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In her article titled “Mellon Foundation Assesses the State of Scholarly Publishing” (Chronicle of Higher Education, July 28), Jennifer Howard drew our attention to a section of the Mellon Foundation’s Annual Report for 2007 that she called “a page turner.” It is an essay co-authored by Donald J. Waters, director of Mellon’s Scholarly Communications Program, and Joseph S. Meisel, co-director of its Research University and Humanistic Scholarship Program. The essay bears the title “Scholarly Publishing Initiatives.” This is indeed an important document that anyone interested in the future of scholarly communication in the humanities should read, not least because of what it reveals about how the Mellon Foundation understands its role in supporting humanistic scholarship and publishing. Since there is no single foundation that has dedicated itself more to ensuring the vitality of this sector of higher education, we all need to listen carefully when Mellon speaks.

The essay is written, it appears, mainly to provide some context for two new initiatives that these two programs have jointly undertaken: one provides grants to groups of university presses to encourage their collaboration in publishing monographs for junior faculty in underserved and emerging areas of humanistic scholarship; the other follows the recommendations of the Ikaha Report in supporting more cooperation between presses and other entities on campus concerned about the production and dissemination of knowledge. Waters and Meisel go out of their way to emphasize that, unlike grants given by the foundation in the 1970s and early 1980s to foster publication of monographs by junior faculty, these new initiatives do not involve direct title subsidies or subventions to individual presses but rather are aimed at fostering the development of modes of collaboration among groups of presses and between presses and other entities within universities that have a stake in publishing, as well as including the development of technological tools to facilitate such cooperation — in other words, enhancing publishing infrastructure instead of easing publishers’ deficits.

Those who like to read tea leaves to make prognostications about the future will find much to speculate about in this report. It is of course much too early to tell how these new initiatives will fare, and there will be post-mortem assessments in due course. But there is also much of value in the essay for those who want to understand how Mellon regards the project from which they invested. Waters and Meisel leave no doubt, for instance, that Mellon views JSTOR as the jewel in its crown of past successes. Project Muse also winds up in the win column. In general, the authors make clear that Mellon has been much more successful in its initiatives with scholarly journals than with monographs. Among initiatives in the latter arena, Gutenberg-e aimed at junior scholars appears to have been a real disappointment for Mellon, while the History (recently renamed Humanities) E-Book project aimed at senior scholars produced at best mixed results, becoming self-sustaining largely because of the marketplace success of the digitization of over 500 backlist titles rather than the production of new ones (only 55 of the projected 85 ever having come to fruition). Bibliovault, originally developed at the University of Chicago Press, has struggled along for years in search of a viable business model, and the authors leave the impression that it seems finally to have found its raison d’etre rather late in the game. And, they note ruefully, the TORCHI project that Oxford University Press was supposed to have developed as a platform for disciplinary collections of monographs from cooperating presses never got beyond the conceptual stage.

What can we learn from the two experiments that were actually carried out and had the most to do directly with promoting the publishing of new electronic monographs, Gutenberg-e and the Humanities E-Book Project? Waters and Meisel provide their own post-mortem: “Both projects have been extremely valuable in demonstrating the capabilities and requirements for publishing monographs authored specifically for electronic media, but neither of them succeeded in establishing the core hypothesis that such books would be cheaper to produce and distribute than those designed for print media. Instead, the Gutenberg-e project proved far too expensive to sustain. Rather than being published separately, the eBooks are being made available by the Columbia University Library on an open access basis, and by subscription as part of the History E-Book Project. Moreover, although at least two of the Gutenberg-e authors have been awarded tenure to date, only 12 of the 22 authors whose prize-winning works have been electronically published are now in tenure-track positions. A major issue is that the Gutenberg-e books have been all but overlooked in the review pages of the relevant general and specialized journals.”

