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Or to: Katina Strauch, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409 • 843-723-3536 (voice) • 843-805-7918 (fax)
843-509-2848 (cell) • <kstrauch@ comcast.net> • http://www.katina.info/conference

I n parts one and two I reexamined my “10 Reasons Why the Internet Is No Substitute for a Library” (http://bit.ly/30iInQb) in an effort to see where I went wrong, or right, as the case may be. On balance, critics notwithstanding, the article holds up well against the empirical data, less so against what one hopes the Internet will be (but isn’t yet). Herewith, are some concluding remarks about this brave new, digital world.

Conclusions

While I still believe the Internet is no substitute for a library, I understand that I am in the minority in that belief. But believing that doesn’t make me, or anyone else for that matter, a Lud-dite. Unless one is a makebate who holds to an either-or view of things, one can see the Internet for what it is, and still see libraries as, for now anyway, infinitely better as a full-service shop for research and resources. As the dean of a medium-size academic library, I cannot ignore the rise of the Web and the digitization of everything. For this reason, we have ebrary, loan iPads, Kindles, Sonys, and laptops. With rare exception, nearly all our article information is digital. At the height of print, we subscribed to some 3,000 titles. Today, that number is less than 600, but our students have access to more than 30,000 titles. Additions like multispectral imaging (http://econ.st/s1X5Y) that delve more deeply into manuscripts to solve mysteries that heretofore remained unknown add up to positives on the Web side of the ledger, and make it a more robust tool for the future.

But none of these things are free. No individual could subscribe to the resources a library does all by herself. Meanwhile, library budgets remain static at best. I hoped that my article then, and its reassessment now, would make the case that print books are not the enemy, and large libraries are not the devil in disguise. Sure, they are costly and yes, there are ways we can make them ever less so. But let’s not throw the cake out with the cake box. If we do, we’ll likely never get libraries back. Moreover we’ll have nothing that is a viable ersatz. My objections to the Internet are valid ones against a change that is not, not yet, a viable ersatz. My objections to the Internet are valid ones against a change that is not, not yet, the panacea for everything.

Print reading hangs on only because most serious readers are over forty and are not yet sold on the eBook reading experience as the exclusive alternative. Even young people half that age are not entirely sold on it for scholarly reading. More than this, however, is the fact that print publishing, the cash-cow of many publishers, will fade only when another equally-profitable model replaces it. Until then, expect digital delays. (And please, don’t ask again for Congress to fix the copyright problem. That’s part of this problem even now.) Let me remind you that eBooks have been around now nearly three decades. We should be within eyesight of the paperless horizon, but we have yet to reach its border. And now news comes that eBooks are on the way out in five years (http://bit.ly/N86JSu).

Even granting the rapid rise of eBooks, my 2000 text stands up better than my critics are continued on page 10