Cites & Insights:
Crawford at Large

Perspective

Changing Attitudes: Celebratory Notes on State Library Conferences

Regular readers already have a sense that the end of March and beginning of April 2001 was a little strange, resulting in the first "late and short" issue of *Cites & Insights*. My wife and I were in the Society Islands (Tahiti, Moorea, Raiatea, Huahine, Bora Bora) for ten days, from March 23 through April 3 (including travel), so I didn't get the issue out until April 4. That's only part of the story—and I'm certainly not asking for sympathy, since the Society Islands vacation was wonderful.

After six days at home, I was off again on an all-day journey, this time eastward to Orlando, where the Florida Library Association held its 2001 annual conference: "Changing Attitudes: Building on the Past…Embracing the Future." I presented the opening keynote and took part in a second program. As I always try to do with state library conferences, I attended the whole conference, going to a number of programs and talking with a range of librarians. Set aside remarks about Mickey Mouse events (it wasn't) or the "Hyatt Motel Orlando" (the most motel-like Hyatt I've encountered—but then, it's one of the oldest large hotels in the Orlando area); they're irrelevant. Once again, I was reminded why state and regional library association annual conferences are my favorite speaking engagements.

Real Librarians, Real Experiences

My sense is that state association conferences involve a broader range of librarians than either ALA or any specialized conference—and that programs tend to be both more current and more "grounded" than in national conferences. Good state conferences have robust programs, sometimes astonishingly robust for the size of the association—and by those lights, I've never been to a bad state conference.

This particular conference had 845 registrants and four dozen programs, as well as committee meetings, discussion groups, poster sessions, receptions and exhibits. Program sessions began at 8 a.m. and ran to 6 p.m. on Wednesday and Thursday, with preconferences and an opening reception on Tuesday and a closing breakfast and workshop on Friday. Time slots that weren't reserved for refreshments and lunch in the exhibits (every state association treats exhibitors well, in my experience—and exhibitors respond by being there and underwriting us out-of-state speakers) typically had four to six program choices. I found programs that interested me in almost every program slot.

Inside This Issue

I've never been to a state library conference where I didn't learn during the programs, and this was no exception. A packed program on filtering included a Florida librarian who explained and defended her district's (mandated) use of filters, followed by a clear discussion from an ACLU lawyer as to why (and how) filters don't and can't work reliably without grotesque limits on appropriate access and a sometimes-fiery question, answer, and tirade session. A research showcase included noteworthy reports on research efforts by Florida librarians, including an intriguing study of the extent to which ILL requests are for locally held items.

The other energizing aspect of (almost) every state library conference has been talking with "real librarians"—people who don't get funded for ALA and people outside the small group I tend to encounter during Annual and Midwinter. Almost every librarian has distinctive, interesting takes on the field and his or her place in it; hearing some of those views and experiences helps to keep me interested in

the field as a whole (and helps to keep me humble about my limited awareness of that whole!).

[**Contradiction alert**: At this point, I suspect one or two California readers who are active in CLA will wonder why they haven't seen me at CLA conferences that often. Someone might even be aware that my name seems obscured on the membership roles. I could explain that "Walt Crawford" is actually a pseudonym for…well, would you believe Roy Tennant or Lee Jaffe or Karen Coyle? Have you ever seen Lee Jaffe and me in the same room at the same time? Or I could just admit that there's a contradiction here and let it go at that. Maybe some day…]

Cases, Causes and Celebrations

Consider some programs at this year's Florida conference:

- ➤ "How are the virtual libraries of TBLC and SEFLIN taking library service to the next generation?" Two executive directors discuss the recent history of these cooperative projects.
- ➤ "Developing a mentoring program." Local speakers in the first-ever program from the Leadership Development Committee.
- ➤ "Attracting young adults to public libraries." Report on a survey of Florida public libraries.
- ➤ "A place at the table: participating in community building." One I planned to attend—and lost track of, unfortunately. The remarkable Kathleen de la Peña McCook (always worth hearing) followed by a panel including another library school professor, a public librarian, and an MLS grad student.
- ➤ "Deciding tomorrow today: libraries' role in building sustainable communities." An interactive workshop developed by ALA and the U.S. Agency for International Development and presented by experienced Florida trainers.
- ➤ "The CLIC Project—Community Libraries in Caring." A "power-packed sharing project" developed by Dunedin Friends of the Library to improve the state of rural Florida libraries— eight speakers and a roundtable discussion.

Several programs included out-of-state speakers. The program offered a fair balance of local issues, technology considerations, service, funding, training, and politics—the reality of libraries and library service, within walls, beyond the walls, and "virtual."

Librarians aren't above a little levity, and FLA was no exception. I have never before been interrupted two minutes into a speech by whistle-blowing women chastising me for my attire, pasting a sticker on my sport coat, and demanding a $1 fine for being inappropriately dressed. But then, I've also never

dressed for a keynote wearing a short-sleeved tropical shirt with—temporarily—a tie and sport coat. It was a setup, to be sure. The organizers had urged casual, tropical clothes for the 85-degree spring Orlando climate and had a "dress patrol" fining those who wore business clothes, proceeds going to the scholarship fund. That was on their conference site; they let me know that they would be happy to exempt out-of-state speakers. I thought the idea was wonderful, and I'd been wearing the same shirts just a week before (if many thousands of miles away); the interruption and my immediate removal of coat and tie got the keynote off on a proper note. (I spotted many dress patrol stickers on exhibitors, but I thought the patrol was a bit lax on women in businesslike pantsuits!) I missed the major social event of the conference (too long and too late), but the conferees enjoyed themselves and their guests.

Try It—You Might Like It

If you're active in your state association, you don't need to hear this from me. Whether it's Nevada's cozy little conference or Texas' enormous extravaganza (the nation's third largest library conference), your state or regional conference offers a chance to mix with a range of librarians and get up to date on local library issues beyond your daily work. Some states, notably Texas, have the best possible situation by retaining all kinds of librarians within the state library association. Others, where school librarians have joined different associations, are finding ways to bring those associations together for better annual conferences, such as Georgia's COMO and Minnesota's overlapping conferences. Joining several low-population states together for a regional conference can also work wonders (though I've never been to MPLA or the other regionals). Sadly, librarians within a few states have become so separated by library type that conferences are weak and lack the cross-fertilization of the best conferences. That's rare (in my limited experience), and it's certainly not a growing trend.

State library conferences deal with nitty-gritty issues and also raise national issues for busy librarians. They can be great fun; they can also be wonderful learning experiences. That's true not only for the mainstream librarians who can't attend ALA Annual, but also for out-of-state speakers who take the time to get involved.

Thanks to wonderful people in FLA and at the conference. It was great—and I look forward to Kentucky this fall. Any Kentucky readers out there who haven't been going to the state conference? It's October 17-20. I'll see you there.

PC Values: May 2001

May's standard configuration includes 128MB SDRAM, 24x or faster CD-ROM, AGP graphics accelerator with 32MB display RAM, V.90 modem, a 15.7-16.1" (viewable) display (called 17" by some makers), and wavetable sound with stereo speakers. "Pluses" and "Minuses" are shown where applicable, along with hard disk size, software, extras, and brand-name speakers.

Top system prices are taken from corporate Web sites for Dell, Gateway, and Micronpc.

- **Top, Budget:** Dell Dimension L933: Pentium III-933, 20GB HD. *Minuses:* 64MB SDRAM, *no* dedicated graphics RAM. *Extras:* CD-RW drive, Altec Lansing speakers with subwoofer, MS Works Suite 2001. $1,029, VR 3.12 (+19% since 2/01, +55% since 11/00).

- **Top, Midrange:** Gateway Select 1300cl Special: Athlon-1300, 60GB 7200RPM HD. *Extras:* CD-RW drive, Boston Acoustics speakers with subwoofer, MS Works Suite 2001. $1,489, VR 2.57 (+25% since 2/01, +64% since 11/00).

- **Top, Power:** Gateway Performance 1700XL: Pentium 4-1700, 40GB HD. *Pluses:* 18"-viewable display with 64MB display RAM, DVD-ROM. *Extras:* CD-RW, Boston Acoustics speakers, MS Works Suite 2001. $2,249, VR 1.94 (+8% since 2/01, +34% since 11/00).

- **Other, Budget:** CyberPower Athlon Lightning DVD: Athlon-1200, 40GB HD. *Pluses:* 256MB SDRAM, DVD-ROM, 18" display. *Extras:* CD-RW, Altec Lansing speakers with subwoofer, WordPerfect Office. $1,129, VR 3.76 (+45% since 2/01 and 11/00).

- **Other, Midrange:** CyberPower Gamer Xtreme 850: Athlon-1300, 40GB HD. *Pluses:* DVD-ROM, 18" display. *Extras:* Altec Lansing speakers with subwoofer, WordPerfect Office. $1,309, VR 2.81 (+41% since 2/01, +52% since 11/00).