The final report on Gutenberg-e submitted to Mellon in August by the American Historical Association (AHA), while presenting a somewhat more favorable assessment, also admits to the project’s failure to confirm the “core hypothesis.” (The final report, as well as other information about the project’s development, can be found here: http://www.historians.org/prizes/gutenberg/index.cfm). While calling the experiment “a qualified success,” the report agrees that “It has not met the Foundation’s goal of a sustainable business model for the project, though the partners in the project differ about why that might be.” Further on the report elaborates on the reasons for market failure: “The ‘first-copy’ costs proved to be higher for books making any substantial use of the digital medium than regular print books, and their availability in an online form did not reduce the costs of working in and through traditional channels for marketing and legitimation of these books. Quite apart from the fellowships given to the authors (which were never considered a ‘sustainable’ part of the project), the costs of administering a selective peer review process for a wide-ranging publication program like this, and the basic costs of preparing books for publication does not seem sustainable without a significant revenue stream or outside support. As the chart of expenses (Attachment 4) indicates, the cost of production ran significantly higher than we had budgeted. Sustaining staff for a longer period than anticipated and developing books that make a substantive use of the medium raised the costs much higher than the initial projections. And these costs appear dramatically greater if they included the true unfunded costs sustained by both the Library and the Press during the life of the project. Despite our initial assumptions that electronic publications would be less expensive to produce, the ‘first copy’ costs of the books proved to be significantly higher for electronic books. The staff time involved in basic copyediting was comparable to that of a print book, but the staff had to take on a number of additional responsibilities to make them truly digital monographs. Assisting the authors with the thornier problems of obtaining rights to images for online publication, creating consistent file types, and standardizing and uploading files, all created significant costs over and above that of print publication. For authors who wanted to really develop their projects and take full advantage of the medium, the costs proved to be even higher. And only a few of those added costs proved to be a benefit to other authors in the project, since each of them brought a different vision and a different set of software requirements for their publication. Lastly, the material in these publications, and the publications themselves, present a significant problem of long-term maintenance and preservation.
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In the brief life of this project, for instance, the standards for coding Webpages changed dramatically.” And so, the report states, “Al- though it was not explicitly stated as one of the goals of the project, the notion of creating a sustainable model of electronic publishing was certainly an implicit goal of the Foundation. And on that score, the project was clearly not a success.”

The Mellon Foundation has always pushed the idea of sustainability as a goal of its philanthropy in the arena of scholarly communication, and that is a primary reason that JSTOR and Project Muse go down in the annals as true success stories. It is therefore not surprising to see, in Mellon’s own post-mortem, that the “core hypothesis” of Gutenberg-e was taken to be that it could reach sustainability because “such books would be cheaper to produce and distribute than those designed for print media.” But one wonders why Mellon believed this to be the “core hypothesis” worth testing because not a single member of the advisory committee that was convened by Robert Darnton, then President-Elect of the American Historical Association, to consult about the project’s development believed this hypothesis to be true! And the advisory committee also anticipated just about every problem of cost that the project ended up encountering.

I was a member of the AHA’s Electronic-Book Prize Committee that Darnton formed in the late spring of 1998 to help him develop the proposal for Gutenberg-e to be approved first by the AHA Council and then submitted to Mellon for funding. The other members of the committee were: John Ackerman (Director, Cornell University Press), Colin Day (then Director, University of Michigan Press, now Director of the University of Hong Kong Press), Carla Hesse (Professor of History, University of California, Berkeley), Michael Grossberg (then Editor, The American Historical Review), Stanley Katz (then Vice President, AHA Research Division), James Michalko (then President, Research Libraries Group), Ann Okerson (Associate University Librarian, Yale University) and Kate Wittenberg (then Editor-in-Chief, Columbia University Press). I had urged Darnton to invite Ackerman to join the committee (partly because he had a Ph.D. in Russian history) and Day (because, as a Cambridge Ph.D. in economics, he knew more about the economics of publishing than anyone else from the university press community). Lynne Withey, then Associate Director, now Director, at the University of California Press, and Edward Barry, then Director of Oxford University Press, also contributed to the committee’s discussion while not being formally members.

