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If Stephen King Sells Poorly, Fire the Editor by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

In a move that stunned the publishing world, Ann Godoff—president, publisher and ed-in-chief of Random House Trade Group—was given the boot. The industry is in total shock, said Suzanne Guay of William Morris. Peter Olson, CEO of Random House says she was falling short of profit targets. “There’s no contradiction between literary quality and financial results.”


Losing Other Peoples’ Money by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Industry Standard, the “Newsmagazine of the Internet Economy” made $200 million in the fat year of 1999 but still failed spectacularly. IDG, owner of MacWorld, InfoWorld and the “Dummies’” yellow paperback series launched a trade magazine about the Internet business in 1997. They hired John Battelle, first managing editor of Wired and a cast of supporting hipsters who predictably clashed with the conservative Boston-based IDG managers. Tens of millions got squandered, and Battelle seemed most interested in an IPO and the big money that could be made from ramping up the stock in those frenzied times. But the real end came with the crash of the Internet economy in 2000 and the mass flight of advertisers.


The Synergy That Wasn’t by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

In Jan. 2000, CEO Gerald Levin sold Time Warner to AOL in a monster-hyped quest for synergy. At the time he said he sold because he couldn’t figure out how to harness the Internet. Then he was put in charge of it all. No one noticed the irony. And of course it’s been a total disaster. Among other non-synergistic aspects, its high speed Internet access strips money out of Warner Brothers music because customers download music for free. And Time Warner execs loathe the techies and spend their time on corporate jets and in limos heading to the Four Seasons. Now the investment bankers will get paid huge fees a second time to tear it all apart.


Talk of the Trade

Talk of the Trade from page 80

ments and masses of other primary sources, Bellesiles showed that few Americans, even on the frontier, had working guns. The book was hailed for its originality and its importance to the anti-gun movement, and in 2001 Bellesiles was given Columbia University’s prestigious Bancroft Prize for historical writing.

There were only two problems with Bellesiles’ argument: one was that it made no sense, it was counterintuitive, and two, his research was, to be kind, flawed. The first problem, the absurdity of believing that few Americans owned guns, even though they were vulnerable to Indian attacks and killed game for a large part of their diet, propelled a number of scholars to try to replicate Bellesiles’ research. It emerged that the San Francisco probate records that Bellesiles quoted were all destroyed in the 1906 earthquake. Primary sources in Vermont and Rhode Island did not match Bellesiles’ charts, and when he set up a Website to confront his critics, the facts he mounted on the site did not check out either. Emory University, Bellesiles’ employer, set up a blue ribbon panel of historians to decide the award winning professor’s fate. The committee reported that “it is almost impossible to tell where Bellesiles got his information...and he is guilty of unprofessional and misleading work.” Bellesiles is still defiant, but has resigned from Emory. It is unclear whether he will return the Bancroft Prize, or if Columbia will demand its return. One thing seems certain: early Americans used guns to hunt and protect themselves, and had they not, they would have been as foolish as those who awarded the Bancroft Prize to Bellesiles.
Code Hill
by Sandra Beehler (Lewis & Clark College)

This article addresses the issue of preservation of computer code. When computer startups company bankrupt, what happens to the thousands of lines of code produced by their programmers? Early on, the idea of reusing code was popular, but in fact it did not prove cost-effective, partly because the code without the people who wrote it is not very useful. Thus only a small portion of it is ever rescued and re-born. Among the small portion saved was voice recognition software marketed as NaturallySpeaking, developed by a small company called Dragon Systems and sold to the Belgian company Leraout & Hauspie just months before the company went bankrupt. NaturallySpeaking was the world's first continuous-speech dictation software and a prime example of irreproducible "deep" code. Luckily its value was recognized and it was quickly bought by another company and put back on the market.

See — "Immortal Code" by Martha Baer, Wired 11.02, February 2003, p. 84.

Publish or Profit?
by Pamela M. Rose (University at Buffalo)

A group of prominent scientists led by Dr. Harold Varmus have announced a new publishing venture, Public Library of Science, as a challenge to the established academic publishers who are more concerned with profits than freedom of scientific information. PLS will begin with two peer-reviewed online journals on biology and medicine with the goal of putting the best scientific papers and immediately depositing them in the public domain, a move which the founders hope will ultimately transform science itself. Success will "depend largely on whether leading scholars are willing to forsake the certain status of publishing in the established journals to support the principle of science as a public resource. In a profession where publishing in a top journal is often crucial to success and grant money, that may be a difficult task."


We’ve Come a Long Way Since Aladades
by Pamela M. Rose (University at Buffalo)

Online, continuously updated, instantly accessible. That's the goal of an ambitious project being undertaken by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) which has launched eight pilot projects in its National Map Program to develop a real-time online digital national map with high-quality topographical data. Such a map would replace sorely out-dated topographical maps which have long suffered from lack of funds to maintain a robust revision program. Some question the ability to maintain such a vast store of knowledge, but USGS hopes to partner with federal, state and local agencies. Pilot projects, such as the one in Lake Tahoe, expected to have a ready core of data from local communities who maintain current Geographic Information Systems (GIS), but are finding a mixed bag of either poor GIS measures or complicated software that needs to be standardized and integrated. However, some regional digital maps are already providing useful information.


IMHBCO (In My Humble But Correct Opinion)

Aid Workers or Bass Pros? Struggling with the Fundamentals of Librarianship

by Rick Anderson (Director of Resource Acquisition, The University Libraries, University of Nevada, Reno, 1664 No. Virginia Street, Reno, NV 89557; Phone: 775-784-6500 x.273; Fax: 775-784-1328) <rickand@unr.edu>

For some reason, I find that as I get older I lose patience more and more quickly with people who brag about not having any answers. You know the ones I mean: they usually have warm, intelligent eyes and quiet, sensitive smiles and they stand in front of large groups of people (often at considerable expense) and say, in a deep, thoughtful voice, "I bring no answers today. I offer you only questions." To which the audience is expected to respond with hushed admiration and knowing nods, as if to confirm to each other that, yes, the ultimate wisdom is in open-mindedness, and the best that can be expected of us in this crazy old world is that we all remain open to a constant questioning.

The problem is that while asking questions may require great courage, an unwillingness to take the next step — that of arriving at conclusions and taking the steps that logically follow from them — is often an expression of just the opposite trait. Open-mindedness is good and praiseworthy, but surely the ultimate value of asking questions is that in doing so we can eventually arrive at, you know... answers. As a librarian, I don’t feel like I have a lot of time to spend sitting around reserve judgment and congratulating myself on my open-mindedness. I need to be getting things done.

I offer the above as sort of an apology for what is going to come next, because this month I bring no answers, only a vexing question. But I do want to arrive at a good answer to it, and I hope some readers will respond to me with their thoughts so that we can revisit it later and maybe come to some conclusions. The question is, I believe, an urgent one — one on which the future of our profession may hang, and believe me, if I thought I had the answer to it I wouldn’t hesitate to say so. But I’m genuinely conflicted on this issue and hope others will speak up and help me work through it.

Here’s the question: As librarians, is it our fundamental function to distribute information to people or to teach people how to find information for themselves? I find myself struggling, in my mind, between two competing models of library service. On the one hand, we can be sort of like foreign-aid workers: we’re here to serve people who may or may not know how to help themselves very well, and we stand on the back of the information truck as they mill
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