated</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Technology Review</td>
<td>50,790</td>
<td>62,968</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE AND EXPLORATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Audubon</td>
<td>257,331</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>379,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>358,713</td>
<td>460,896</td>
<td>496,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>332,442</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>297,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE-ORIENTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Futurist</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a Next</td>
<td></td>
<td>np</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>cp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] I have arbitrarily put magazines with circulations of over 1,000,000 in a separate category, as economic considerations make them compete with nonscience magazines in different ways. (b) Chemistry, an ACS publication, was replaced by SciQuest. (c) Several of these magazines changed format in the late 1970s, and began to seek advertising in the same market where the popular science magazines were competing. I have included Science Digest, The Sciences, and Sierra in my count of magazines that "first" appeared in the late 1970s or early 1980s. [n/a = data not available; np = not yet published; cp = ceased publication]

members of the journalism community. Although the scientific community quickly (and apparently enthusiastically) supported the popular science projects, it did not initiate them. Discover was started by veteran Time science editor Leon Jaroff. "Walter Cronkite's Universe" and NBC's "Quest" both came from television network news staffs. Science 80, though published by AAAS, was produced by Allen Hammond, an editor on the staff of Science, and Eric Schrier, a journalist.9
Fall of the “Science Boom”

As the science boom started in the early 1980s, its prospects looked good. *Science 80* quickly shot past its original estimate of 300,000 circulation and hovered around 700,000. *Omni* and *Discover* also regularly sold over 750,000 copies. With each copy read by an average of between 2.0 and 3.7 people (according to some, however, disputed measures), around 3.5 million people were apparently regularly reading about science. On television, “Walter Cronkite’s Universe” regularly received a 10 rating (considered acceptable for a magazine-format show), implying that more than 13 million people were watching each program.10

Even as the euphoria peaked in 1981 and 1982, however, signs of trouble appeared. Several magazines, such as *Technology* and *SciQuest*, folded. Television network executives killed both “Walter Cronkite’s Universe” and ABC’s “Omni” (produced by the magazine of the same name.). *SIPScope* observed that the failures “raised serious questions about the future of science and technology coverage by the mass media.”11

But the science writing community refused to believe the signs of trouble, preferring to stay on the boom bandwagon. *SIPScope* observed that the failures “raised serious questions about the future of science and technology coverage by the mass media.”11

Even as the euphoria peaked in 1981 and 1982, however, signs of trouble appeared. Several magazines, such as *Technology* and *SciQuest*, folded. Television network executives killed both “Walter Cronkite’s Universe” and ABC’s “Omni” (produced by the magazine of the same name.). *SIPScope* observed that the failures “raised serious questions about the future of science and technology coverage by the mass media.”11

But the science writing community refused to believe the signs of trouble, preferring to stay on the boom bandwagon. *SIPScope* observed that the failures “raised serious questions about the future of science and technology coverage by the mass media.”11

By 1983, the major television networks were no longer producing science series; the science boom consisted primarily of the magazines and, increasingly, newspapers. With the frenzy of creation on a nationwide scale over, the field became somewhat better defined. Although individual observers constructed different lists, three mass-circulation, general science magazines appeared consistently: *Science 80*, *Science Digest*, and *Discover*.15

From 1984 on, advertising revenue began to drop, however, in large part because personal computer manufacturers cut back their advertising budgets in response to a general industry slump. By 1985, publishers of the three general science magazines recognized that they were in serious trouble. *Discover* fired both its business and editorial staffs and brought in new blood from Time Inc.’s *Sports Illustrated*. *Science Digest* tried to “reposition” itself as a “men’s” magazine. (Positioning is the art of convincing advertisers that a magazine’s audience meets certain criteria. *Science Digest*’s goal was to present its readers as the type of male, high-spending, young professionals many advertisers seek.)16

Such drastic measures failed, however, to stem the financial bleeding. In Spring 1986, Time Inc. signaled, by offering to buy *Science 86*, that it was willing to commit more money. AAAS recognized that it could not match Time’s resources and sold out for between $5 and $7 million. Hearst, struggling along in third place, sold out for $2 million when its managers realized that Time (which had a reputation for accepting millions of dollars of losses before its projects made a profit) would be willing to buy out the competition. The industry “shakeout” periodically predicted since 1981 had hit, and *Science 86* and *Science Digest* died. The media reports were dramatic: Paul Zuckerman, an
executive at the New York advertising agency Doyle Dane Bernbach, told the Philadelphia Inquirer, "The science magazines didn't shake out. They fell apart."