Getting Past the Arc of Enthusiasm

Spell it $TM. The prices of scholarly journals in science, technology, and medicine seem nearly incomprehensible to those of us who don't work in academic libraries. $9,036 a year for one narrowly focused science weekly. An *average* of $658 for all science journals in 1999. Even some of the initiatives for lower-priced journals seem staggering: $2,415 a year (for Web-only access) sounds cheap only when compared to that $9,036.

For more than a decade now, some scholarly journals have worked at a different price point: Free, at least for Internet distribution. That non-price raises two questions:

- Are free scholarly electronic journals any good?
- Do free scholarly electronic journals last?

Pioneers: The 104 Starters

ARL's *Directory of Electronic Journals, Newsletters and Academic Discussion Lists* for 1995 includes 104 items that appear to be free refereed scholarly electronic journals. Those journals still publishing in 2000, a minimum of six years, can be considered lasting titles. Some electronic scholarly journals started years before (typically using email or other non-Web distribution techniques); I've served on one (now-dead) electronic journal's editorial board since late 1989.

While 1995 may seem like ancient times for the Web, Mosaic (the first widely-available browser) was well established by then. Most academic libraries had Internet access, many used various forms of electronic communication, and more than a few were building Web sites.

Fifty-seven of the 104 journals in the 1995 *ARL Directory* had Web or Gopher addresses (URLs). Seventeen of those addresses still worked in early 2001. Finding the others proved fascinating and frustrating. After working with a variety of tools, I found Eureka and Google most useful.

The RLG Union Catalog via Eureka provides a good first cut answer as to whether a journal has been *noticed* by academic libraries or the Library of Congress. For nineteen titles, not a single record could be found, a bad sign for academic significance. For most of the others, I could click on a cataloged Web address to locate the journal itself—and most of those addresses worked. Where Eureka failed (through lack of records, lack of URLs, or dead URLs), Google usually succeeded—not always in finding the journal itself, but finding evidence that the journal *did* exist at one time.

Good News: The Results

Early free electronic journals have done better than might have been expected:

- Eighteen were misdescribed or have changed direction.

- ➢ Ten are missing in action—or have nothing but e-mail addresses, which makes them invisible to the larger scholarly community.
- ➢ Five are so confusing that their status is unclear.
- ➢ Twenty seen to have fallen prey to the arc of enthusiasm: after a few good years, the journals have died or become comatose.
- ➢ Two journals ceased for reasons other than declining interest.
- ➢ Twenty-one journals still publish a small but steady flow of manuscripts.
- ➢ Twenty-eight journals still publish substantial numbers of refereed articles.

Of 86 titles that were available as free refereed scholarly journals in 1995, 49 (57%) still publish six years later. Given the difficulties of coordinating refereed journals and the problems inherent in "free," that's a remarkable record.

Clarifying Intentions ("Misdescribed")

Some titles in this group may have changed approach over the years; others are cases where I interpreted the 1995 entry too loosely. *Associates: The Electronic Library Staff Support Journal* has turned out three issues per year since 1995—but, while valuable, it does not appear to be a *scholarly* journal. *JAC Online: A Journal of Composition Theory* is a print journal that provides free online access to *archived* articles (currently ending in 1996). Three journals currently carry prices—although in two cases, the prices are relatively low ($100 for *J.UCS*, $20 for *Postmodern Culture*). Several titles are actually literary journals or journals of campus life.

Mysteries, Confusion, and Oddities

Does *Advances in Systems Science and Applications* exist? Is there an *Electronic Visual Arts Journal* or an *Online Modern History Review*? Varied and extensive efforts failed to turn up any publicly accessible evidence. Three 1995 titles lack Internet archives of any sort but may still "publish" by e-mail only. Eight journals have Web sites that don't work. A Google-cached home page for the *Electronic Journal of Analytic Philosophy* shows six issues between 1993 and 1998—but none of those issues can be reached.

Digital Technical Journal, the online version of an established print journal, published at least 20 articles per year from 1993 through 1997. That declined to ten each in 1998 and 1999. Then, as Compaq absorbed the remains of Digital Equipment Corporation, the journal disappeared. *Slavic Review (Post Print Edition)*, also an online offshoot of a print journal, managed two online issues in 1994 (13 pa-

pers) and four in 1995 (30 papers). Then, the publishers called an end to the online experiment.

The Arc of Enthusiasm

The largest group of dead or comatose journals follows a pattern I call the arc of enthusiasm. After the considerable effort of creating a new journal, all goes well for two to five years, but the flow of articles never regains the peak reached in the first or second year. Finally, the flow of articles dwindles to a trickle. The journal shuts down or continues as a ghost journal, publishing one or two articles every year or two. Some observers of this scene assumed that *most* early free scholarly electronic journals would show this pattern. Refereed scholarly journals are hard to maintain without any revenue, and it's been difficult to use electronic publications for tenure or to show their impact on a field.

While some of the ten mystery journals may have succumbed to the arc of enthusiasm, only 23% of the properly-described 1995 titles clearly fall into this category—and back issues of these 20 journals continue to be available on the Web or the Internet.

Public-Access Computer Systems Review (*PACS Review)* began in 1989 and has published only one article since 1997. At least one study of electronic journals showed that *PACS Review* has had more impact than most, but that wasn't enough to keep it healthy. The *Katherine Sharp Review* published seven articles in 1995, eight in 1996, 11 in 1997, nine in 1998, and five in 1999. Then it was cancelled.

Arachnet Electronic Journal on Virtual Culture showed a classic arc: 14 articles in 1993, 25 in 1994, 8 in 1995—and three in 1996, its last year. *Didaskalia: Ancient Theater Today* published 20 articles in 1994, 14 in 1995, 12 in 1996—and six in 1997. The list goes on, including some journals that had run out of steam by 1995 and one or two that may yet spring back to life.

Small Successes

Twenty-one titles still publish a steady flow of articles but average fewer than ten articles a year. In some fields, a journal that publishes six good articles a year is a significant addition to the literature.

Only three titles are in science and medicine: *Complexity International, PSYCHE: an Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Consciousness,* and *Solstice: An Electronic Journal of Geography and Mathematics*. At least three-quarters are in the humanities and social sciences. This group includes such specialized journals as *E Journal: Murdoch Electronic Journal of Law, Electronic Antiquity: Communicating the Classics,*

CLIONET (now called *The Electronic Journal of Australian and New Zealand History)*, and *Classics Ireland*.

Librarianship shows up in two titles: *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship* and *LIBRES*. Several titles focus on aspects of education: the *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *Journal of Technology Education*, *New Horizons in Adult Education*, and *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*.

All but one of these titles have university affiliations. Six are sponsored by or affiliated with associations. Not one survives without the formal or informal subsidies that university and association affiliation provide.

Strong Survivors

The largest group of journals, 28, represents clearer success stories. All but two have either university or association affiliations or sponsorships. Exceptions are *Emerging Infectious Diseases* (published by the Center for Disease Control) and the *Web Journal of Current Legal Issues* (affiliated with a commercial print publication).

Eleven titles fall into science, technology, and medical fields (with three others arguably fitting there as well). Math has journals such as *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis,* and the *New York Journal of Mathematics.* A number of free STM journals are not only healthy but vigorous: the *Journal of Fluids Engineering* has published at least 100 papers in each of the last four years.

Librarians have one long-standing success story: *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, sponsored by ACRL's Science & Technology Section. Four journals focus on education: *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, the *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, the *Journal of Statistics Education*, and the *Journal of Extension*, an established print journal that moved to pure electronic publication in 1992. Other journals cover topics in law, humanities, social sciences, and literature—including such gems as *De Proverbio* (international proverb studies, with articles from names such as Alan Dundes).

Do Free Journals Matter?

Free electronic scholarly journals—the 49 surviving pioneers and many more begun since 1995—seem lost in the library shuffle, as attention turns to aggregation of online articles from expensive commercial scholarly journals. These aggregate sources are anything but free. SPARC and other initiatives work toward priced journals that don't punish libraries as severely, while JSTOR and other initiatives work to make journal archives more readily and reasonably available.

Only a handful of pioneering free electronic journals turn up in ISI's lists of 3,000 indexed serial titles: *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, the *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, and the *Journal of Fluids Engineering*. My own attempt to get feedback on the significance of these journals yielded too few responses to be significant. A few people suggest that these journals are significant within their fields, in addition to the three just noted: *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometry, Electronic Green Journal, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, Electronic Journal of Communication, Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis, Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship, New York Journal of Mathematics,* and the *Journal of Extension*.

Stephen P. Harter and colleagues studied the impact of electronic journals in 1996. Of those that seemed to have some demonstrable significance at the time, only two still appear to be healthy: *Psycoloquy* and *Electronic Journal of Communication*.