By this time Darnton and I had already long been discussing, and worrying about, the fate of the monograph. I had known him from my days as an editor at Princeton University Press, where he served on the Editorial Board for a number of years. As a pioneer in the then fledging interdisciplinary field of book history, Darnton had even more reason than most faculty to take a special interest in what would become of the book in the digital age. Beginning back in the early 1970s, when the press’s director, Herbert Bailey, Jr., and its associate director and controller, William Becker, identified and limned the dimensions of a “crisis” in scholarly publishing in a series of influential articles in the journal Scholarly Publishing (later renamed the Journal of Scholarly Publishing), we had already started to talk about monographs in certain fields of the humanities and social sciences as “endangered species” (a term that I believe Bailey, a former science editor at the press, had coined). This term of art became widely employed in more widespread discussions that followed, both with faculty like Darnton and with key personnel at the Mellon Foundation, including its president, John Sawyer, with whom Bailey had a close relationship. (The connections became even stronger after William Bowen left the presidency of Princeton, where he had served ex officio on the Press’s Board of Trustees, to become president of the Mellon Foundation in 1988.) It served as a focal point not only for the formulation of the plans for Gutenberg-e but also for a report written by Herbert Bailey in 1990 for the Association of American University Presses titled The Rate of Publication of Scholarly Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences 1978-1988 and for a joint project of the AHA and ARL known as the Historical Studies Distribution Network, which ultimately was abandoned after AHA’s then Executive Director, Sandy Freitag, left the organization.

Darnton had imbibed the lessons from us publishers (and also the librarians with whom he consulted) well, and in his first draft of the proposal that he sent to me for comment on February 20, 1998, he summarized the plight of the monograph thus: “Three interlocking problems bedevil our current system: skyrocketing price of journals has decimated library budgets and produced a disastrous drop in purchases of monographs; the drop in demand from the libraries has made university presses cut back drastically on the publication of monographs; and recent Ph.D.s are finding it fiercely difficult to advance in their careers by converting their dissertations into books.” With allowance for certain rhetorical flourishes (“decimated,” “disastrous,” “drastically,” “fiercely difficult”) that were his own invention, this was a nicely succinct description of the pattern that the ARL had documented statistically for many years to show the baneful effect of spiraling journal (especially STM) prices on the purchases of monographs. Those who have followed Darnton’s career into his present position as head of Harvard’s library will also see here the root of his passion for “open access” of articles, which is now being implemented at Harvard. In this original proposal for Guten- berg-e, Darnton in fact envisioned that “the books should be made available to any reader without charge. Perhaps the AHA could publish directly from its office or via the H-NET. It might be possible to include documentary material as a supplement to the main body of the text. And although publication would be free, there should be copyright protection concerning the re-publication of the text.” Is it any surprise that Harvard has followed the path it has with open access? One sees here even an adumbration of the Creative Commons noncommercial license.

If cost recovery was of no immediate concern to Darnton, then what was motivating him in proposing Gutenberg-e? One hint comes from this section of the original proposal: “The principle behind the prize would be to sanction electronic publishing by showering the winners with so much honor that tenure committees and academic administrations would sit up and take notice. If successful, the example could spread and help change the rules of the game in academic life. It could also promote scholarly communication of a new kind at a time when publishers and librarians are perplexed about how to take the first steps in the difficult and dangerous field of electronic publishing.” Alas, Darnton’s strategy underestimated the entrenched power of traditional academic practices, and as Mellon’s post-mortem observes, this aim of the project was never realized beyond a very limited extent: the eBooks were all but ignored by professional review media, and few of the authors gained tenure or even got on the tenure track. (The AHA’s own post-mortem, however, details somewhat greater success on both counts).

