



# THE Exchange

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN  
UNIVERSITY PRESSES

WINTER 2003

## CONTENTS

Introduction: Focus on  
New Technologies / 1

Annual Meeting 2003 / 1

Gutenberg-e: A Model for Future  
Scholarship? / 2

A Gutenberg-e Author's Tale / 3

Digital Monticello / 6

The CrossRef Initiative / 4

The Real Meaning of Copyright / 6

A (slightly) New *Exchange* / 6

RoweCom Declares Bankruptcy / 7

Calendar / 8

## STAFF

Editor: Brenna McLaughlin

Assistant Editor: Yejide Peters

Contributing Editors:

Rob Dilworth, Duke University Press  
(Journals)

Erich Staib, Oxford University Press  
(Journals)

Ann Wendland, University of  
Arizona Press

---

## Well Past the Thin Edge of the Wedge: Focus on New Technologies in Scholarly Publishing

Take a look at <http://aaupnet.org/resources/electronic.html>. The diverse, innovative electronic publishing projects briefly described there represent just the tip of the iceberg of university press engagement with new publishing technologies. Short-run printing, e-editions, standard XML coding of book files, online catalogs and online book sales, are all becoming more and more common in the daily work of scholarly publishers. Floating beneath the publicly promoted special projects listed at the Electronic Publishing Projects web page is the new reality of technological integration at all our members businesses.

These "tip of the 'berg" projects are instructive to watch, however. Many are in fact new applications of a traditional scholarly publishing practice—mining a press's own back list for exploitation in a new format or medium. One of the newer projects is an example of this: Harvard University Press's Print on Demand project, bringing 100 out-of-print scholarly classics back through a POD capability at their warehouse.

Other projects use collaborations of presses to bring economies of scale to broad implementation of electronic publishing technologies. These include the granddaddy of e-publishing projects, Project Muse, and the much newer leverage of an existing distribution consortium of presses into the Chicago Digital Distribution Center, which is experimenting with both short-run printing technologies and electronic versions of books from a wide variety of presses.

And still other presses have leapt into programs of publishing new scholarship primarily or solely in an electronic form. One of these programs, Columbia University Press's Gutenberg-e, we'll look at more closely in this special focus section of *The Exchange*. We'll also take a look at a successful project of journals citation linking and a behind the scenes process essential to the seamless integration of new technologies into the long-term publishing commitments of scholarly publishers—the digitization of a classic font. The special focus on the integration of new publishing technologies in scholarly communications begins on page two. Look for more explorations of this topic in future newsletters.

---

## 2003 Annual Meeting: St. Louis, June 22-25

In past years, a preliminary program for the AAUP Annual Meeting has appeared in the winter edition of *The Exchange*. As AAUP's one on-line capacity expands, we offer more annual meeting information—and a regularly updated program—on our web site at <http://aaupnet.org/programs/annualmeeting/>.

"We're All in This Together" is the theme of the 2003 Annual Meeting. In that spirit, panels will bring in our colleagues from outside the presses: librarians, university administrators, and booksellers. Visit the web site for more information on the panels, workshops, receptions, and exhibits planned for St. Louis.

---

# Gutenberg-e: A Model for Future Scholarship?

By Brenna McLaughlin

In 1999, historian Robert Darnton published an article in *The New York Review of Books* looking at the possibilities electronic publishing might hold for scholarly monographs in the humanities and social sciences. If the start-up costs can be overcome, will electronic publishing allow more scholarship, particularly in currently under-published fields, to reach its academic audience? Could new technologies revolutionize how monographs are written, offering new ways to present arguments? Would tenure and promotion committees come to view e-books as legitimate forms of scholarly publication?

Darnton was not just building castles in the air. As then President of the American Historical Association (AHA), Darnton was overseeing the introduction of the Gutenberg-e Awards. This program, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, selects up to six dissertations per year and provides for their publication as e-books by the Electronic Publishing Initiative at Columbia University Press (EPIC).

The awards to authors serve two purposes. A prize of \$20,000 supports the work of preparing a traditional dissertation for publication as an e-book, but the stamp of approval from the AHA is intended to overcome any bias against e-publication within the academic profession. "The program is not intended simply to reward excellence in scholarship with yet another prestigious prize but rather to use prestige—the bluest of ribbons awarded by the grandest of juries with the full authority of the AHA behind it—to set a high standard for electronic publishing," reads the AHA description of Gutenberg-e.