Although only two magazines actually died, observers could no longer retreat to optimism. The boom was over, its death recorded—and thus proclaimed—by the Washington Post (which covered Science 86's closing party on its society page), The New York Times, and other national media. Commentators began to propose explanations.

The Publishing Tripod

Because the deaths occurred among the magazines, most of the immediate analyses addressed a traditional publishing metaphor: the three-legged stool. According to this image, a publication is supported by three legs: advertising support, circulation (that is, readers), and editorial content. Although the balance among these legs may vary (an academic journal, for example, receives a much higher portion of its support from its readers than does a weekly newsmagazine), the legs of the tripod must all be present for a publication to succeed. This metaphor is helpful, not only for understanding how participants saw the issues, but also for drawing out some broader themes.

Advertising: The easy culprit

Many analyses attributed the failure of Science 86 and Science Digest to the two-year decline in advertising revenue. As advertising fell, the argument ran, publishers who had structured their projects in the expectation of receiving profits faced the prospect of sustaining massive losses. To survive, they either had to seek new capital or kill their projects before the losses became too great.

"The magazines depended on computer and business advertising, which went through the floor," said Robert Cohen, a New York magazine consultant and publisher of the short-lived Technology. "Consumer advertisers were also pulling back," so the science magazines were "hit from both sides." Science 86 had lost 50% of its advertising revenues over the previous two years. Science Digest showed a similar loss over the 1985–1986 period. Because of a generally poor advertising market, publishers could not predict when a turnaround might occur.18

Most observers, but not all, attributed the advertising woes to an oversupply of magazines and an undersupply of advertisers. "Three or four consumer magazines were going after the same market," said Richard LePere, a Washington, DC, magazine consultant. "There was definitely a market out there—two million people were willing to plunk down their money."19 Advertising executive Paul Zuckerman put more blame on the magazines themselves:

It was too difficult to pick among the magazines. There was no separation. In the early days, I asked someone at Science Digest what the difference was between his magazine, Discover, and Science 86. He said, 'Read them and find out for yourself.' That's when I pulled up the drawbridge. That's his job and he didn't know.

But Zuckerman also pointed to another issue: the inability of the magazines to specify how their audiences could uniquely serve advertisers.

We, the advertisers, couldn't read what was in the so-called 'science category.' It had no unique niche. You have to meet a marketing need and they didn't do that. They were trying to force us into a category and we didn't understand it. So we turned them off.20

This ability of advertisers to "turn off" editorially successful magazines suggested to some observers the need to look beyond immediate advertising problems to provide a better explanation of the fall of the science boom. As Dorothy Nelkin points out, "Public communication of science or anything else depends on soap, or cigarettes, or automobile advertising." Nelkin, who was on the AAAS board that approved the sale of Science 86, charged that "the public is really getting shortchanged."21

Others, like Allen Hammond, believed that "the way advertising is sold is a real part of the problem." Hammond was particularly upset about "syndicated research," the survey-derived marketing information used by many advertisers to select appropriate magazines for their ads. In syndicated research, he said, "they send surveyors out across the country . . . . And they flash logos in front of people. 'Do you recognize this one? Do you recognize this one?' Based on the results, they project actual readership. It's all plugged into the com-
puter. If you want to reach males, 30–40, with a
certain income, just print out the top 15. If you’re
not in that list, they don’t want to talk with you.”
But the system, he believes, is biased in favor of
magazines seen widely in supermarkets, barber-
shops, and high-traffic newsstands.
Different elements of syndicated research also
drew an attack, especially the numbers on “read-
ers per copy,” an area where science magazines
fared poorly. Unlike many mass circulation maga-
zines, which are passed from one reader to the
next, the science magazines tended to be kept for
reference or future use. Gerald Hotchkiss, a former
publisher of Science Digest, said that “media
hype” helped “invite a television mentality of
buying. Size [circulation] and reach [readers per
copy] took the place of . . . [aiming at] influenc-
ing a limited group of people who have the real power
and influence over sales.”