Michael Fosmire and Song Yu published "Free Scholarly Electronic Journals: How Good Are They" *in* a free scholarly electronic journal, *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship* (Summer 2000). This fine article is limited to STM journals (taken from the 1997 ARL *Directory*). Briefly, the study ranks *Emerging Infectious Diseases* and the *Journal of Artificial Research* very high for impact, with the *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations* ranking fairly high for immediacy; two others ranked higher than average for impact or immediacy.

Just as there's no such thing as "the serials crisis," there's no such thing as *The* Solution. Scholars will not unanimously flock to utopian concepts that all papers should be distributed from "preprint" archives or that "scholarly skywriting" will save the day. For better and worse, commercial journals (as print products and as electronic aggregations) seem likely to dominate the field of refereed scholarly journals for some time to come.

Domination is not exclusivity. Any path towards easing the funding and access crises for scholarly journals includes many disparate steps. Free electronic scholarly journals represent one such step— and they can succeed, even prosper. Such journals offer specialized outlets in humanities and social science niches that are too to narrow justify commercial journals. They may also pre-empt aspects of science, technology, and medicine, or at least offer competitive outlets for quality scholarship.

It isn't easy, but it can work. It does work. Four dozen journals, all of them free, refereed, scholarly, and electronic, continue to publish a significant flow

of articles after at least six years of life. Libraries should pay attention to those journals, and librarians should be part of efforts to expand the field. It's not a total solution, but it is one counterbalance to the power of the international journal publishers.

Free Electronic Journals from 1995: The Lists

For completists, the lists of journal titles follow. Except for the mysteries, you can probably find the current Web sites for most of them using Google.

Misdescribed

These publications are either priced, non-scholarly, or not journals at all.

Associates: The Electronic Library Support Staff Journal
CORE
Cornell Political Forum
Counterpoint
Deep South
Depth Probe
JAC Online: A Journal of Composition Theory
Jewish Studies Judaica eJournal
Journal of Veterinary Medical Education
J.UCS (Journal for Universal Computer Science)
Modal Analysis
NETCOMTALK
Postmodern Culture
RUNE: MIT's Journal of Arts and Letters
Sand River Journal
Sixteenth Century Journal
Virtual Mirror
We Magazine

Mysteries

While some of these may be available as email "journals," I was unable to find any working Web presence for them as e-journals in early 2000 or early 2001.

Advances in Systems Science and Applications
Electronic Visual Arts Journal
Ideas Digest Online Newsmagazine
Olive Tree
Online Modern History Review
Psychology Graduate Student Journal: The PSYCGRAD Journal (PSYGRD-J)
Radio Scientist On-Line
RD: Graduate Research in the Arts
Sense of Place
SPEED: An Electronic Journal of Technology, Media, and Society

Oddities: The Least-Clear Cases

It's hard to know what to make of these five, although cases can be made that *InterJournal* and *Psychiatry On-Line* are small successes of odd sorts. I append informal notes on each one.

Electronic Journal of Analytic Philosophy (EJAP). Unable to reach Web site; cached copy on Google indicates six issues between 1993 and 1998; individual issues unreachable.

Grist On-line. "Network Journal of Language Arts." Pattern: 1993: 3 issues; 1994: 2 issues; 1995: 2 issues; 1996: 1 issue. Apparently continues in non-journal form.

InterJournal. Distributed on per-article basis. Pattern: in early 2000, 225 accepted items on Web site, dates only on individual articles. In early 2001: 620 manuscripts, of which 328 are supposed to be final. Divided into three parts: CX: Complex systems (318), PX: Polymer and Complex Fluids (20), BG: Genetics (2).

Psychiatry On-Line. Finally able to locate UK version in 2001. No issues; 51 papers over the last six years.

RhetNet. Tiny amount of odd material on Web site; appears to be wholly inactive since mid-1997.

The Arc of Enthusiasm

Some of these could come back to life, to be sure—but most seem to follow a pattern that becomes familiar. Here and for the remaining categories, where I could determine the patterns, I show the number of issues and formal articles for each calendar year beginning in 1993 (in the form *year: issues/articles*)—or, for journals that appear on an article-by-article basis, the number of articles (year: articles). Many e-journals in all categories include quite a bit of material in addition to formal articles; in some cases, a "+" shows a journal with unusually extensive contents other than articles. "Many" means that I stopped counting after a couple of dozen articles. "Ceased" indicates that the journal explicitly ceased publication. Some titles began years before 1993.

Arachnet Electronic Journal on Virtual Culture. 1993: 7/14; 1994: 4/25; 1995: 3/8; 1996: 1/3.

Architronic: The Electronic Journal of Architecture. 1993: 3/17; 1994: 3/7; 1995: 3/9, 1996: 3/12; 1997: 1/4; 1998: 1/2; 1999: 1/4.

Asia-Pacific Exchange (Electronic) Journal [APEX-J]. 1994: 2/4; 1995: 2/5; 1996: 1/1.

Didaskalia: Ancient Theater Today. 1994: 5/20+; 1995: 3/14+; 1996: 3/12+; 1997: 1/6+.

Dogwood Blossoms. 1993: 5/12; 1994: 4/30; 1995: 2/10.

Education Research & Perspectives. 1996:2; 1997: 2/14; 1998: 2/11; 1999: 1/7.

EJournal. 1993: 3/3; 1994: 4/5+; 1995: 2/3; 1996: 3/1.

Electronic Journal of Strategic Information Systems (SIS-EJOURNAL). Appears to be one each in 1994 and 1995, nothing since.

Flora Online. Gopher shows 29 issues: 1987: 12; 1988: 8; 1989: 2; 1990: 4; 1991: 1; 1992: 2; 1993: 1. Ceased 1993.

Gassho. 1993: 1/3; 1994: 3/10.

International Journal of Continuing Education Practice. One issue (1994); formally ceased 1/95. Now a priced journal from MCB University Press.

Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21ˢᵗ Century (IPCT, IPCTJ). 1993: 3/15; 1994: 4/18+; 1995: 4/16+; 1996: 3/10+; 1997: 2/8+; 1998: 2/4+; 1999: 1/3.

IOUDAIOS Review. 1993: 26; 1994: 25; 1995: 16; 1996: 8; 1997: 11; 1998: 2; 1999: 1. Reviews only after 1999; none posted for 2000.

Journal of Mathematical Systems, Estimation, and Control. 1994-96: Quarterly, >20 each year. 1997: 3/15; 1998: 2/21. Ceased 1998.

Organized Thoughts. Nine issues published between 1992 and 1994; ceased 1994.

Public-Access Computer Systems Review (PACS Review). 1993: 6/9+; 1994: 7/8+; 1995: 5/6+; 1996: 6/6+; 1997: 4/5+; 1998: 1/1+. Ceased 2001.

Research & Reflection: A Journal of Educational Praxis. 1995: 2/12+; 1996: 2/8+; 1997: 2/7+; 1998: 1/2; 1999: 1/1+. Unreachable in early 2001.

Sharp Review. (Originally *Katherine Sharp Review*.) 1995: 1/7; 1996: 2/8; 1997: 2/11; 1998: 2/9; 1999: 1/5. Ceased 1999.

Surfaces. 1993: 1/21+; 1994: 1/27+; 1995: 1/11+; 1996: 1/many; 1997: 1/4.

Ulam Quarterly. dates unclear; may be 1997: 4/22, 1998: 4/22; 1999: 2/11.

Ceased for Other Reasons

Digital Technical Journal was an established print journal from DEC that went electronic in 1993. Compaq purchased DEC; some time later, it killed off the journal. *Slavic Review* just didn't work out as a free electronic "post-print" but may continue as a print journal.

Digital Technical Journal. 1993: 4/34; 1994: 4/21; 1995: 3/21; 1996: 4/27; 1997: 3/20; 1998: 2/10; 1999: 1/10. Ceased 1999.

Slavic Review (Post Print Edition). 1994: 2/13; 1995: 4/30. Ceased (in e-journal form) 1995.

Small Successes

Is it fair to separate this group from the final group simply because these journals publish fewer than ten formal articles a year? Perhaps not, and "small" does not mean either useless or insignificant.

Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy. 1995: 4; 1996: 5; 1997: 2; 1998: 0; 1999: 2; 2000: 2.

Classics Ireland. 1994: 10; 1995: 11; 1996: 13; 1997: 8+; 1998: 6+; 1999: 7+; 2000: 6+.

CLIONET: The Australian Electronic Journal of History. Renamed *The Electronic Journal of Australian and New Zealand History*. Not issue-oriented. Three articles in 2000; 15 from 1996 through 1999; also book reviews, conference summaries, etc.

Complexity International. 1994: 10; 1995: 48; 1996: 34; 1997: 8; 1998: 6; 1999: 35; 2000: 6+.