It is the second goal Darnton identified here that I believe to have been at least as important as helping junior faculty achieve career success in Gutenberg-e: to foster visualization and justification. Promoting scholarly communication “of a new kind” is indeed a noble goal and should have been recognized by Mellon as the principal objective of the whole project in the first place. The origin of this inspiration, I believe, came from conversations I had with Darnton about how technology could help create a new kind of book, unlike anything that could be accomplished in codex form. Darnton had been influenced by sentences from an article that Cornell librarian Ross Atkinson had published in College & Research Libraries in May 1993 titled “Networks, Hypertext, and Academic Information Services: Some Longer-Range Implications.” His term for this “new kind” of document structure is “concentric stratification,” which “might consist of a top level that would contain some kind of extended abstract; this level or stratum would then be connected to the next level, and so on. Each succeeding level would contain the information in the previous level, but would provide in addition greater degrees of substance and detail. Scholarly communications that would require an extended context, and would therefore deserve a monograph in the paper environment, would in the online environment merely include more levels than would a communication that would in print environment have been published as a journal article.” As hinted before, Atkinson sees electronic publishing as breaking down the dichotomy between monographs and journal articles, and he also sees reading shifting from a linear form to something “that is done, so to
Darnton clearly was inspired by this vision as well. It was, in a way, the centerpiece of his now classic article for the New York Review of Books (March 18, 1999), “The New Age of the Book,” where he explained the background and rationale for both the Gutenberg-e and ACLS History E-Book projects:

“If everything comes together successfully, will electronic monographs be recognized as books? Will they acquire enough intellectual legitimacy to pass muster among suspicious tenure committees and to relieve the pressure on academic careers? This is the point at which veteran scholars can make a difference. Those who have proven their ability to produce first-rate conventional books could help create books of a new kind, far more original and ambitious than a converted dissertation.

“In the case of history, a discipline where the crisis in scholarly publishing is particularly acute, the attraction of an eBook should be especially appealing. Any historian who has done long stints of research knows the frustration over his or her inability to communicate the fathomlessness of the archives and the bottomlessness of the past. If only my reader could have a look inside this box, you say to yourself, at all the letters in it, not just the lines from the letter I am quoting. If only I could follow that trail in my text just as I pursued it through the dossiers, when I felt free to take detours leading away from my main subject. If only I could show how themes crisscross outside my narrative and extend far beyond the boundaries of my book. Not that books should be exempt from the imperative of trimming a narrative down to a graceful shape. But instead of using an argument to close a case, they could open up new ways of making sense of the evidence, new possibilities of making available the raw material embedded in the story, a new consciousness of the complexities involved in constructing the past.

“I am not advocating the sheer accumulation of data, or arguing for links to databanks — so-called hyperlinks. These can amount to little more than an elaborate form of footnoting. Instead of bloating the electronic book, I think it possible to structure it in layers arranged like a pyramid. The top layer could be a concise account of the subject, available perhaps in paperback. The next layer could contain expanded versions of different aspects of the argument, not arranged sequentially as in a narrative, but rather as self-contained units that feed into the topmost story. The third layer could be composed of documentation, possibly of different kinds, each set off by interpretative essays. A fourth layer might be theoretical or historiographical, with selections from previous scholarship and discussions of them. A fifth layer could be pedagogic, consisting of suggestions for classroom discussion and a model syllabus. And a sixth layer could contain readers’ reports, exchanges between the author and the editor, and letters from readers, who could provide a growing corpus of commentary as the book made its way through different groups of readers.

“A new book of this kind would elicit a new kind of reading. Some readers might be satisfied with a study of the upper narrative. Others might also want to read vertically, pursuing certain themes deeper and deeper into the supporting essays and documentation. Still others might navigate in unanticipated directions, seeking connections that suit their own interests.
Far from being utopian, the electronic monograph could meet the needs of the scholarly community at the points where its problems converge. It could provide a tool for prying problems apart and opening up a new space for the extension of learning. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has provided support for several initiatives in this direction. One, a program for converting dissertations into electronic monographs, has just been launched by the American Historical Association. Another, for producing more ambitious eBooks, is now being developed by the American Council of Learned Societies.

Others are in the works. The world of learning is changing so rapidly that no one can predict what it will look like ten years from now. But I believe it will remain within the Gutenberg galaxy — though the galaxy will expand, thanks to a new source of energy, the electronic book, which will act as a supplement to, not a substitute for, Gutenberg's great machine."