A unique aspect of the Gutenberg-e program, and a vital part of the experimental process, is the degree of collaboration between the authors and EPIC staff. Twice a year authors are brought to New York for workshops,

where reports and updates are shared on the progress of manuscripts, the site technology, and marketing and sales plans. AAUP was able to attend the most recent of these workshops, held March 10 at Columbia University.

Twelve Gutenberg-e authors, at various stages of publication, gave presentations on their book projects. One of the most positive aspects of the reports given had to do with the perceived legitimacy of this form of publication. One author reported that her publication of a book with Gutenberg-e had helped her win a further research and publication grant. The faculty senate of another scholar's university had agreed that the e-book would count towards tenure requirements, and others reported their institutions' support for and pride in the award.

One of the common issues addressed by the historians was the challenge of procuring and preparing the supplementary materials that e-publication permits. In the seven monographs already published photos, video and audio clips, extensive document archives, and links to other online resources can be found. The acquiring of these materials—through requests for rights, photographing and scanning, re-interviewing sources on tape, and so on—forms a large part of the work each author undertakes to prepare his or her dissertation for Gutenberg-e publication. (A first-hand account of being a Gutenberg-e author follows.)

For the AHA and the Press, Gutenberg-e is a research project as well as a publishing program, a project to discover how humanities scholarship can best be brought into the electronic world. At the workshop, EPIC staff reported on the evolution of the project's editorial vision, changes in the marketing and sales models, and new technological directions being explored.

Originally, the AHA designated the Gutenberg-e prize for fields

deemed endangered—those difficult, especially for first-time authors, to publish in, such as South Asia, Africa, Europe before 1800, and Latin America. This led to a diverse first offering of titles from Gutenberg-e, encompassing studies of Telugu-speaking India and French Enlightenment playwrights, among others. In 2003, the AHA plans to give the awards in fields of history that are currently growing, women's history and the history of gender. At the same time, Columbia University Press is looking at ways to present the Gutenberg-e titles in a way that emphasizes the common links between the various monographs—bringing traditional considerations of list building and series development into the electronic environment.

In terms of marketing and sales, Columbia recently introduced the sale of individual titles. Gutenberg-e was introduced with an online subscription model in which libraries and institutions pay an annual rate of \$195 for access to the entire list of Gutenberg-e titles. With feedback from authors and customers, the press recognized that individuals and some libraries, particularly those with special collections, would prefer the option to acquire permanent access to only one or a selected few Gutenberg-e titles. Individual titles now cost \$49.50, and include access to all of the supplementary materials that accompany each monograph.

One of the most fascinating, if complex, technological developments introduced by the EPIC team was the concept of "topic maps." This new functionality is being developed as a way to allow readers of a monograph to explore a text, its attendant materials, and perhaps related monographs in new ways. The topic map itself is a description of the connections between disparate items in a text or group of texts, which overlays the monograph(s). A topic map would allow connections to be uncovered or

*Continued on next page*

---

## *A Model for Future Scholarship, continued*

followed between events, people, places, and things that are different than the path of argument presented in the author's original text.

The concept was described as "3-D indexes," or analogous to the experience of getting caught up in a thesaurus search. You start by looking up one word, are intrigued by one of its synonyms and look *that* up, and then another, and then another until you are far along a branching path from your original search term, and possibly rethinking what you meant to say in the first place.

The topic maps are not yet applied to any of the Gutenberg-e books and

one of the hurdles yet to be leapt in their development is the question of who prepares the topic maps. It is beyond the traditional job description of an author, editor, or electronic manuscript editor. While the EPIC team has been working on an interface that allows authors to submit relationships to be "mapped," it was admitted that a rich enough topic map could easily be as long as the original text. Is this a new job in electronic publishing for a super-indexer, or a task for special editorial committees or boards?

There are many intriguing new developments in the still-young

Gutenberg-e program. The fact that it is considered an experimental research program allows for continued adjustments to both technical and business models. Other presses and scholarly societies, such as the Modern Language Association, are beginning to look at this program as a possible model for humanities e-scholarship. The shape and the success of Gutenberg-e will continue to be closely watched by all members of the scholarly community, AAUP among them.