The advertising community defended syndi-
cated research, pointing to the benefits it brought
to commercial magazine publishing. “In the old
days, we had the ‘selective’ publications: The New
Yorker, Harper’s, Atlantic, and Saturday Review,”
said Zuckerman. But that label, beyond providing
a vague sense of “culture” or “class,” did little to
help advertisers seeking particular audiences.
“Now we’re into lifestyles. We threw the shotgun
away, we use a rifle. We want specific people, not
households.”

The debate about syndication reveals the ten-
sion between economic and intellectual goals in
magazine publishing. Few magazines of Zucker-
man’s “selective” category have survived un-
sathed in recent years: The New Yorker, Atlantic
have been sold to new owners, and Harper’s
survives only with a substantial subsidy from the
MacArthur Foundation.

The popular science magazines may, in fact,
have brought the troubles on themselves. Proponents like Hammond argued that treating science
as a commodity did not serve the interests of the
public. The nature of magazine publishing sug-
gests that, by looking for advertising support,
Hammond and other journalists creating popular
science magazines had been the ones to claim that
science was a commodity.

Circulation: A less obvious problem

Circulation is the second part of the magazine
publishing tripod—and some analysts suggested
that the problems of the popular science maga-
zines lay there. Publishers can achieve virtually
any level of circulation by giving away subscrip-
tions in special deals and spending millions of
dollars to force magazines into newsstand distri-
bution. The cost of maintaining circulation does
not, however, always justify the cost of achieving
circulation. “We could get to two million” said
Discover publisher James Hayes; “but it would
cost an arm and a leg to get there and three arms
and three legs to stay there.”

Many observers thought that the science maga-
zines did just that. “There has to be a technical
name for it,” said consultant Cohen, “maybe in
game theory, where all the players get caught in
the same game, which is self-destructive. They all
want to be number one in circulation, and of
course they can’t all be number one. But so they all
have to be near one another.” The major players
got caught, Cohen said; “clearly there is a market
for science, but the market is not large enough for
all of them.”

By 1986, the three general science magazines all
had circulations between 500,000 and 1 million.
Yet some editors and publishers suggested that a
few hundred thousand might be a more natural
circulation level. Citing marketing studies she had
conducted in the late 1970s, former SciQuest edi-
tor Patricia Morgan raised questions about “the
ability to do economical circulation buying for
upwards of 300,000 circulation . . . . Interest in
science was a fad. You have to work to understand
science. It’s not like home decorating.”

Support for this idea also comes from Science 80,
Technology Illustrated, and Science Digest, all of
which had initial circulation goals between
200,000 and 400,000. In addition, one publication,
Science News, although not competing directly
with the popular science magazines, held its circu-
lation between 150,000 and 180,000 for much of
the science boom years.

Most people associated with the mass circula-
tion consumer magazines claimed that subscrip-
tion support was not a problem, citing a combined
circulation for Science Digest, Science 86, and Dis-
cover of about two million. However, accurate
circulation figures (as opposed to publicly
announced figures) are some of the most tightly
held numbers in the publishing business. Because
advertising rates depend on circulation levels,
publishers regularly use heavy promotion to in-
crease circulation temporarily at crucial measur-
ing points during the year, but the new readers are
often those least likely to continue “trial” subscriptions or newsstand purchases. Subscriptions (rather than newsstand sales) and their renewal rates are often cited to indicate the strength of a magazine’s audience; they indicate how much turnover a magazine has among its readers. A given renewal rate, however, can be anything from the number of people who convert from a cut-rate introductory subscription to a regular subscription (typically, about 40%) to the number of people who, having already subscribed for three years or more, continue to renew (for a successful magazine, at least 60% or 70%).

