same principle? Their commercial publishing colleagues certainly don’t have any scruples.

My final point will be more controversial. Establishing the principle that academic libraries evaluate their actions according to economic self-interest opens up the possibility that their host institutions will do the same in evaluating the academic library. I worry about the future of academic libraries with the arrival of Google, the decreased importance of reference, faculty buying their own books, and the growing numbers of online students who are much harder to convince to use library services. The Internet favors disintermediation. I’m not sure what I would say to an administrator who proposed on the grounds of the institution’s economic self-interest that another unit could purchase and support the databases that the faculty select and that the faculty might as well purchase what they want (PDA) without library intervention. The level of service for some would certainly not be the same, but it might be good enough and have enough economic justification to be implemented. To avoid this scenario, I believe that libraries need to nurture support and create good feelings among its constituencies as most academic libraries have done in the past. Doing so individually and collectively might require blunting the focus on economic self-interest in some cases or at least hiding this principle well enough that others don’t have reason to use it against the academic library.

The situation for public libraries is different because they are suffering from having some major trade publishers act in what they believe to be their economic self-interest. If these publishers are willing to walk away from sales to libraries, estimated at 9% of their total sales, public libraries have little direct leverage to change this decision. For public libraries, the first strategy would be to challenge the publishers’ assumptions that library lending hurts their profitability. Perhaps the research already exists or could be commissioned to provide some proof for the reasons commonly given on why libraries don’t harm publishers and may even benefit them. To begin, an argument can be made that high library circulation can co-exist with high publisher sales. A guest lecturer to my collection development class, Celeste Chaote, showed figures that both public library circulation and book sales are among the highest in the nation in Ann Arbor. While this campus community may be atypical, perhaps further research would show that high library use and book buying are linked. A second point is that the availability of books in libraries doesn’t detract from sales as much as publishers believe because library users often buy the book anyway. Contrary to the argument above, some library users most likely don’t buy many full-priced books out of principle or due to the lack of money. The literature on copyright infringement is filled with analysis that the number of “stolen” copies of music or films does not translate into the dollar value of lost sales because the “thieves” wouldn’t have bought the stolen content. A third contention is that libraries are more likely to purchase relatively unknown authors, especially those who have received good reviews in the library press. Increasing the readership of these authors makes them better known and may ultimately translate into higher sales and profits for publishers. With the Amazon long tail, this argument perhaps makes less sense than it used to but may still have some validity.

Economic self-interest does create some allies for public libraries. If the commercial publisher has a library division, these employees have great economic self-interest in selling to libraries since the existence of their division is at stake as print sales decline. The library jobbers have the same self-interest of wanting to sell as many eBooks as possible to their customers. Their desire to put pressure on publishers may not be quite as strong since public libraries may not have reduced their purchases from them but are rather spending the acquisitions budget on other materials.

The final strategy for public libraries is to publicize this self-serving economic strategy on the part of commercial publishers. The public still has a favorable view of libraries and may be able to apply some pressure on these “greedy” publishers. In addition, some want to borrow the books at their local public library. The letter from Maureen Sullivan, ALA President, to the publishers is a good example of implementing this strategy. Public librarians should tell their patrons why the library doesn’t have the eBooks that they wish to borrow and suggest that they complain. Library associations at all levels and individual libraries should take their case to the press. They, along with their patrons, should use social media to put pressure on the publishers. Effective lobbying on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube can sometimes produce the desired results. Even talking to politicians at the state level, as was done in Connecticut, increases awareness of the issue even if state laws cannot force publishers to sell to libraries since federal copyright takes precedence over state legislation.

Continued on page 77