More information about Gutenberg-e, including available and forthcoming titles, can be found at <http://www.gutenberg-e.org>.

---

## *21st Century Privilège: A Gutenberg-e Author's Tale*

by Greg Brown

On several levels, my relationship as author of *A Field of Honor: Writers, Court Culture and Public Theater in French Literary Life from Racine to the Revolution* to my publisher, the Electronic Publishing Initiative @ Columbia University Press (EPIC), has differed from that of a usual first-book author to an academic press.

Indeed, that relationship actually predates the existence of Gutenberg-e, since 1998 when a *New York Times* reporter writing an article on the project that became Gutenberg-e included me in the lead, as an example of a junior scholar struggling to place my manuscript with a scholarly press. At the time, my manuscript was under final review for publication in more conventional form with another university press, but the article led many of my colleagues to the impression that I had opted already to publish an e-book.

My interest in the relationship of authors to publishers is more than just personal or professional; it is the topic of the book itself. *A Field of Honor* studies the strategies of aspiring eighteenth-century French playwrights to have their plays accepted and performed by the royal

theater, the Comédie Française. More precisely, it is about how the many subjects in the book experienced and narrated their quest for legitimacy as *gens de lettres*, a status conferred by acceptance and performance.

For those who could not achieve this status, an increasingly common alternative was to change the medium and sell the work to an authorized bookseller to be printed, with appropriate dedication, censorial approbation and *privilège* (an early form of copyright). Having spent years studying the economic, political and psychological factors involved in this strategy, my decision to publish *A Field of Honor* as a Gutenberg-e book deepened my understanding of my subject.

During the period from March 2001 through March 2002, when I worked with the EPIC staff to convert the manuscript into a published book, my relationship to the publisher greatly differed from both that of my eighteenth-century authors to the theater and from the relationships I had experienced with two major university presses that had reviewed my manuscript previously. No longer a supplicant for cultural capital and

legitimacy from a patron, I found myself instead working as I had while part of an editorial and technical team that developed another electronic work, the pedagogical CD-ROM and website *Liberty, Equality and Fraternity* (Jack R. Censer and Lynn A. Hunt, eds., 2001) on which I served as Associate Editor. (I have written about this experience in *The History Teacher* (2001) 34:2.)

On the one hand, EPIC gave me the sort of free hand that almost no author receives from a publisher today—no word count limit, an encouragement to include as many illustrations as possible, and the freedom to propose not only a text but also to provide input on design (including even font and color scheme), page layout, book structure, and editorial style. On the other hand, I was part of a group, constrained by collective decisions about the production process and the appearance of the end product that had been made to create a site style for all the books and to take advantage of economies of scale in producing a library of e-books; this included a pre-existing page-layout template, foot-noting system, and navigational tool.

*Continued on page 7*

---

# Digital Monticello: The Revision of a Classic Typeface

by Chuck Creesy

*The distinguished typographer Matthew Carter will give a presentation, "The New Digital Monticello: Reinterpreting a Historical Typeface," at the 2003 Annual Meeting. He will be joined by Chuck Creesy, Princeton's Director of Computing and Publishing Technologies, who will recount the 200-year history of this font.*

Sixty years ago, when Princeton University announced plans to publish the complete Papers of Thomas Jefferson, the Mergenthaler Linotype Company offered to produce a historically appropriate typeface for the project. Christened "Monticello," it was a revival of a font crafted in the early 1800s by Binny & Ronaldson, America's first successful foundry, whose types dominated the domestic market during Jefferson's presidency.

Last year Princeton University Press, faced with radical changes in printing technology and expectations that the Jefferson project will continue until 2026, commissioned Matthew Carter, one of the foremost type designers in practice today, to create a digital rendition of the font suitable for the computer age.

Carter was uniquely qualified to undertake a revival of this kind. The son of a distinguished British historian of typography, he went to Holland in his teens to learn the art of cutting punches for the manufacture of handset type and later spent several years designing fonts at Linotype. In 1981 he co-founded Bitstream, an early developer of digital type. In recent years, he has advanced the art of optimizing type for reading on computer screen with the creation of fonts like Verdana and Georgia. From his work on such designs as ITC Galiard, Miller, and Big Caslon, he gained the experience in interpreting historical typefaces that he would bring to Digital Monticello.