For Science 86, the currently available evidence is contradictory. Publisher William Carey said that final promotions to maintain Science 86’s 700,000 rate base (the “official” circulation level) were proving very costly; others indicated that long-term renewal rates were as low as 42%. Science & Government Report said that actual, paid-up circulation when the magazine was sold was only slightly over 500,000. But Allen Hammond (who opposed the sale of the magazine) said that Science 86 was doing very well; he claimed a long-term renewal rate of over 70%. Consultant Richard LePere has gone even further and claims that “it is categorically untrue that Science 86 had bad renewal numbers. They had some of the best subscription economics in the business.”

At Discover, Hayes also denied subscription problems, claiming that over half of Discover’s circulation came from long-term renewers. On the other hand, he acknowledged that Discover did not expect to triple its circulation once it had the market to itself. “We hope to extract the hard core science reader,” he said. “I’ll be disappointed if we don’t end up with a million this optimism suggests that circulation was not a real problem—and that raises another of the deeper issues obscured by the rush to eulogize the popular science magazines. “Even if Discover ends up with only 1.1 million readers, and that’s all the people interested in science,” said former Science 86 managing editor Ellis Rubinstein, “that compares favorably with the market for any other serious magazine. What is the true market for [the magazine] Foreign Affairs? Even Esquire, which isn’t as serious as it once was, has only 700,000. One of the great tragedies is that the recent turn of events has permitted the myth to be perpetuated that there is no market for science. On the contrary, there is a bigger market than for almost anything else. The continuing of the myth is one of the most frustrating things. And it’s absolutely unsupported.”

The concept of a limited audience for popular science is often traced to Jon Miller’s research on the “attentive public” for science. For example, drawing on Miller’s work, Jonathan Ward of CBS pointed out in 1984 that virtually all television science shows draw audiences of around 10 million viewers. He suggested that these are always the same viewers, hunting out science wherever it appears. Yet Fred Jerome has argued that “numerous readership surveys conducted over the past 25 years . . . repeatedly confirm that readers consider science articles ‘among the most interesting of newspaper items.’” The conflicting evidence on the true popularity of popular science suggests that this area deserves considerably more study.

The editorial leg

At first glance, the third leg of the publishing tripod—the editorial product—seems an unlikely place to look for the causes of the failure of the popular science boom. These publications and shows won national awards (Science 86 got two National Magazine Awards; “Walter Cronkite’s Universe” received Peabodies, Emmies, and other television awards); they were regularly praised for the contribution they were making to a vital area of public interest.

Once again, some analyses suggested problems beneath the surface. “They used the word ‘science,’ but it’s not really science,” said Zuckerman. “Progress, technology, that’s closer to the truth.” He approved of Discover’s move in 1985 toward a “future, new technology” format. “Discover is on a better track now, lowballing science, highballing the future. They have the right philosophy: ‘Here, Mr. Consumer, is what you need to know.’”

Owen Lipstein, who was Science 80’s general manager before leaving to start American Health in 1982, was less harsh, but he essentially agreed with Zuckerman’s analysis. The science magazines “suffered from the perception that they were irrelevant. The science books were sometimes edited as though they were running for awards, not readers. They didn’t contact the readers enough. ‘What difference does it make to my life?’ You always have to ask that.” But Lipstein, along with Hammond, led an unsuccessful effort to buy Science 86 before it died, and he says he would have made few changes had he bought the magazine.
Hammond acknowledged the charge that his magazine was "highbrow." But he pointed to the AAAS, his institutional home, and said that "to get really popular would have made AAAS uncomfortable. We had to produce something that the scientists liked, that a sophisticated audience would like. It was an ideologic strategy, but one that felt comfortable to me, since that's what I wanted to do anyway."  