E Law: Murdoch Electronic Journal of Law. 1993: 1/1+; 1994: 3/6+; 1995: 3/10+; 1996: 4/18+; 1997: 4/4+; 1998: 4/5+; 1999: 4/9+; 2000: 3/4+.

EF/hm: EthnoFORUM/hypermedia. 1995: 2+; 1996: 4+; 1997: 5+; 1998: 1+; 1999: 1+; 2000: CD reviews only.

Electronic Antiquity: Communicating the Classics. 1993: 6/23+; 1994: 6/10+; 1995: 4/10+; 1996: 2/3+; 1997: 3/8+; 1998: 2/5+; 1999: 2/5+.

Electronic Journal of Sociology. 1994: 1/2; 1995: 2/4; 1996: 2/5; 1997: 3/9; 1998: 2/9; 1999: 3/11; 2000: 2/6.

Essays in History. 1993: 6; 1994: 4; 1995: 5; 1996: 5+; 1997: 4+; 1998: 5+; 1999: 3+; 2000: 4+.

Government Information in Canada. 1994: 2/13; 1995: 4/15; 1996: 4/15+; 1997: 3/12; 1998: 2/2; 1999: 4/5; 2000: 2/2.

Information Technology and Disabilities. 1994: 4/23+; 1995: 4/17+; 1996: 3/11+; 1997: 3/14+; 1998: 2/15+; 1999: 2/9+; 2000: 1/8+.

Journal of Buddhist Ethics. 1994: 3+; 1995: 11+; 1995: 9+; 1997: 6+; 1998: 12+; 1999: 9+; 2000: 7+.

Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture. 1993: 5/0+; 1994: 6/4+; 1995: 6/5+; 1996: 3/2+; 1997: 1/1+; 1998: none; 1999: 3/5+; 2000: 2/3+.

Journal of Political Ecology. 1994: 4+; 1995: 3+; 1996: 4+; 1997: 3+; 1998: 3+; 1999: 4+; 2000: 0+many reviews.

Journal of Technology Education. 1993: 5/9+; 1994: 2/10+; 1995: 2/10+; 1996: 2/8+; 1997: 2/8+; 1998: 2/9+; 1999: 2/9+; 2000: 2/9+.

LIBRES. ISSN, 2 RLG, new Web site. 1995: 3/4+; 1996: 2/5+; 1997: 2/3+; 1998: 2/1+; 1999: 2/3+, 2000: 2/3+.

MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship. 1993: 2/7+; 1994: 2/5+; 1995: 2/3+; 1996: 2/7+; 1997: 2/3+; 1998: 1/7; 1999: 1/4+; 2000: 3/4+.

New Horizons in Adult Education. 1993: 1/4; 1994: 2/4+; 1995: 1/1+; 1996: 1/1+; 1997: 1/2+; 1998: 2/?; 1999: 1/1+. Unable to locate in early 2001.

PSYCHE; an Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Consciousness. 1993: 3+; 1994: 4+; 1995: 2+; 1996: 4+; 1997: 1+; new signs of life: 1998/99: 13?; 2000: 4; 2001: 2 so far.. Dates uncertain.

Solstice: An Electronic Journal of Geography and Mathematics. 1993: 2/5+; 1994: 2/6+; 1995: 2/3+; 1996: 2/5; 1997: 2/5+; 1998: 2/5+; 1999: 2/4+; 2000: 2/5+.

TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language: An Electronic Journal. 1994: 2/7+; 1995: 2/6+; 1996: 2/4+; 1997: 3/7+; 1998: 2/5+; 1999: 3/6+; 2000: 2/4+.

Strong Survivors

When a commercial publisher says that there's no such thing as a free journal, here's a list of established scholarly journals that suggests otherwise. (The asterisks mean "so far, as of early February 2001.")

Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie/Contributions to Algebra and Geometry. 1993: 2/24; 1994: 2/24; 1995: 2/27; 1996: 2/29; 1997: 2/40+; 1998: 2/49?; 1999: 2:40; 2000: 2/49; 2001: 1/20*.

Bryn Mawr Classical Review. Reviews only. 1993: unclear; 1994: 12/160; 1995: 12/238; 1996: 12/205; 1997: 12/285; 1998: 12/256; 1999: 12/280; 2000: 12/250+.

Bryn Mawr Medieval Review (now *The Medieval Review*). Reviews only. 1993: 5/33; 1994: 12/85; 1995: 12/82; 1996: 12/84; 1997: 12/97; 1998:12/136; 1999: 11/1616; 2000: 155.

Crossroads: The International ACM Student Magazine. 1994: 2/9+; 1995: 4/17+; 1996: 4/20+; 1997: 4/20+; 1998: 4/18+; 1999: 4/24+; 2000: 4/24+.

CTHEORY / Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory. (Renamed *Theory, technology, and culture*) 1993: 11+; 1994:

17+; 1995: 26+; 1996: 18+; 1997: 31+; 1998: 30+; 1999: 21+. Unclear situation for 2000.

De Proverbio. 1995: 2/20+; 1996: 2/20+; 1997: 2/18; 1998: 2/18; 1999: 2/15; 2000: 2/16+.

Early Modern Literary Studies. 1995: 3/10+; 1996: 3/11+; 1997: 3/3+; 1998: 3/25+; 1999: 3/15+; 2000: 3/15+.

Education Policy Analysis Archives. 1993: 15; 1994: 14; 1995: 20; 1996: 20+; 1997: 22+; 1998: 21+; 1999: 32; 2000: 53; 2001: 3.

Electronic Green Journal. 1994: 2/9+; 1995: 2/8+; 1996: 2/5+; 1997: 1/3+; 1998: 2/17+; 1999: 1/4+; 2000: 2/18+.

Electronic Journal of Combinatorics. 1994: 1/13; 1995: 1/25; 1996: 2/61; 1997: 2/53; 1998: 1/47; 1999: 1/44+; 2000: 60+; 2001: 6*.

Electronic Journal of Communication. 1993: 3/23; 1994: 2/21; 1995: 3/24; 1996: 4/18+; 1997: 4/16; 1998: 3/18+; 1999: 2/25+; 2000: 2/17.

Electronic Journal of Differential Equations (EJDE). 1993: 8; 1994: 9; 1995: 17; 1996: 11; 1997: 25; 1998: 36; 1999: 50; 2000: 70; 2001: 11*.

Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis. 1993:7; 1994: 13; 1995: 10; 1996: 11; 1997: 27; 1998: 13; 1999: 20+; 2000: 15.

Emerging Infectious Diseases (EID). 1995: 4/many; 1996: 4/many; 1997: 4/many; 1998: 4/many; 1999: 6/many; 2000: 6/many.

Federal Communications Law Journal. 1993: 1/5+; 1994: 4/30+; 1995: 2/4+; 1996: 3/10+; 1997: 3/11+; 1998: 3/10+; 1999: 3/16+; 2000: 3/18+.

Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship. 1993: 4/14+; 1994: 4/10+; 1995: 1/3+; 1996: 1/5+; 1997: 3/11+; 1998: 4/20+; 1999: 4/16+; 2000: 4/19+.

Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR). 1993: 6; 1994: 14; 1995: 26; 1996: 27; 1997: 19; 1998: 20; 1999: 28; 2000: 20.

Journal of Computer-Mediated Communications (JCMC). 1995: 3/16; 1996: 4/29; 1997: 4/25; 1998: 3/17; 1999: 4/25+; 2000: 4/21+.

Journal of Extension. 1993: 4/29++; 1994: 4/27++; 1995: 6/91+; 1996: 6/71+; 1997: 6/64+; 1998: 6/74+; 1999: 6/80+; 2000: 6/22+.

Journal of Financial and Strategic Decisions. 1994: 3/25; 1995: 3/24; 1996: 3/26; 1997: 3/25; 1998: 2/18; 1999: 3/21*. Unable to reach in early 2001.

Journal of Fluids Engineering. 1996: 3/98+; 1997-2000: four issues each year with at least 100 papers per year.

Journal of Industrial Teacher Education. 1994: 1/4+; 1995: 4/16+; 1996: 4/19+; 1997: 4/17+; 1998: 4/16+; 1999: 4/15+; 2000: 2/10+*.

Journal of Statistics Education. 1993: 1/5+; 1994: 2/10+; 1995: 3/12+; 1996: 3/10+; 1997: 3/13+; 1998: 3/14+; 1999: 3/12+; 2000: 3/16+; 2001: 1*.

Journal of World-Systems Research. 1995: 20+; 1996: 30+; 1997: 3/12+; 1998: 2/9+; 1999: 3/21+; 2000: 3/41+.

Music Theory Online (MTO). 1993: 6/6+; 1994: 5/10+; 1995: 6/10+; 1996: 7/11+; 1997: 5/12+; 1998: 6/15+; 1999: 4/4+; 2000: 5/15+.