Binny & Ronaldson weren't the first to manufacture type in America, but they were the first to make an ongoing business of it. When the two young immigrants from Scotland formed their partnership in Philadelphia in 1796, Archibald Binny tended to the typemaking while James Ronaldson looked after the

firm's business affairs. Ronaldson first met Jefferson in late 1805 or early 1806, and soon thereafter began corresponding with him. Their early letters deal mainly with wool, textiles, and the promotion of manufactures. But in 1809, Ronaldson mentioned with increasing urgency a crisis besetting his type business.

Antimony—a critical element in printing type, the ingredient that makes the alloy hard and durable—had yet to be discovered in the young republic. Because of competing political and economic interests, England stopped supplying this mineral to its former colonies. When the deepening shortage threatened to shut his foundry down, Ronaldson asked Jefferson for help in finding another source.

Jefferson gave Ronaldson a letter of introduction to Pierre S. DuPont, a prominent statesman and publisher in Paris (two of whose sons would found a company in America bearing the family name). Ronaldson crossed the Atlantic and, with DuPont's aid, succeeded in obtaining a sufficient quantity of antimony from France. America's typefounders survived, and with them its printing industry, ultimately realizing Jefferson's desire that "[we] soon supply ourselves with most of the books of considerable demand."

In the 1820s, popular taste came to prefer fatter and more stylized typefaces. Binny's early fonts lost favor and gradually fell out of use. But the matrices that he and his punchcutters created from 1796 to 1815 were preserved by the series of companies that descended from B & R. In 1892 Binny's original "Pica No. 1" was revived by the American Type Founders Company under the name of "Oxford." Several highly regarded printers—including Daniel B. Updike, Bruce Rodgers, Fred Anthoensen, and

the Grabhorns—used it with great skill and effectiveness.

By the turn of the century, however, handset type was affordable only for special projects. Commercial printing relied on type set by machine. The possibility of recreating Binny's fonts for Linotype had been considered in the 1920s by C.H. Griffith, who was to become Mergenthaler's vice-president for typeface development, but it was the Jefferson Papers that spurred him to action. Griffith was joined in this effort by P.J. Conkwright, destined to become Princeton University Press's most acclaimed book designer. For six years they worked together to preserve the spirit and style of the original design while moving it to a radically different technology.

Despite a few compromises necessitated by the limitations of Linotype, most evident in the italic faces, this typeface served the Jefferson Papers project well through the "hot metal" years. Then, in the 1980s, the printing industry underwent technological changes no less momentous than the transition from hand-set to machine-set type a century earlier. This began when Linotype machines gave way to "cold type" devices that utilized photo-chemical processes to render letterforms on film and then on metal plates for printing.

By the mid-1990s, the production of type came to be dominated by raster image processors employing the PostScript language pioneered by Adobe. The Jefferson Papers made do for a few years with a digitization of Monticello created by early scanning software that could not trace curves: the letterforms were defined by a dense pattern of dots connected by straight lines. This type worked surprisingly well in small sizes, but with each upgrade to a newer generation of

*Continued on next page*

---

# The CrossRef Initiative

by Amy Brand

CrossRef is an independent, publisher-run membership association for building shared technologies. It has an unusual charge: to enhance the accessibility of published scholarship via direct collaboration among sometime competitors in the scholarly and professional publishing arena.

CrossRef launched in early 2000 as a cooperative effort among publishers to enable citation linking in academic journals by using the Digital Object Identifier, or DOI. A DOI is an alphanumeric name (e.g., "doi:10.1101/gr.10.12.1841") for digital content, such as a book, journal article, chapter, image, and so on. The DOI is paired with the object's electronic address, or URL, in a central directory that may be updated and is published in place of the URL to prevent stale links, while allowing the content to move as needed.