The need for popular science magazines to appeal to scientists points to a well-recognized problem in science journalism: The degree to which science writers identify with scientists, whose cooperation they need to understand and then explain intricately complex subjects about which they may know nothing. But, as Zuckerman and Lipstein suggested, the science boom may have carried the closeness between journalists and sources to an unacceptable extreme. William Bennett wrote in 1981 in the Columbia Journalism Review that "it would be silly for any of the magazines to identify itself as 'anti-science.' . . . But surely there are possible attitudes that are neither 'pro' nor 'anti.' "  

Criticisms such as these still fail to explain fully the death of the science boom. Even taking the lowest estimates of loyal readers, the strength of the circulations implies that readers approved of what the magazines were producing. It was the advertisers who would not support the magazines.

The Context of Failure

Analyses based on the publishing metaphor of the three-legged stool provide a host of reasons for the failure of the science boom. None of these approaches, however, explain why it happened when it did—and why the failure of just two magazines, no matter how successful, was regarded as signalling the "sudden collapse" of an era in which "we [science journalists] had died and gone to heaven."  

The perception of a boom started when several specific events and trends coincided. Without that particular confluence, the boom would not have started. The perceived end of the boom was similarly marked by a particular sequence of events.  

As the new magazines rose quickly in the early 1980s, the venerable Scientific American began to suffer. For nearly 40 years, Scientific American had addressed itself to scientists, engineers, and others looking for detailed articles about specialties outside their own. Although it had never claimed to address a mass-circulation audience, Scientific American's long record of success and 1980 circulation of more than 700,000 made it a natural target for the newcomers of the science boom. Advertisers, especially, frequently grouped it with the newer publications for reasons of convenience. When the decrease in computer advertising hit Scientific American in 1984, the magazine's founders, publisher Gerard Piel and editor Dennis Flanagan (both in their mid-60s), decided to retire [although Piel remained chairman of the board].  

The financial picture at the various popular science magazines did not improve during 1985. In mid-year, both Science Digest and Discover acquired new publishers, and Discover revamped its entire editorial staff and orientation. By February 1986, the AAAS had instituted cost-saving measures and considered such drastic measures as cutting Science 86 from a monthly to a bimonthly publication schedule. Then, in late March, Scientific American's continuing losses forced it to look for more capital. Although Piel would have preferred to keep the company privately held—his son, Jonathan, had become editor, publisher, and president of the company—the decision to sell the company was reportedly made at the urging of a shareholder who had purchased Flanagan's stock two years earlier.  

Scientific American's sale drew major media attention to the problems of the science magazines, with articles about the sale in The New York Times, Advertising Age, and other publications. Advertisers became leery of committing themselves to placing ads in magazines that were no longer seen as "hot," that were no longer the place to be seen (for advertising is a very image-conscious industry). "All the media attention created a self-perpetuating prophecy," said Hayes; "the magazines were doing poorly, so it caused people to back off." William Carey recalled leaving a meeting with his advertising sales staff about this time "in a state of shock" at the dramatic drop in expected advertising revenues.

Time Inc. executives considered bidding for Scientific American, but soon realized that its audience was not the one that Discover needed for advertising sales purposes. Still, the approach to Scientific American apparently suggested to them that purchasing another science magazine might help their own fortunes. Around the beginning of April, Time executives came to Carey and asked
him whether the AAAS would be interested in selling Science 86. Carey stalled, but determined that "we had to do something by the end of June." Science 86 founder Hammond, working with former colleague Lipstein, began to prepare a proposal for buying the magazine from AAAS.

Shortly after the AAAS annual meeting in May 1986, at which apparently no decisions about the Time offer had been made, Time [perhaps upset at the slow pace of negotiations] leaked its offer to the press. The leak created, in Carey's mind, "a climate of crisis." The AAAS soon received a number of information proposals, but, again according to Carey, "in the end, the only party that wanted it badly enough was Time Inc." Hammond and Lipstein, whose efforts at putting together a purchase plan kept requiring revamping, later charged that the AAAS acted too hastily in accepting Time's bid, and in not allowing other potential bidders to present formal proposals. Carey and other members of the AAAS board defended their actions, arguing that various time limits and contractual agreements forced their hand.