New York Journal of Mathematics. 1994-95: 13; 1996: 7; 1997: 16; 1998: 17; 1999: 13; 2000: 16.

Psycoloquy. Mostly brief notes, Steven Harnad's idiosyncratic contribution to e-journals. 1993: 78; 1994: 129; 1995: 90; 1996: 73; 1997: 43; 1998: 126; 1999: 118; 2000: 129.

Web Journal of Current Legal Issues. 1995: 5/44+; 1996: 5/39+; 1997: 5/33+; 1998: 5/29+; 1999: 5/20+; 2000: 5/13+.

Press Watch I: Articles Worth Reading

Obermayer, Joel B., "Pipe dreams," *The Industry Standard* 4:8 (February 26, 2001), pp. 66-8.

I have no excuse for mentioning this article except nostalgia. As a student at UC Berkeley, I worked in the Doe Library from my sophomore year until I turned full-time employee. For part of that time, I was a page. In the earliest years, the Doe stacks were closed to undergrads; all books were paged from the front desk. When I started, pages were stationed on one or two of the nine big stack tiers and relied on a pneumatic tube system to receive requests. Front-desk clerks put the charge slips in the tubes and sent them to the proper tiers. We took out the slips, found the books (if they were there), put books into plastic tubs, and sent them to the front desk via a conveyor system. When we weren't hearing containers popping out, we were reshelving books.

Later, as more students gained access to the stacks, we had one page for three floors. Then we dropped the tier assignments, with pages all working from the central station—but pneumatic tubes still carried requests from the front desk to that station. The system worked, in both its full-fledged and stripped states.

This article discusses the rivalry among the three companies in the pneumatic-tube business. It hasn't disappeared: annual sales are in the $75 to $100 million range and growing 10% a year. Hospitals count on them to fill prescriptions.

It's an interesting article with some historic notes (e.g., 1875 dreams of a big 3,000-mile pneumatic tube to transport people between the U.S. and Europe). The article even mentions libraries, specifically NYPL. It's nostalgia of sorts, but it's a good read. And there are times that I look fondly back on those days of reshelving, listening for that clunk as a new paging request popped out of the tube.

Ozer, Jan, "Will MPEG-4 fly?" *PC Magazine* 20:7 (April 3, 2001), pp. 101-6.

Consider the evolution of standards from the Moving Pictures Experts Group. First there was MPEG-1: mediocre video that fits on a CD-ROM. Then there was MPEG-2, at the heart of DVD and most current digital video. MPEG-3 was designed for high-definition television (HDTV), but MPEG-2 handles HDTV as well, so the standard is "now undefined." But MPEG-2 uses a lot of bandwidth; it's

not suitable for real-time streaming video on most real-world networks.

MPEG-4 offers an object-oriented approach that could yield different quality levels on the fly as needed for different situations. It's a multicompany industrial standard, avoiding the proprietary nature of MS Windows Media, RealMedia, and Quick-Time. Unfortunately, the current codec (compression/decompression algorithm) offers quality that is "at best, a distant third behind those of Real Networks and Microsoft" (and likely to run fourth behind the next QuickTime codec.

If all of this sounds interesting to you, go to the source: Ozer's careful description and analysis. Ozer knows his stuff when it comes to digital video, codecs, and the like. This isn't a wowie-zowie article; it's a lengthy, detailed discussion.

Sauer, Jeff, "What's it good 4?" *EMedia* 14:3 (March 2001), pp. 38-44.

Here's the industry-oriented counterpart to Jan Ozer's article. As you'd expect given *EMedia*'s target audience, it's primarily upbeat and includes extensive comments from people working toward MPEG-4 use. If you read both articles, you'll have a reasonable sense of what MPEG-4 is all about. Will you be ready to implement it? Probably not just yet.

Lessig, Lawrence, "Adobe in wonderland," *The Industry Standard* 4:12 (March 26, 2001), pp. 32-3.

It's easy to say "read Lessig's column whenever it appears," but I'm trying to highlight those that seem most relevant to *Cites & Insights* readers. This gem qualifies. It's about the bizarre permissions statement that originally appeared with Acrobat eBook Reader downloads. When you downloaded *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, long out of copyright, you were informed that you could not copy text selections to the clipboard, do any printing "on this book" (which means "of this book"), lend or give the book to someone else, and "This book cannot be read aloud." Sorry, kids, but Adobe says I *can't* read to you.

"That control struck most (though, in the company I keep, not all) as absurd." (The parenthetical comment may say more about the state of intellectual property law—and lawyers—than the article.)

Turns out that Adobe doesn't mean "read aloud" (as in, "verbalize what you read on your screen so that someone else can hear it) when they say "read aloud." What they *mean* to forbid is text-to-speech conversion, or at least the routine that comes with eBook Reader. But then, even that clarification means that Adobe thinks it's a good idea to lock out

basic assistive technology when using *public-domain* texts. When Adobe revised the permissions, they still forbade lending the downloaded text or giving it away—but now you could "copy 10 text selections every 10 days" or "print 10 pages every 10 days."

Lessig uses Adobe as a prime example of the trouble with content permissions management. "The crunch comes when the means of control in cyberspace become more powerful than the means of control in real space." When you buy a book, you automatically have the right to lend it, sell it, give it away, read it out loud, and copy as many pages as you wish for your own use. But publishers want to be more restrictive in cyberspace. That's not news to librarians who've been paying attention, but Lessig's discussion is worth reading. It's particularly worth noting that Adobe emerges as a gray hat in this struggle: They're trying to find a balance, not create the kind of lock-down that the MPAA loves. (Did you know that, if you buy a high-definition television and a HDTV tuner for available satellite broadcasts, the original producers of programs can *and do* prevent particular tuners from passing through the high-definition signal?)

Harris, Scott, "The solar solution," *The Industry Standard* 4:13 (April 2, 2001), pp. 60-6.

The oddest point about this fascinating article is that it's in *The Industry Standard*, "The Newsmagazine of the Internet Economy." The article is about solar energy—*big* solar-power plants using Stirling engines and other techniques—with notes on why it hasn't become prominent so far and its likely future. There's a 354-megawatt solar plant in Barstow, California, generating "five times the wattage produced by all the solar panels in the United States"—but that plant uses less-efficient 1980s technology.

The problem with solar power has been the cheapness of fossil fuel and coal (and the power of "traditional" suppliers to steer government subsidies their way). Still, the techniques have improved and the costs are in line with current costs for other sources of electricity. It's a good article, and I guess it can be justified for this publication since you need electricity to run the Internet. You need electricity to run libraries as well; is that justification enough for me to cite the article here?

Morrison, Jim, "Protecting kids from cyberwolves," *FamilyPC* 8:4 (April 2001), pp. 64-9. (And related articles through p. 77)

I'm not sure whether this piece belongs here or not. It's all about filtering, and the editorial introduction proclaims it to be "a balanced report that will help you draw your own conclusions" about fil-

ters. But remember that this is *FamilyPC* and that the editor claims in that same introduction that *most* of the Internet is unsuitable for children.

How balanced is the report? Filtering manufacturers and spokespeople get 15 paragraphs; opponents (two of them, not including the best-informed) get 4, with a *direct* response from pro-filtering people after a PeaceFire tidbit. A sidebar on CIPA lawsuits quotes ALA's Judith Krug for four sentences—and immediately "balances" that with four contentious sentences from a Family Research Council spokesperson who, of course, accuses ALA of being "misinformed and out-of-date with new technology."

The article is worth reading but fundamentally pro-filtering. Maybe that's appropriate for a family magazine. Even with that bias, there are some gems. Did you know that the American Family Association offers a filter that "not only prevents children from seeing objectionable sites, but also keeps adults from straying into online activities that may tempt their marital vows"? AFA's chastity belt "cannot be over-ridden" once installed, of course.

The article precedes a group of product reviews—one of five major filters, another comparing three spyware products, and three others comparing remote filtering services, "kid browsers" that reach nothing but pre-approved sites, and "private internet services" that do something similar. *FamilyPC*'s so-called balance shows in these reviews as well. Grades for the five filtering programs range from A- for McAfee's Internet Guard Dog to a *low* of B- for CyberPatrol; the horrendous Cybersitter gets a B. (After Cybersitter almost put my computer out of commission when I was required to test it for an award, I'm not very charitable.) The spyware choices—sorry, "monitoring tools"—can help your children learn that *your parents are always watching*. Spector 2.1 gets a solid A; Computer Cop trails with a B. I should note that the introduction says that "many parents won't want to touch one of these tools, because they don't like to snoop on their kids or make them feel unable to be trusted."

Remote-filtering services are like software filters, but you connect to the Web through their site and pay them a fee ranging from $5 (for FamilyClick from Pat Robertson's son) to $22 (for Integrity Online, which is a "full-service ISP"—except that it won't serve up unapproved sites. Note that these services block *everybody*.