Darnton's vision, it should be clear, was a further elaboration of the scheme that Ross Atkinson envisioned six years earlier. To his credit, Darnton has not only talked about this idea abstractly but actually put it into practice in his own multifaceted, multilayered book about publishing in 18th-century France that he is completing for Oxford University Press. He gave a superb account of it in his Gutenberg Prize Lecture in 2006, Lingua Franca, in an article titled “The French Revolution Will Be Webcast” (July/August 2000), gave this description of Darnton's planned eBook: “Tentatively titled ‘A Literary Tour de France: An Electronic Book about Books in the Age of Enlightenment,’ the essay will be accompanied by its source — a traveling salesman’s 1778 diary, full of such details as how much he paid to have his horse shod and bled. Darnton has in mind not so much an online scholarly edition as an online ‘archaeological dig’. Along the stops of the book peddler’s journey, Darnton hopes to place a series of essays on bookstores, smugglers, paper suppliers, and press workers, all hyperlinked to each other and to original source material. Eventually he hopes to post online some eighteen hundred letters and other documents from the period, drawn from the archive of an eighteenth-century Swiss-French publisher, the Société Typographique de Neuchâtel. Darnton hopes to develop an online site for the archive where other scholars can contribute their own interpretations of the documents and criticize his work and each other’s. He himself would edit the site, and he imagines a committee of scholars would carry on after he retires.”

Alas, this vision is still well ahead of its time. The actual development of the Gutenberg-e proposal shows how Atkinson’s and Darnton’s dream ran up against the cold, hard reality of the economics of scholarly publishing. Darnton’s original idea for making the eBooks available “to any reader without charge” quickly disappeared as later versions of the proposal were generated in response both to the advisory committee’s comments and to Mellon’s demand for a business model that could produce some reasonable basis for expecting the project to be sustainable after the grant ran out. All of the publishers on the committee, joined also by librarian Ann Okerson, voiced their strong doubts that the project could be carried out at a cost less than what print publishing of a monograph would typically entail. Colin Day was most eloquent and forceful in expressing this point of view. In a lengthy email message dated September 29, 1998, to Darnton in response to questions Darnton had asked the committee to consider, Day began by emphasizing the importance of keeping market and economic considerations in mind in designing the project even while admitting that “university presses have evolved to provide a unique and valuable mix of the altruistic and the economic” and that a university press, in contrast with a commercial publisher, “decides to publish on scholarly grounds and then attempts to make the best economically of the work, whereas the commercial house merely decides on economic grounds.” He then went on to discuss the important “value added” by presses in the editorial work they perform. Continuing, he said: “So far I have treated the work as though it could be thought of as a manuscript: as a linear text. However, there are many more potential dimensions to the electronic publication. And these complexities blur the distinction between the editing I have been discussing so far and the more detailed and technical issues that demand attention in a digital medium. What is new to the electronic environment and difficult to generalize about is the work that is required not to ensure the digital elements ‘work’ but to design the publication: to develop the ‘look and feel’, to exploit the technology effectively, to ensure that, not just as a simple text, but in this new medium, the work is an effective vehicle conveying its message to its intended readership. This is an expensive exercise costing much more than the analogous activity in the traditional medium. It may well be that for the kind of scholarly works under consideration for the prize, the work should be envisioned only as text delivered electronically, i.e., without these costly efforts. However, it is by showing the capabilities of this medium, and showing them well, that the prestige which is the end objective of the whole exercise will be achieved. Simple or complex, there remain the questions of who manages the work and who pays for it. We are, I assume, focusing on works that would not be economic to publish in traditional monograph form. So the full costs of traditional publication would be higher than the likely revenue. Now electronic publication of a straightforward text may be a little cheaper than traditional…, so there is a category of work that may be viable in electronic form that is not viable in traditional form. But the category, I believe, is a small one. Carefully restricting the competition to such works, even if we could successfully identify them ex ante, would seem rather artificial and not in the spirit of the project. It would eliminate many worthy candidates that would not be fully viable even with the (modest) cost savings of electronic publication. Thus we have to plan on the basis that winners will not generate sufficient revenue to cover costs. This is certainly true if the works exploit the technology and have rich hyper-textual linking and multi-media elements embedded. Again, the costs of designing and implementing such devices and checking them for reliability are significant. So I see an inescapable need for funding to support these tasks of publication. I have not mentioned the questions about controlling access, copyright, collecting payments, etc., which all raise questions about the income flow in such electronic publishing. Although I am moderately sanguine about the establishment of long-term solutions to all these problems, any scheme designed today should presume that revenue from an electronic book (using the term ‘book’ elastically but excluding the repetitive subscription-based publication of the journal-type) will be small. So I find it inescapable that the project will need ongoing funding not only for the prizes and the competition administration but also for the publication of the winning works.”