For instance, the publisher may need to migrate content from one production system to another (pre-print to post-print), or content may move from one publisher to another if a journal, or the publisher itself, changes ownership. In these cases the DOI never changes, which means that all the links to that content that have already been made still function. Hence, one key insight of the DOI system is persistence; the other is "actionability." Like the URL itself, one click on a properly implemented DOI gets the user to the location of the content they want.

Perhaps the weakest aspect of this approach is that publishers have to follow certain guidelines in the use of the DOI and inform the DOI directory if a registered item moves. The CrossRef system makes updating the URL in the central DOI directory very easy.

CrossRef publishers update their records reliably, and reports of nonworking DOIs are increasingly rare, even with millions of DOIs being resolved each month.

The success of CrossRef is strong evidence that this approach works for cross-publisher linking. The network currently spans 180 publishers from around the world (among them several society and university presses), 7,000 journals, and nearly 7 million registered DOIs. More important, scholars are using these links at a rate of about 2.5 million DOI clicks per month. While most linked items are journal articles, CrossRef has begun registering books, book chapters, and conference proceedings as publishers have come to understand that DOIs address both their internal and external linking needs. In order to realize the vision of a linking backbone for all scholarly and professional literature online, the DOI directory will have to include patents, technical reports, and other forms of publication that cite and get cited. Coverage will also continue to expand backward in time as publishers digitize archival material.

CrossRef members are currently exploring new ways to leverage this nexus of collaboration to serve the publishing and research communities. As of last year, CrossRef DOIs can integrate with library systems for institutionally appropriate, or localized, linking. Other developments include forward linking (to answer the question, "Which publications cite this article?") and the ability to associate a single DOI with multiple links and resources.

Finally, CrossRef has piloted a platform for cross-publisher, full-text searches—a federated portal into the

depths of published scholarship. This would expose publishers' proprietary, full-text content for search purposes without giving it away and could serve small publishers in particular by augmenting the "discoverability" of their content. Researchers would benefit from the ability to perform thorough searches limited to the authoritative literature. Think of it as a kind of "Google with glasses."

Two themes running through CrossRef's story help explain why publishers are willing to join forces: (1) CrossRef focuses on the technology and leaves business practices up to individual publishers, and (2) publishers participate but don't aggregate. CrossRef's linking system is a form of virtual or distributed integration; the publisher deposits only a minimal set of metadata required for linking, while the content itself remains at the publisher's site. Integration is achieved only by linking. Similarly, the CrossRef search prototype contains a centralized index of publishers' full-text content but not the content itself.

University presses are especially close to academia and are aware that some of their own authors and readers now perceive publishers as perhaps unnecessary intermediaries in the scholarly communication process. CrossRef is about helping publishers be creative in meeting the demand for greater access to scholarship through technology, while promoting their own relevance to the research community.

*Amy Brand is Director of Business Development at CrossRef. She received a doctorate in cognitive science from MIT in 1989 and previously held positions at Ingenta, MIT Press, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, and the University of Pennsylvania.*

---

## Digital Monticello, continued

text-processing and typesetting programs these fonts became increasingly troublesome.

The task Carter undertook in reinterpreting Monticello for modern

publishing methods paralleled the 1920's work of Griffith and Conkwright. He also took advantage of the opportunity to correct certain distortions, particularly in the italic letterforms, restoring some

of the original spirit and style that had been lost in the earlier translation. The result brings us much closer to the font that Jefferson knew and admired two centuries ago.

---

# Yes, Virginia, There is a Copyright Clause: The Real Meaning of Copyright

by Peter Givler

*Before angry backlash at recent copyright legislation that seems to many designed to protect large corporate interests can destroy the foundation of a modern system of authorship and a viable publishing market, it is important to clarify the interests that are truly served by copyright.*

*Peter Givler, Executive Director of AAUP, gave a talk on this thorny issue at the 2003 annual meeting of the Professional and Scholarly Publishers Division of the Association of American Publishers. Hoist by his own petard after suggesting that a non-profit publisher be included on the copyright panel—while non-profit and commercial publishers often stand together on copyright concerns, sometimes their interests diverge—Peter found himself sandwiched between top copyright lawyers, quoting Byron.*

*Peter's talk, a call to reconsider and better communicate the real significance of copyright laws, was extraordinarily well received. The talk itself will be published in the Journal of Scholarly Publishing, while an essay on the same subject will be published in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Following are highlights of the position on copyright articulated by Peter in recent months.*

"But words are things, and a small drop of ink, / Falling like dew, upon a thought, produces / That which makes thousands, perhaps millions, think."\*

Words are things. Copyright is a specialized form of property law that recognizes that works of original expression belong to the person who created them. Today that doesn't seem very remarkable. As a specific statutory right, though, it's relatively recent; the first English copyright law, the Statute of Anne, was passed in 1710, about 95 years after Shakespeare's birth.