Fair is fair. There's good material in the main article, including a discussion of a radical new idea— the best way to protect older children from the Evil Internet might be to *teach them values and how to think*

for themselves. When I read sidebars about teenagers still being filtered, it makes me wonder.

Abramson, Ronna, "Look under 'M' for Mess," *The Industry Standard* 4:14 (April 9, 2001), pp. 56-7, and Frauenfelder, Mark, *Science friction*, pp. 58-9.

A good discussion of Britannica's problems— how *Encyclopedia Britannica* fell on hard times and why Britannica.com has such trouble finding a working economic model. No comment here; read the short piece.

Then turn the leaf to a wonderful bit on Harlan Ellison and his quixotic battle against online posting of his writings. Harlan Ellison has never been the calmest writer, either in his fiction and nonfiction or in his personal life, but that's part of what makes him worthwhile. He gets outraged a lot—and he's outraged by the tendency of his fans to upload copies of his books and stories. To quote Ellison, "At some point you just look around and say, 'Mother of God, the gene pool is just polluted and we really ought to turn it over to the cockroaches if we can't do any better than this'" Read the piece—and if you've never read Ellison, try a little. Not all 74 volumes, to be sure, but a few key short stories: he's good. It's a fairly lonely battle, but it's hard to argue with a truly original writer who thinks he should be rewarded for his efforts.

Howard, Bill, "Handicapper's guide to storage," *PC Magazine* 20:8 (April 24, 2001), p. 179.

Here's a one-page commentary on what's happened in portable storage and what seems likely to happen in the near future. I'd almost forgotten about high-density diskettes (the LS-120 SuperDisk and Sony's HiFD), but as Howard notes, the dominance of Iomega's Zip killed them off. The Zip may be on its last legs thanks to CD-R and CD-RW, and Iomega's Jaz just costs too much to make sense.

He discusses some other contenders. I find nothing to disagree with. His recommendation is to equip desktop PCs with both DVD and CD-RW drives— and to skip the DVD if you only have room for one drive. He sees good current uses for most other devices as well. He sees promise in the odd little Data-Play, "an inch-wide CD-R" with $10 discs that hold 250MB per side. It's awfully late to market and has the single-vendor curse, but it could provide high capacity where CD-R is just too big.

Schmeiser, Lisa, "Test drive your Web site," *Macworld* May 2001, pp. 44-50.

Windows users note: this article has almost nothing to do with Apple or Macintosh OS. It's a good description of one effective methodology for

prototyping and testing Web sites. Worth a quick read and worth considering if you're building or re-building a complex site. The only Mac-centric aspect is a sidebar describing some software to help with prototyping, and even there I'm not sure the programs mentioned don't have Windows versions.

Trends and Quick Takes
That Line Has Been Disconnected

Wait a week or two to read a monthly computer magazine and strangeness happens. Consider a half-page story in the April 2001 *Computer Shopper*'s "Net Now" news section, "Kozmo calling." We learn that Kozmo.com is so eager to hear from you that it's offering a free cell phone that includes one-button dialing so you can get Kozmo's quick delivery service. The goal is to "service customers wherever they are." ("Serve" might have less of a red-light-district feel to it, but English has never been high in dot-com priorities.)

The small piece is amusing. The phones are Internet-ready but Kozmo.com doesn't offer a wireless portal. The senior vice president comments that, while other retailers offer free phones with service plans, Kozmo.com "offers a better assortment of higher-quality phones." That "assortment" consisted of the Ericsson R280LX, period.

What makes this noteworthy is the timing. I read the story on April 16. Kozmo.com went out of business on April 12, after burning through more than $400 million of investment capital while losing money on every delivery. That special Kozmo.com button presumably yields…well, see the heading.

Sense and Scents

A bit later in that same "Net Now" section, we read about Trisenx and its new plans. "Trisenx has already brought the world the MultiSenx scent device, a PC peripheral that mixes and dispenses aromas." Next comes a new peripheral loaded up with 200 "flavor cartridges." "It will work like an inkjet printer and dispense the requested flavor onto an edible potato-based wafer." It won't be here until early 2002; I, for one, can wait.

Has anyone seen a MultiSenx stink factory in action? Is anyone *really* willing to visit Web sites and literally swallow what the ads are saying? Ready to equip library Internet computers with both scent and taste systems?

Another timing wonderment. I wasn't aware that there were *two* companies trying to convince us to add scent to our computing; I was only aware of DigiScents, the higher-profile company. DigiScents went under on April 16; their business plan apparently stunk up the place.

Starbucks and GPS

Maybe you've been lucky enough to miss the great cliché of our wireless future with location-sensitive cell phones and PDAs. As repeated in too many stories, you're walking down the street, cell phone in pocket, and you get a beep as you near a Starbucks: a buck off a cappuccino, that outlet only! The writers seem to think this coupon-at-the-right-time idea is enthralling; some readers find it absurd.

So, it turns out, does Starbucks. They have no plans for wireless coupons. When *The Industry Standard* asked a handful of Starbucks customers (in three cities) what they thought about the wireless-coupon idea, the reaction was all over the map, but those who didn't care for it—half of them—*really* didn't like the idea. I love the reaction of Mark Flolid, cofounder of SignalSoft (which makes mobile software): "I hate it. If that's the only service [that makes use of someone's location], God help us." (Everything in these two paragraphs is paraphrased from a charming one-page article in the April 9, 2001 *Industry Standard.*)

Two weeks after reading that *Industry Standard* article, I open the April 24, 2001 *PC Magazine*, where the editor's column discusses "the right wireless apps." To quote:

> In case you haven't heard, there's a buzz about location-based wireless services. It's pretty simple: You walk by a Starbucks and your phone beeps, informing you of a great deal on a cappuccino.

It does make you wonder why so many hotshot journalists seem incapable of dreaming up a second example—maybe even one where the vendor is considering implementation.

Knocking the iBook

Actually, "knocking around"—*Macworld* ran the kind of torture tests on the iBook that *PC World* and others have run on Windows notebooks. The results are what you'd expect, given the "bulletproof plastic" of the iBook and the realities of notebook construction. Short-term cold doesn't bother the unit; neither does being run over by a scooter, sat on, or hit by a baseball (although the case got dented). Throw your iBook "like a Frisbee" and it might work—but the screen will break, leaving "a desktop picture that never goes away." Spill your venti nonfat mocha and the iBook will die—as it will if you take a blowtorch to it. None of this is too surprising.

MyCereal

Sure it's off-topic, but librarians eat breakfast too, and this was just too good to pass up. As described in the April 9, 2001 *Industry Standard*, General Mills is "quietly testing MyCereal.com, a site that will let you dream up outlandish combinations of cereal and potentially order them for home delivery." The illustration shows "Lucky Chex"—Rice Chex with Lucky Charms marshmallows added. The site provides more than a million potential combinations; you can choose up to three kinds of cereal and three additions. There are limits: you can't add moist fruits to puffs, for example, because the puffs would get too soggy during shipping. Fruit-flavored corn rings, mango bits, honey-roasted soy bits? Bring 'em on!

You put together your cereal of choice; you even choose the name for your cereal. General Mills prints the box labels, fills your order, and sends you Your Cereal! And it costs a nere $6.25 for seven one-cup servings plus $4 for shipping. That's a lot more than you'd pay in a store—but then, Safeway doesn't custom-produce your special cereal.

Photo Prints As Good As Lab-Quality?

That's what *PC Magazine* says about the new Epson Stylus Photo 1280 in an April 24, 2001, five-dot review. The new unit offers tabloid-size printing and boosts resolution to 2880x720dpi. When the editors compared 8x10" prints on Epson's premium glossy or matte papers with film prints, they found "no meaningful difference" at high resolutions.

To get a high-quality 8x10" print, the photo should be at least a three-megapixel shot, but that's a different issue. Maybe 8x10" (and larger) prints are where digital photo printing makes economic sense: you may spend $1.05 to $1.65 per print for supplies, but that's cheaper than full-page Kodak prints. Don't expect super speed, however. At 720dpi, it took about five minutes to produce an 8x10 print— and at the full 2880dpi, roughly 24 minutes!

Half a Keyboard?

You can buy neat little folding keyboards for PDAs— but Matias thinks it has a better idea. As noted in the May 2001 *Macworld*, the $99 Half Keyboard "looks like a sawed-off laptop keyboard" and gives you—well, the home row is ASDFG. You use special shift keys for the rest of the letters and numbers— and, I suppose, two shift keys for a capital L?

The writeup says that "learning to use the Half Keyboard is surprisingly easy if you can touch-type." I wonder.

Press Watch II: Commentary

"Special report: metrics," *The Industry Standard* 4:12 (March 26, 2001), pp. 67-83.