Besides Colin Day’s admonitions about its economic viability, the project’s rationale was questioned by Ann Okerson on grounds of the inconsistency of its presumed goals, which she identified from Darnton’s original formulations as: “legitimizing electronic publishing with all its attendant advantages; relieving the pressure on library budgets and on the production of monographs; advancing the careers of young scholars; saving the ‘endangered’ monographs; covering many diverse fields of historical study.” As Okerson observed in her email response of October 8, 1998, “legitimacy is far more likely to be achieved by publishing manuscript contributions from notable, established scholars such as Professors Darnton, Katz, or Hesse than by publishing dissertations from even the brightest Ph.D. students”; “no publisher who has written to this committee has suggested that quality electronic publication will be cheap, at least at this time, and thus there is no hope that electronic publications will positively affect library budgets…”; “young scholars’ careers are not likely to be advanced by using them as guinea pigs for electronic publishing experiments — for them, a prize for a brilliant dissertation in book form is likely to have more effect”; “…putting [endangered monographs] into electronic form, a form which is not widely accepted and which we are told is as expensive to craft as print, and using unknown authors on top of that, is not likely to make the endangered work any more affordable in e-form — possibly even less so”; “covering diverse fields with a limited number of prizes per year doesn’t result in enough critical mass for the included books to benefit from the advantages of linkage to supporting documentation.”
Colin Day and Ann Okerson were both responding to a letter from Darnton dated August 18, 1998, in which he posed five questions for the committee to consider prior to a planned meeting on October 10: “In which fields or sub-fields among the historical disciplines is the monograph most endangered…? How would the competition be organized…? Who would be the publisher…? Assuming the books will be offered for sale, how should the marketing and sales be done…? What linkage can be developed with other projects?” I was asked to address the first question in particular, as many of my discussions with Darnton had focused on the “endangered species” that we all presumed to exist on the basis of anecdotal and some limited statistical evidence from Princeton University Press’s sales histories by discipline. My reply to Darnton, based on a mini-survey of fourteen press directors, was that the issue was rather more complicated than we had supposed. With sales of scholarly books already at a very low level across the board, one director dryly observed that “the differences between these endangered subfields are miniscule. Do you sell 395 copies of a book on 19th-c. Italy and 403 of a book on 18th-c. France? Is that statistically meaningful?” This same director ruefully concluded that “over half of everything that is worth doing is endangered.” This sentiment was echoed by John Ackerman in his very detailed and thoughtful answer to the survey: “I find myself hard-pressed to say which fields are ‘endangered’ when the whole enterprise seems to be in trouble.” I tried to communicate the complexity of defining what can be considered “endangered” to Darnton thus: “John’s thoughtful memo has led me further to believe that any quick generalizations are hazardous because there always seem to be exceptions. E.g., while German history in general may not sell well, books on the Nazi period often do. We see in U.S. history great differences in sales between books on, say, the Gilded Era and books on the Civil War; even a narrowly focused book on the latter period could easily outsell a broad-gauged book on the former. In Cold War history I would expect books that have to do with espionage to do much better generally, than books about diplomacy. And so it goes through most ‘fields’ defined either by country or by period. It may be true that highly quantitative studies do worse than books in ‘cultural studies’ these days because the latter is still the fashion of the day….” Books with a focus on gender used to do better on average than books without that focus, although the bloom is a bit off the rose in that respect as the market gets more crowded with such studies. I think it’s fair to say that books on almost any ‘small’ country — say, Albania in eastern Europe, or even Bulgaria, and countries like Paraguay or Ecuador in Latin America — covering any period will not have much of a market, and that’s simply because there are far fewer scholars working on these countries than there are on the ‘major’ countries, like Poland or Mexico. But even here there are exceptions: when a ‘small’ country gets in the news a lot (as Vietnam did in the 1970s and Nicaragua did in the 1980s), almost all books on it will benefit from the extra exposure in the general media and have more of a market during their period in the limelight. Just because of this consider- able complexity, which John highlights so well in his memo, it seems a mistake to develop very broad categories for the process of selection. As a number of people have said, it seems that practically every area of publishing in history is affected these days, with perhaps only a subset of U.S. history being the major exception… I think it may take a pretty refined statistical study over some period of time to come up with really reliable ‘patterns’ that can serve to identify ‘endangered’ fields/subjects/approaches with the degree of precision that could justify discrimination at the level that might really respond to the problem this set of prizes is supposed to help solve. I guess I am more convinced than before, then, that the prizes might best be designed, not so much to ‘rescue’ certain subfields from extinction (since practically every area of history is suffering to some degree now) as to promote experiments in electronic publishing of documents that will take full advantage of the special attributes of the new medium and thus go well beyond the traditional codex form of monograph.”

