

June 2012

Booklover-Closer to Home

Donna Jacobs
MUSC, jacobsdf@musc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jacobs, Donna (2012) "Booklover-Closer to Home," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 24: Iss. 3, Article 30.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6289>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

JUNE 2012

ASCE LIBRARY

Did You Mark Your Calendar?

ASCE Library Launches
June 29, 2012

Come and Experience
the New **ASCE Library!**

ascelibrary.org

ASCE Library, now on **Atypon's Literatum™ platform**, is the largest, most comprehensive peer-reviewed collection of civil engineering research and application-oriented content.

Contact ASCE: Phone: 1(800) 548.2723 (US)/1(703) 295.6300 (Int'l) | Email: marketing@asce.org

Booklover — Closer to Home

Column Editor: **Donna Jacobs** (Research Specialist, Transgenic Mouse Core Facility, MUSC, Charleston, SC 29425) <jacobsd@musc.edu>

During the three or more years that I have been writing “Booklover,” I have received a couple of emails commenting on one thing or another. Recently, I received one that turned into a real gift. One of the librarians at the **Medical University of South Carolina** contacted me because the library was getting ready to “toss” four volumes of *Nobel Lectures Physiology or Medicine*. The volumes spanned the years from 1901-1970. Her question to me was: “Would I like to have them?” “Of course” was my reply. I walk by the entrance to the **MUSC** library at least once a day, so it was easy for me to stop in at the front desk and retrieve the four tomes. Physically heavy and weighty in subject matter, I was delighted to have them. The subject matter was closer to home. With more than thirty years in the research community, I was familiar with many of the names listed in the table of contents and have even had the privilege to attend lectures given by some of the laureates.

The Forward in the first three volumes is the same. Written and signed by **Arne Tiselius**, President of the **Nobel Foundation**, it explains that the foundation granted **Elsevier Publishing Company of Amsterdam** the right

to publish the English translations of the **Nobel Lectures** from the five domains (Physics, Chemistry, Physiology or Medicine, Literature, and Peace) starting in 1901 and continuing to 1962. In addition to the lectures, there is a brief description of the award-winning work, short biographies of each laureate, and presentation speeches. I perused all four volumes, and it was like a walk down memory lane recalling Biochemistry lectures in college or seminars attended at conferences or at **MUSC**. But the 1962 award is particularly close to home since I work in the molecular biology/genetic field. Today DNA is a household word, made so by paternity testing and **CSI** TV shows. The path to mainstream began in 1953 when **James Watson** and **Francis Crick** proposed the double-helical structure of the molecule.

Francis Harry Compton Crick, **James Dewey Watson**, and **Maurice Hugh Frederick Wilkins** won the **Nobel Prize** in Physiology or Medicine in 1962 “for their discoveries concerning the molecular structure of nuclear acids and its significance for information transfer in living materials.” **Professor A. Engström**, of the Staff of Professors of the **Royal Caroline Institute**, gave the presenta-

tion speech. He opened with a discussion of the definition of a caricature and led into the relevance of defining the three dimensional structure of deoxyribonucleic acid or DNA. “The discovery of the three-dimensional molecular structure of deoxyribonucleic acid — DNA — is of great importance because it outlines the possibilities for an understanding in its finest details of the molecular configuration, which dictates the general and individual properties of living matter.” **Wilkins** won for his X-ray crystallographic recordings of DNA which gave the first view of the molecule. **Watson** and **Crick** won for recognizing from these recordings how the molecule is able to take on its staircase structure — the staircase that leads to our heredity.

Dr. Wilkins’ lecture was entitled “The Molecular Configuration of Nucleic Acids” and was filled with a physicist’s enthusiasm for these fundamental molecules of biology.

Dr. Watson’s lecture was entitled “The Involvement of RNA in the Synthesis of Proteins.” He entertains with stories of meeting

continued on page 66



From A University Press — To Download or Not to Download, That Is the Question

Column Editor: **Leila W. Salisbury** (Director, University Press of Mississippi, Jackson, MS 39211; Phone: 601-432-6205) <lsalisbury@ihl.state.ms.us>



The shift to the purchase — or in many cases, licensing — of scholarly eBooks raises no end of questions about acquisitions philosophies, pricing, consortial sharing, single-user versus simultaneous-access models, demand driven purchasing/lending, the remaining market for print versions of these books, and the list goes on and on. After the matter of pricing, however, no issue in this landscape may be more contentious, or less understood, than the downloading of eBook content onto a patron's various devices.