"Corporate America's obsession with research and technology is producing reams of data. Making sense of it all isn't easy—but it's key to survival." Not that there's anything special about corporate love of numbers; what library operation doesn't depend on measures and statistics? This special report is worth reading, with a few highlights worth noting. In this case, my commentary isn't to cast doubt on the article itself, but on some of the elements within.

One two-page section compares forecasts for Internet advertising and e-commerce with the apparent actual results. The comparisons are tricky, particularly since the definition of online advertising and e-commerce varies so much, but it's fair to say that most two-year-forward forecasts were essentially worthless. (In the case of e-commerce, Forrester's same-year forecast for 2000 was a mere $19 billion too high—76% above the actual $26 billion—while IDC was $16 billion too high. The Yankee Group was on the money, but only for its same-year prediction.) A sidebar offers some of the sampling absurdities—for example, Media Metrix' findings that 25 percent of Brazilians owned PCs and 75 percent of those owners dialed in to the Internet. Great, except that only 12 percent of Brazilians have telephones!

A one-page diagram with text explains that analyst estimates aren't smoke and mirrors—although, if you read the diagram with a skeptical eye, it's easy to see a crystal ball in among the spreadsheets. That crystal ball comes into full glory in the last two pages, "the five-year forecast," offering a set of forecasts for the state of technology in 2005 (as compared to 2000). That two-page item is almost worth clipping and saving for 2005. For example:

➢ Consumer e-commerce will jump from $45 billion in 2000 (actually $26 billion, but who's counting?) to $269 billion in 2005.

➢ Interactive TV will be in 29.4 million households (not "between 25 and 35 million," but precisely 29.4 million), as compared to last year's 400,000 (using a broad definition of interactive).

➢ While we'll still spend nearly 1,600 hours per year watching TV (do you get in your 4.4 hours a day?), we'll average 228 hours per year online at home (as compared to 135 hours last

year) and *more* time listening to the radio (1,012 hours rather than 980 hours).

➢ Wireless Net users will grow from 4.1 million to 153 million (in the U.S. alone), with *ninety percent* of Americans using cell phones or equivalents (about 40 percent of us use them now)—and, worldwide, the number of wireless Net users will grow from 45 million to 894 million in five years.

Dvorak, John, "Swan song for snapshots," *Computer Shopper* 21:4 (April 2001), p. 53.

John Dvorak *loves* digital cameras; that's been clear for a while. He believes that digital photography is the most interesting peripheral technology for PCs. He assures us "there's not even a remote notion that film will continue to exist in anything other than specialized high-end applications"—but remember that Dvorak had the recording industry out of business before the end of last year.

What's odd about this one-page article is Dvorak's stance. "I'm eager to watch film's demise." That's a precise quote, followed by "It isn't dead yet, but it will be within the next decade." Will film survive? I can't say—but why be "eager" for it to die, unless there are compelling reasons that film needs to disappear.

Dvorak claims that disposable cameras are the main gimmick keeping film alive. My wife took more than 300 photographs (not snapshots) on our last cruise, only 81 of them using disposable (underwater) cameras—and we certainly didn't have the computer along that we'd need to store 300 high-resolution digital pictures! Additionally, Dvorak admits that passing around snapshots can't readily be replaced by digital means—but he says we'll give up on that, just as we've (mostly) stopped showing slides. He thinks handheld viewers will be the future of snapshot photography.

Maybe. Maybe not. Film works differently from digital imaging. There are a few million photographers falling between snapshooters and professionals; for them, I suspect the film system has more than a decade left. I could be wrong.

Raskin, Robin, "True confessions," *FamilyPC* 8:4 (April 2001), pp. 53-5.

Maybe I'm picking on Ms. Raskin, but she invites it. Earlier in the same issue she informs us that she's "been at the forefront of the discussions" on filtering "ever since the first commercial filtering-software packages appeared on the scene." I don't remember seeing Raskin's name on an ALA filtering programs, but never mind. One more interesting sentence from her editor's note: "There's no doubt that there's a preponderance of stuff on the Internet that's truly unsuitable for children." Hmm. She's a professional editor, so let's check the dictionary. "A superiority or excess in number or quantity; majority." So she's saying that *most stuff on the Internet* is *truly* unsuitable for children. That's pretty strong.

This "Double click" column isn't about filtering, however. It seems to be another step in Raskin's continuing (if slow) recognition that there may be a real world out there. The tease: "I've been a die-hard Internet shopper for years, but now I'm starting to appreciate good old bricks-and-mortar stores." Why? Because she ran out of black pants.

Apparently her only real store is the Macy's from hell: "The store was crowded and hot, and when I did spot a salesperson to ask for directions, he was overburdened and curt." Our Macy's (which I don't care for) has visible directories, but presumably not hers. Anyway, despite the horrors of real-world shopping, when she found the right department, "I found myself in black pants nirvana." In case you're one of those "die-hard Internet shoppers" who *knows* that it always makes sense to buy over the Web, consider this revelation. Racks and racks of black pants. Fabrics you can touch. Cleaning instructions you can read. "Then I tried them on by the dozens. Two hours later, I left the store with four pairs of black pants."

Now she's "dismayed by what the online world had denied me." She rebelled: doing *holiday shopping* in stores! Calling a *travel agent* to book a vacation!

She actually claims that this trip to Macy's was the first time she'd "done retail" in *years*. I find that hard to believe, given the state of Internet retail in, say, 1999—but if you're a true believer, you must suffer for your beliefs.

Will Raskin ever gain a plausible balance between real life and her beloved Internet? Will *FamilyPC* start running more stories that involve something more than annotated Web sites? Only time will tell.

Perspective

Copyrights and Wrongs: Drawing Conclusions

Last month, I offered a dozen scenarios for your consideration. If you haven't read them, go back to *Cites & Insights* 1:4 (April 2001); the essay is on pages 8 and 9. I'll repeat scenarios and note my own ethical conclusions regarding each one. In those cases where I *suspect* that the legal and ethical considerations differ, I'll note that suspicion—but I'm no legal expert!

Scenarios 1-6

Take one of Roy Tennant's columns in *Library Journal*—since, as he notes, those columns are posted on LJ's Web site for anyone to read or download.

➢ I find one of the columns so magnificent that I extol its virtues on my own Web site and provide a link to it.

Appropriate and a fine thing to do. Citing someone else's work has always been appropriate; providing an explicit link offers contemporary convenience.

➢ As part of my new *Libraries 2.0* commercial Web site, I link to the column—but bring it up within my own frame, so that it appears to be material prepared for *Libraries 2.0*.

Questionable. Tennant's byline still appears, but by suggesting that it's part of *Libraries 2.0* rather than *LJ Digital* I'm at least partly in the wrong. I wouldn't do this, and quite a few site owners object to being "framed" in this manner.

➢ Rather than linking to it, I download it and include it—in full, including Roy's byline—in the next *Cites & Insights.*

Clearly unethical. I'm now reusing the material (albeit with byline) in a situation that I don't regard as fair use and without Roy's knowledge or permission. Using one paragraph from an article (with citation) would be ethical and legal; taking the whole piece goes too far.

➢ I think it's a wonderful article, so I mention it in "Press Watch 1" with a brief description, a pointer, and some commentary.

Appropriate and traditional.

➢ I realize that I wish I had said that first—so I download it, strip off the byline, and include it in *Cites & Insights*—or, better yet, send it off to another publication under my own name.

Outrageously unethical and probably illegal. Pure theft, even if the source material is "freely" available on the Web.

➢ For an article in *Libraries 2.0*, I use each of the facts and interpretations in Roy's article, including his best phrases, but I revise the actual sentences so that it's not a word-for-word copy. I run it under my own byline.

Ethically questionable—and a case where I think the law and ethics differ. At worst, this is plagiarism rather than direct theft. You can't copyright facts or ideas (at least not directly), but an ethical writer would *at least* give credit for the inspiration.

Scenarios 7-12

The wonders of digital technology.

➢ I buy a DVD and take it home to play on my Linux PC. Oops: there's no DVD software for Linux. So I download DeCSS, which indirectly makes it possible for me to enjoy the DVD.

If the red light goes on, it should. I regard this as *entirely* ethical behavior—but there's considerable doubt that it's legal, at least as cases stand in the courts. I find that appalling. Once I've purchased a DVD, it should be mine to enjoy as I see fit.

➢ I think CDs cost too much, so I find the songs I want using Gnutella or other peer-to-peer technology. I'm deaf enough to think that 128K MP3 is high fidelity, so I'm happy.

Unethical as far as I'm concerned, even though I agree that the big record companies have acted outrageously in maintaining high prices for CDs even though costs are lower than for LPs. Overpricing does not justify theft.

➢ I burn those Gnutella-acquired MP3s onto CDs and give them to my friends.

Slightly more unethical than the previous situation, as it adds distribution of stolen material, albeit distribution without personal gain.