The final proposal as submitted to Mellon on October 30, 1998, reflected much of this internal criticism noting, for instance, that the project, in trying to achieve multiple objectives (“to promote electronic publishing, rescue the endangered monograph, and ease the difficul- ties of young scholars”) raises the danger of trying to do too many things at once or of work- ing at cross purposes.” The proposal admitted that “several members of the committee warned about the need to define priorities, and the com- mittee as a whole thought the development of first-rate electronic monographs should stand out as our top priority.” On the definition of what is “endangered,” the proposal referred to my survey and observed that “the very notion of fixed and stable fields now looks dubious,” but nevertheless recommended the project “to concentrate on a few areas where the difficulties are greatest and to avoid subjects that are flourishing on the marketplace, such as modern America, the Civil War, and gender studies.” The proposal also acknowledged the emphasis that Kate Wittenberg and other members of the committee had placed on achieving “critical mass” as a precondition for successfully selling the eBooks through site licenses: “We have no illusions about proposing a set of texts with enough affluence in subject matter to create hypertext links within the group of prize win- ners. (According to one rule of thumb, it takes 500 books in a database before readers benefit from online cross-searching [the number that came out as a rough estimate of backlist titles for the History E-Book project]). But if this works as a pilot project, it could open the way for other, larger endeavors such as the program to be developed by the ACLS [i.e., the History E-Book project]. In the long run, we should be able to develop some important linkage.” And, indeed, the final decision made about Gutenberg-e was to incorporate it as a subcomponent of the History E-Book database, while also retrograding to the original vision Darnton had had for making the eBooks avail- able online “to any reader without charge.”

The proposal frankly admitted the “diffi- culties” the project faced: “(1) Despite some useful experiments, this sort of enterprise has not been adequately tested and involves a great deal of guesswork. (2) The best-informed guesses are mutually inconsistent, at least in some important details. (3) Despite their discrepancies, all estimates indicate that electronic monographs could be expensive to produce, especially if they are heavily loaded with bells and whistles.” Further, in concluding, “We dare not make promises about blue [sic] ink and bottom lines. But we can put together a feasible program, one that will provide a start toward solving a set of problems at the heart of scholar- lily in this country. At the very least, this program will generate the knowledge necessary to get a better understanding of those problems. But we expect it to do more. It should open the way to a new kind of scholarly communication, the well-wrought electronic monograph. Some variety of electronic book seems certain to proliferate in the near future, but it will be done well only if an organization like the AHA takes the lead in developing it, setting standards, and legitimizing the whole endeavor in the eyes of a skeptical profession.”

