become, I asked myself if it was worth the effort to try to compete with that systyem --- if there was any point in continuing to revise this book so that other people could skim the profits off my intellectual work and creativity, leaving me with little to show for my efforts.

To try to answer that question, I decided to sort out my financial rewards on a per-hour basis, and then went back over my 1988 work schedule to total up the time that I spent preparing the 1989 revised edition. This included basic manuscript preparation, going over galleys, preparing front matter, and so on. I discovered that if I took the entire royalties I earned from the previous edition as an estimate of probable return, and divided by the number of hours that went into the current revision, I had worked for less than the minimum wage.

I made my decision. The book will never again be revised. It is simply not worth it. I don't care if it is used world-wide; authors of this kind of book should not be paid at a rate equivalent to that received by unskilled teen-agers in entry-level jobs. After five editions the book has ceased to be a labor of love, and whatever prestige it brought will not meet the mortgage payment. I can make more money per hour — spent by mowing my neighbor's lawns, or serving hamburgers in the local fast food joint.

More important than my personal suspect that decision, authors of works that have been important in advanced programs of study are going to come to the same conclusion. It takes no great insight to see that the result will be a decline in the number of advanced books that are written, as well as in the number that are carefully revised. Since our politicians seem unwilling or unable to provide any protection for authors from this kind of exploitation, the lesson seems clear: Profits to the bookstore are more important than the quality of the textbooks available to students in our most advanced programs. Therefore, do you have any lawns that need mowing?