➢ I encode my own favorite songs, from CDs that I've purchased, in high-rate MP3 (256K), then create my own custom CDs to use with my portable MP3/CD player.

Appropriate. I'm reformatting songs that I've purchased for my own convenience. I don't know of any legal issue, and there's certainly no ethical issue.

➢ I copy my own favorite songs in .WAV form (essentially audio CD format) and burn them onto audio CDs for my own use.

Equally appropriate. Note that audio CDs do not contain copy protection, so there's not even a legal issue of circumventing protection.

➢ My mix of songs is so great that friends offer to buy copies, which I sell to them for a reasonable price—say, $6 for an 80-minute mix CD.

Oops. Unethical, as far as I'm concerned. There's one conceivable ethical justification—that I'm creating a new work of art by rearranging existing material—but that's a tough sell when you're just choosing a group of complete songs. I don't know of any anthologists who have successfully claimed that they're creating new works of art and therefore don't need permission from the writers anthologized!

If you disagree on the ethics, I'd be interested in hearing why—but I have little patience for arguments that boil down to "Two wrongs make a right" or "If it's easy, it's ethical."

Review Watch

These notes cover *comparative* reviews that seem worth noting, primarily from magazines in the personal computing field. Constant grumbles: *PC World*'s rigid review format leaves out much of the work they do, and *Macworld*'s reviews are typically so brief as to break down to "trust us, we know what you need."

Desktop Computers

Broida, Rick, "Penny-wise & powerful," *Computer Shopper* 21:4 (April 2001), pp. 100-11.

What kind of a PC can you get for less than $1,000? The bar for this review was set high: at least an 866MHz CPU, 128MB RAM, 20GB hard disk, 16"-viewable display, CD-ROM or DVD-ROM, and Windows ME. Four systems appear—albeit only one from a first-rank vendor, Dell. The Best Buy goes to ABS' AMD Web Special for its good looks, high-end graphics card (nVidia GeForce2 MX), Altec Lansing speakers with subwoofer, big, fast hard disk (30GB, 7200RPM) and inclusion of both modem and Ethernet adapter. You don't get the comfort of a name brand or much in the way of software, but it's a lot of computer for the money.

Encyclopedias

Stinson, Craig, "Quick study," *PC Magazine* 20:6 (March 20, 2001), pp. 186-7.

Reviews by librarians would trump this comparison, but it's a useful starting point. This mini-roundup includes the four deluxe CD encyclopedias with 2001 editions: Compton's, possibly caught in the turmoil of Mattel's (eventually successful) effort to sell the Learning Company, didn't do a 2001 edition. For that matter, IBM no longer distributes World Book and Grolier is now part of Scholastic.

The winner here should come as no surprise, even though it's the only digital encyclopedia that never had a print version. Microsoft Encarta Reference Suite just keeps getting better (and has long since lost much resemblance to its Funk & Wagnall's origins); now, in addition to the Encarta Atlas and Dictionary, the suite includes the superb Encarta Africana. At $75 list, this is the most expensive of the products and quite possibly the biggest bargain. World Book and Britannica tie for second (four dots each); Grolier's 2001 edition trails with two dots.

Graphics

Ginsburg, Lynn, "Photo ops," *Computer Shopper* 21:4 (April 2001), pp. 124-8.

Inexpensive photo-editing software keeps getting better, as this four-product roundup of under-$100 programs shows. The point ratings cluster surprisingly close (7.0 for two products, 7.8 for two others) but the programs aren't interchangeable. If you want performance and would rather keep your distance from Redmond, your best bet may be one of the two top-rated programs, Ulead's $100 PhotoImpact 6. But the Best Buy goes to Microsoft for its $60 Picture It Photo Premium 2001.

Portable Devices and Access

Behr, Mary E., and Angela Graven, "Choose your weapon," *PC Magazine* 20:8 (April 24, 2001), pp. 110-35.

This article makes a good case for the "wireless Web" *for some people*—using PDAs, cell phones, or the newer BlackBerry. In addition to examples of real business uses—not the "killer app" or such nonsense as watching a movie on your PDA, but specialized applications for sales, service, and other areas—the review couples hardware and software comparisons in four areas: Palm OS devices, Pocket PCs, Internet cell phones, and two-way pagers. The editors even did comparative timings—how long it took to order a CD on Amazon, find the closest theater showing *Traffic*, or get a stock quote (for example). All tests were done in New York City and represent the average of three trials; dot ratings show overall effectiveness *within wireless services*. So, for example, OmniSky earns four dots overall in both Palm OS and Pocket PC incarnations, but that can't compare to a high-speed desktop Web connection.

Overall, the editors liked OmniSky's wireless service better than any competitors, although it's not universally available. You'd need to read the article for details within each category.

Waring, Becky, "Wireless PC Card modems," *Macworld* May 2001, pp. 66-7.

This brief roundup covers three PC Card devices that could probably be used with either PowerBooks or Windows notebooks. Highest-rated of the group is Novatel's Merlin for Ricochet ($299), which offers the highest-speed wireless access—but Metricom's Ricochet is expensive ($75 per month) and currently covers a mere 13 metropolitan areas. Note that the Ricochet modem sucks power: constant use can cut the battery life of a PowerBook in half. Note also that, while Ricochet typically operates at 96

Kbps or so, the alternative CDPD network offers throughput averaging 14.4Kbps: fast enough for e-mail but slow for full-scale Web browsing.

Printers

English, David, "The art formally known as prints," *Computer Shopper* 21:4 (April 2001), pp. 112-20.

The joke's getting a little old, since Prince reassumed his name a couple of years ago, but cute titles neither make nor ruin a group review, This one covers four "specialized printers [that] put the life back in your snapshots"—an odd grouping, with prices from $200 to $999 and a mix of technologies. For that matter, they're not all specialized printers: HP's $399 PhotoSmart 1215 is a quality general-purpose printer. The Best Buy is an odd unit, Lexmark's $200 Z82 Color Jetprinter, which includes scanning and copying features. It's as bulky as you'd expect for a flatbed-scanning unit. The award's a little tricky, given the supposed emphasis on photo printing, since both the HP and the $999 Olympus produce better-quality prints; indeed, the summary lists the Olympus as first choice and HP as second choice. The Olympus isn't an inkjet; it uses dye sublimation, which should yield better quality—but supplies cost a *lot* more and it's not really useful for anything but photos.

A quick note on the fourth printer. Kodak's $200 Personal Picture Maker 200 has a little LCD screen so you can print pictures directly from digital camera storage media—but it's the slowest in the roundup and the prints are the worst.

Sound Cards & Speakers

Labriola, Don, "Let's hear it," *PC Magazine* 20:7 (April 3, 2001), pp. 184-6.

I find it amusing that *PC Magazine*, with its laudable inclusion of specific numeric tests for computing equipment, completely omits objective measures in this review of 23 speaker systems. That's not new but it's unfortunate. I'd like to know what "enhanced bass" means. Would it take that much space to provide small response curves for each system, or at least room-averaged frequency response limits for a +/- 3dB tolerance? A magazine that will do precise measurements of various objective quality levels for computer displays ought to do a little better than "A/B listening tests" against a $200 "reference" system in the sound arena: the instrumentation isn't that expensive, and the best way to do room-averaged response curves in the real world relies (oddly enough) on a PC-based program.

None of that here. One paragraph for each system offers text such as "average midrange muddiness," "snappy bass," and "unparalleled punch and immediacy." If you can deal with reviews that depend entirely on editors' ears (the same editors who consider 128K MP3 to be CD quality?), you'll find an interesting range of choices here.

They select an Editors' Choice in each of four "ranges." For low-end upgrades, the $40 Labtec Spin-70 plays louder than you'd expect. If you want "good sound at a moderate price," the winner is the $200 Klipsch ProMedia 2.1, with "ear-splitting volume levels" (this is a good thing?) and "seemingly bottomless bass."

If you're a gamer who wants multichannel sound and heavy bass, go with Songistix' $300 Monsoon MM-2000, the "most accurate desktop system we've heard." And for "serious immersive gaming or desktop theater," where a 5.1-channel system would appear to be required, the choice is Altec Lansing's $300 ADA890, "perhaps the most accurate 5.1 system yet." Note that "5.1" is a misnomer here. This system *doesn't have a center speaker*. Instead, it creates a ghost center channel through the front left and right speakers. "They work best when the listener is on axis (centered between the satellites)." But then, the whole reason for center channels is to keep center information where it should be even if you're off axis! *Any* stereo system creates a centered image when you're on axis.

It might also be worth saying that *PC Magazine*'s effusive claim for the ADA890 is *only* within the realm of inexpensive PC speaker systems—it's pretty much inconceivable that Altec Lansing's $300 system is as accurate as, say, a $10,000 5.1-channel home theater speaker system.

The Details

URL: cites.boisestate.edu/civ1i5.pdf