Early reactions to both Mellon e-book projects reflected the reservations and skepti- cism expressed by the publishing members of the advisory committee. In the same article where it had described Darnton’s own eBook project, Lingua Franca quoted Walter Lippincott, then Director of Princeton University Press, as saying “It seems unlikely that elec- tronic books are going to be any cheaper to publish. The big cost for a university press is the gatekeeper function. It is not so much the copyediting and the printing and the binding in nice cloth. It is deciding which are the very best monographs to publish. And I don’t see the demand increasing just because they are in electronic form. The fact is there is a limited demand for monographs.” Walter Waters, executive editor at Harvard University Press, intoned: “I’m afraid it will be a big waste of money. The notion of just letting more stuff flow out, when we are already inundated with stuff, is just making the world worse.”

Mellon’s own post-mortem, in light of this history of Gutenberg-e’s development, seems a bit unfair and wide of the mark. No one on the advisory committee ever thought it should be judged a success only if it proved the “core hypothesis” of proving electronic publishing to be cheaper than print, or turned out to be economically sustainable after the initial grant had run its course. Whether or not the Mellon Foundation ever saw the comments of the advisory committee members I do not know, but the proposal as submitted certainly hedged its bets on this score, noting various “difficulties” and making no “promises about…bottom lines.” Knowledgeable external observers, too, felt it could never succeed in these narrowly continued on page 72
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Booklover — Joy and Against the Grain

Column Editor: Donna Jacobs (Research Specialist, Transgenic Mouse Care Facility, MUSC, Charleston, SC) <jacobsdf@musc.edu>

Editor’s Note: Donna Jacobs is a medical typist whose job title is “Research Specialist, Transgenic Mouse Care Facility.” I first met her over 15 years ago at a friend’s cocktail party. Recently we reconnected and I learned that she is an avid reader and has as her current project to read all the books that have won the Nobel Prize. We began talking and now we have Donna as a regular columnist. Can’t wait to see her perspective on all the books she’s reading! — KS

When a library is in one of its top five destinations while on holiday it makes for interesting discovery. The Book of Kells located in the Trinity College Library in Dublin Ireland, Copernicus’s autography “De Revolutionibus” in the Jagellonian University Library located in Krakow Poland, the beautiful walnut-walled 10,000-volume library of George Vanderbilt located in the Biltmore Estates in Asheville North Carolina are good examples. The fun part is that one never knows what one will find, like being introduced to the Haynes Library on Eleuthera Bahamas or being invited into the personal library of Joy.

Joy — a three-letter word to express delight, elation or to call a unique friend by her name. We often speak of the joy of reading and I have actually met Joy. She inherited her love for reading from her mother, who read to her and her brother from the time they spoke their first words.

My husband and I spent several days in 2003 visiting friends on Eleuthera Bahamas and it was during this visit we were introduced to Joy and her husband by these friends. Joy had arrived on Eleuthera Bahamas in 1946 with her brother aboard a converted Lancaster bomber. The flight was a test flight for British South American Airways and was piloted by Air Vice Marshall Bennett with a crew of 5 and a passenger list of 13.

Joy invited us to their home for cocktails and the promise of a magnificent sunset. Besides the spectacular view of Governor’s Harbour, I was immediately entranced by the library until I was encouraged to come to the patio for cocktails, and “nibbles” made even more delightful by numerous hummingbirds enjoying the hibiscus. The sun began to set and true to promise it was as picturesque as a tropical postcard.

We retired to the main room decorated with books and began to discuss literature; this book and that book read until one book’s title failed to come to mind. Joy disappeared to a more private room and produced a journal. Opening the journal she began running her fingers down the lines of entry — title, author, month, year. This journal was just one in a series that Joy kept as a source of inspiration and experiential knowledge for many years to come and will undoubtedly prove to have been worth the investment in the long run.
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