The specific actions in this confluence of events thus raise two issues identified earlier: the media's role in creating the image of boom and bust, and the degree to which the organized scientific community actively supported popular science during the boom.

Media Responsibility

Much of the media coverage of the sale of the magazines contributed to a sense of "crisis"—at least among the central actors—that might not otherwise have existed. Carey perceived a "climate of crisis" generated by the media and causing advertisers to stay away from science magazines as they heard more and more about the problems of the category. AAAS board member Nelkin said that the sale "made a lot of press mostly because the science writers got exercised. People were looking for something to blame." He agreed that the media's preoccupation with the problems of one or two publications may have affected the entire span of science-oriented publications. In the late 1970s, said Leo Scullin, a senior vice president at Young and Rubicam, "everybody saw the opportunity at the same time, and that caught the eye of journalists, focused attention on the magazines. And it put enormous pressure and responsibility on the editors to perform." In addition, he said, all the attention created a state of confusion that led advertisers unhappy about immediate results to pull out quickly and wait for the inevitable shakeout to happen.

Scientists' responsibility for the public understanding of science

Although AAAS board members defend their decision to sell Science 86 as necessary for the association's financial health, many people concerned about the public understanding of science worry that the association's action negates its own charge to promote that understanding. In a bitter column published in the Washington Post, Science 86 staff writer William Allman charged that by selling the magazines, "scientists have declared that they don't want to be a part of" the task of informing the public about science. "Presumably, they feel they have more important things to do. They don't."40

Defenders of the AAAS action argued that even if the magazines had survived, they would not have succeeded in reaching the people who most need to learn about science. "The task of crusading for the popularizing of science to large audiences," said Piel, "has to await better education in our schools."41

It is frequently reported that the scientific establishment does not favor scientists who cooperate willingly with the press. And so it might not be surprising that the scientific community did not wholeheartedly support the new efforts. But solid research backing up this claim is rare. This area requires more research, both to produce solid support for the hypothesis and to understand its implications for the history of various efforts at publishing and producing information about science for the broad public.42

The Future of the Science Boom

Explaining fully both the birth and death of the popular science boom will require an intricate understanding of the tensions between the commercial needs of publishing and the intellectual arguments of those promoting the public understanding of science. There is no evidence that the
boom’s health reflects changing public perceptions of science or changes in public interest in science. Quite the contrary. For example, the number of weekly science sections in newspapers rose about threefold from 1984 to 1986. Frequently combined with “health” or “technology” sections, these sections appear to be attracting readers and advertisers more easily than did the magazines.43

In addition, many of the magazines listed in Table 3 do remain healthy, especially those specialty magazines that serve readers with more tightly constrained interests or memberships. Among the obvious survivors are The Sciences, Natural History, and Astronomy. Each of these receives enough subsidy from its own sponsoring institution or from subscribers to support smaller circulations and less attractive advertising structures. Moreover, new publications have been launched in Winter 1986–87, such as The Scientist, intended for “the science professional,” and Hippocrates, a magazine devoted to popular medicine and founded by one of Science 80’s founders, Eric Schrier.

On television, the public broadcasting system continues to work around the advertising problem by seeking funding in other ways. “Nova” remains one of PBS’s most popular series. Weekly shows like “Newton’s Apple” and “Innovation” keep building larger audiences.

Even on commercial television, science is finding a place, usually as part of general interest programs. NBC has a regular science correspondent for the “Nightly News” and its morning “Today” show. CBS has a well-known science writer on tap as a science consultant. The magazine-format shows routinely include stories related to science. “We’re successfully selling pieces on climate change, common cold research, technology of espionage,” said Jonathan Ward, now an independent producer. “Basically, we provide the specialty science news bureau that the shows themselves don’t support.”

The science boom was real. Its “death,” however, was only partially real. Those magazines and television shows that did die did so because of commercial realities undermined by the uncertain support of scientific organizations and the insecurity of science journalists. And this episode—both the reality of what happened and the perceptions of the participants—can perhaps help us to understand better what we mean by “the public understanding of science.”
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