In the years since university presses began signing up with vendors old and new to sell scholarly content electronically, the issue of downloads has been a source of concern, and in many cases publishers refuse to allow any patron downloads. That is, if publishers know about the downloading to begin with. Product offerings and the various features they allow develop rapidly, and vendors sometimes assume that these new packages are covered by language in an agreement a publisher might have signed years before. I think about this issue a great deal of late. I want to make sure that my press's electronic content is being considered for these new and pilot programs, included as part of the title catalog being loaded at libraries just testing out a PDA or short-term loan plan so that the books have the maximum number of opportunities for discovery (and therefore use and purchase). On the other hand, I also worry that our press's content is being offered in ways that I would not want, at least at the moment, or at prices disconnected from those we have set. So though I am deeply interested in this topic and want to engage with vendors about our electronic content, the reality is that I don't always know exactly what happens to our eBooks, and that's an uncomfortable feeling.

With these eBooks, when printing and downloads of electronic content become in-

involved, publishers begin to get very nervous. Why? It's not that we dislike change (well, perhaps many of us do, but we've also learned to accept that change is now the norm rather than the exception when it comes to scholarly communication and dissemination of content). Rather, it's that publishers see the revenue sources that sustain many university presses — particularly course adoption sales and licensing fees for material included in coursepacks, whether print or electronic — directly impacted by programs that allow for unrestricted sharing, printing, and downloading. This may seem surprising, but at an average university press (and there are more than 130 with membership in the **Association of American University Presses**), only 25-50% of revenue might come from institutional sales. Less than half of a typical press's income is derived from libraries. The rest comes from trade/general interest titles, regional publications, and, you guessed it, course adoptions.

I could devote a separate column to the issue of whether an eBook offers greater/different accessibility than a print book or article placed on reserve in the library for use in a particular course and whether that should be considered as fair use (the **ARL's** new January 2012 *Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Academic and Research Libraries* addresses this issue from the library perspective). With the Georgia State ruling just handed down, this question just got clearer, or murkier, depending on whether you're a publisher or a librarian. For the purpose of this piece, I'll posit that publishers believe that unrestricted electronic access to content (unless licensed under a multiple-user model) and full-text downloading will almost certainly decrease library and consumer sales of a course-appropriate book. With print books, students either bought the book (admittedly it may have been purchased used) or coursepack, shared a copy among a

handful of classmates, or went without. With a library's eBook edition and with the ease of sharing (whether sanctioned or unsanctioned) of this material, there is no need for the library to purchase more than one copy of even high-circulation materials, and students have practically no incentive to purchase a book for a course if it can be downloaded for reading and printing at their leisure.

At issue is not that publishers want to suppress use of the scholarly content we publish. In fact, we want just the opposite. The mission statements of most university presses call for the widest possible dissemination of the scholarship we publish, in whatever form, print or e. What alarms publishers is lost sales and revenue. An electronic copy in a library may mean the loss of 10 or 20 print sales for a course. But multiply this 10 or 20 by the twice per year that course is taught, and then by the 20 campuses where this book is being used, and now you're talking about a substantial number of books.

Standard business guidelines for university presses suggest that 40% of a press's annual income should derive from new titles, while 60% or more of the revenue should be generated by the backlist. For many presses, these backlist sales rely heavily on the course books described above. In many ways, these books are the foundational rocks that sustain university press operations. If sales of these books decline precipitously because of eBook downloads and printing capabilities, the money to develop, edit, print, and publish the next new scholarly book may simply not be there.

No one wants this, of course, not the libraries and certainly not the publishers. As I remind myself daily, this is a moment of transition for scholarly communication, and our needs and practices are evolving. Publishers need to understand that, as one librarian recently told me, students make a lot of assumptions about electronic content. They want to download it to multiple devices because that's the way they're used to working. Conversely, libraries need to know the changing financial picture publishers face and to understand that concerns about lost sales are what motivate download and other use restrictions. The money to keep fulfilling the mission publishers are called to serve has to come from somewhere.

I wish I had an answer to this conundrum today. I can, however, at least begin with an explanation of scholarly publishers' thinking on this issue and view that as a first step to finding a solution satisfactory to all parties. Both libraries and publishers are deeply committed to high-quality content and want patrons to be using that content. So I take comfort in the fact that this is a pretty good starting place for the discussion.

Booklover from page 65

Francis, developing a kindred relationship around the subjects of DNA, RNA, and their structure and wanting to work on something interesting and not "something inert like collagen." Once they defined the elegant structure of the DNA molecule they could begin to divine how DNA made RNA made protein.

Dr. Crick's lecture was entitled "On the Genetic Code." He used his lecture to "ask certain questions about the genetic code and ask how far we can now answer them." Proteins are composed of twenty different amino acids. How is this made possible from

a molecule that only contains four individual nucleic acids? Defining the composition and size of the codon, a term defined by **Dr. Crick** as the set of nucleic acids that code for an amino acid, was essential to understanding our genetic code. He ends his lecture with the hope that "all these points will be clarified in the near future, and that the genetic code will be completely established on a sound experimental basis within a few years."

Fifty years later, the human genome has been completely sequenced and we only have more questions. Molecular biologists and geneticists continue to fill journals with experiments that solidly confirm the elegance of this genetic code. 🐭