Shakespeare furnishes an instructive example of the perils of authorship before copyright. Once his company had performed one of his plays, Shakespeare lost the legal ability to prevent further performance by anyone else. All he could do was keep the acting script, or prompt book, under lock and key. This created a brisk business in counterfeit manuscripts that were sold to rival companies and performed as works by William Shakespeare. After 400 years of Shakespeare scholarship we still don't know for sure which of the many variant texts of Hamlet

represents Shakespeare's authorized version, and we probably never will.

Copyright law changed two things. First, by giving authors legal control over their own texts it created a system for maintaining textual integrity. Second, it created our modern sense of what the profession of author means: to be someone whose reputation—and with luck, livelihood—rests on being recognized as the creator of the precise texts published under his or her name.

If this sounds abstract, in university life it has enormous practical significance. For most academic authors the direct financial rewards of publication—royalties and advances—are negligible, but the indirect rewards—promotion, tenure, higher professional visibility, the ability to attract larger grants, better jobs, and so forth—are significant indeed. At the core of those indirect rewards is professional reputation, which in a university rests precisely on being recognized as the author of a specific body of texts.

Copyright grants the creator of original written work exclusive right to publish it for a certain length of time, and makes that right

transferable to someone else. In doing so, copyright creates the basic legal mechanism that allows publishing costs to be recovered from the marketplace. Once again, we take this for granted, but before copyright, if an author wasn't wealthy, publication depended largely on his or her ability to appeal to the generosity of sponsors and patrons. By shifting the funding of publication from patronage to the marketplace, copyright laid the foundation for the enormously expanded range of ideas an information published today.

For that reason, copyright deserves the same zeal and enthusiasm publishers bring to discussions of freedom of speech. The two are closely related; both bodies of law originate in our Constitution, and both address the central importance of communication to a modern, democratic society. The First Amendment protects the expression of ideas from government interference, while copyright provides the economic engine that drives their widespread distribution.

\*George Gordon, Lord Byron, Don Juan.

---

## *New Exchange Appearance and Distribution Policy*

AAUP is proud to announce that *The Exchange* is now printed on 100% de-inked post-consumer recycled paper. We're also shifting to a greater reliance on the online publication of the newsletter to reach our membership. We'll continue to distribute print copies of *The Exchange* to press directors and department heads, but will provide online access to the majority of members' staff. Print or electronic subscriptions are also available gratis to members of the academic and publishing communities, with a \$15 shipping and handling fee for foreign or library print subscriptions.

---

# RoweCom: A Subscription Agency Fails

by Brenna McLaughlin

Journals publishing has been roiled in recent months by the financial implosion of library subscription agent RoweCom. RoweCom, reportedly already financially troubled, was acquired in November of 2001 by divine, inc., a new-economy era company "focused on extended enterprise solutions." In December of 2002 divine announced to RoweCom customers that they would no longer support the library subscription agent.

As awareness of the crisis grew, an informal creditors group of both libraries and affected publishers formed itself via a Yahoo! Group called *rowecomcreditors*. A steering committee of this ad-hoc group has been an integral part of negotiations to resolve the crisis, primarily through the acquisition of RoweCom's business by EBSCO, another large subscription agent. The steering committee included five libraries and five publishers, among them Oxford University Press, Elsevier Science, and the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers.

On January 27, 2003, RoweCom simultaneously filed for bankruptcy and lodged a 14-count lawsuit against parent company divine alleging fraud. The lawsuit claimed that divine, inc., had wrongfully transferred millions of dollars from its subsidiary, causing RoweCom's financial failure. Divine

has maintained that the claims are without merit. Divine itself filed for bankruptcy a month later.

Libraries experienced huge losses in RoweCom's financial collapse. The two largest creditors, according to the company's Chapter 11 filing, were the National Institutes of Health at \$2.4 million and Virginia Tech, which lost \$1.6 million. Many smaller libraries lost their entire, and often irreplaceable, periodicals budgets and faced the prospect of tremendous gaps in their collections and decreased service to patrons. Since the beginning of the debacle, publishers have made efforts to accommodate library subscribers who used RoweCom. Many journals publishers extended grace periods until the end of March.

On March 5, 2003, it was announced that EBSCO had agreed to the purchase of RoweCom U.S.A. (they had earlier indicated intent to purchase the company's European business.) The acquisition relies in large part on the participation of publishers. The plan would call for participating publishers to fulfill those 2003 subscriptions for which libraries paid RoweCom but the publishers never received payment.

The subscribers would then assign their claims against RoweCom for the amount of the paid subscription to the publisher. Participating publishers would collect

any return on the debt that may result from RoweCom's bankruptcy proceedings. Libraries who sign on to this plan agree to sign over their debt to publishers, and agree to factor in the participation of publishers when making 2004 periodicals purchasing decisions.

The number of publishers ultimately participating by signing on to the Prepaid Order Agreement will affect the purchasing price EBSCO will pay for RoweCom's assets, and thus affect the amount of money that could be collected for payment of the bankrupt subscription agent's debts.

It is a tough situation for both subscribers and publishers, with no clear or easy decisions to be made, and it will be a long time before the full effects of this crisis on journals publishers and libraries are known. Presses should, of course, seek qualified legal advice before making a decision.

For more details on the EBSCO purchase plans, visit <http://www.alpssp.org/rowecom.htm>. Publishers and librarians can join the RoweCom creditors discussion list at <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/rowecomcreditors/>.

A separate discussion group for AAUP publishers has been set up, which can be joined by sending a blank e-mail to [aaup-rowecom-subscribe@yahoo.com](mailto:aaup-rowecom-subscribe@yahoo.com).

---

## Gutenberg-e Author, continued

Perhaps the most innovative aspect of my relationship to EPIC is that our interests are now much more closely aligned than are those of authors and academic presses in the conventional, print publication process. Whereas in the conventional relationship, the author defines success by favorable reviews, awards and a broad readership, the publisher defines success by revenues. Although

part of EPIC's mandate is to produce a viable cost-recovery model, the Gutenberg-e program has defined success in terms of the credibility and legitimacy, in short the cultural capital, conferred on these books. Which is what has lead aspiring writers, from the Enlightenment to the present, to seek out publishers in the first place. As the publisher's role moves away from the material production of the

book towards the legitimization of electronic works largely or entirely created by the author, or a team of authors, it will be the degree of evolution in relationships among author, publisher and reader, rather than technological innovation, that will mark whether all scholarly publishing will succeed or fail.

*Greg Brown is assistant professor of history at the University of Nevada in Las Vegas.*

---

# Calendar

## **International Conference on the Future of the Book**

April 22-24, 2003  
Cairns, Australia

## **The Johns Hopkins University Press 125th Anniversary Celebration**

April 30, 2003  
Baltimore, MD

## **Society for Scholarly Publishers Annual Meeting**

May 28-30, 2003  
Baltimore, MD

## **Book Expo America**

May 30-June 1, 2003  
Los Angeles, CA

## **Production Managers Meeting**

June 21-22, 2003  
St. Louis, MO

## **2003 AAUP Annual Meeting**

June 21-25, 2003

### **AAUP Pre-Meeting Workshops**

*Fundraising for Nonprofit Publishers*

June 21, 2003

*Print on Demand*

June 21, 2003

*Press Directors Meeting: Tales from the Front Lines*

June 22, 2003

Hyatt Regency Union Station, St. Louis, MO

Contact: [annualmeeting@aaupnet.org](mailto:annualmeeting@aaupnet.org)

## **Midwest Presses Meeting**

September 7-8, 2003

Iowa Memorial Union, Iowa City, IA

## **Frankfurt Book Fair**

October 8-13, 2003

Frankfurt, Germany



THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES  
71 WEST 23RD STREET, SUITE 901  
NEW YORK, NY 10010