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This short, compact, and very readable book presents five of the papers given at the RTSD Preservation Microfilming Institute in New Haven, Connecticut, on April 21-23, 1988. Wesley Boomgaard, Ohio State University, discusses the preservation microfilm process and describes how it interacts with other library processes, such as collection development. He discusses selection, bibliographic control, camera preparation, filming, and quality control. Along with those, Mr. Boomgaard identifies the interconnective areas to be considered for good planning “... of systemwide preservation within the archive or library,” cost control, copyright cooperation with other sectors, future technology, and the reader.

Myron Chace, Library of Congress, covers and historically analyzes the standards and specifications affecting preservation microfilming. The paper is very readable and provides an excellent introduction to the standards that affect the field. The appendix which lists the standards and addresses for obtaining them is especially valuable.

Margaret Byrnes, National Library of Medicine, provides an extensive discussion of the factors to consider when deciding to contract for preservation microfilming or to create an in-house preservation microfilming unit. She very nicely covers such aspects as personnel, space and equipment, productivity, film quality, flexibility differences allowed by an in-house preservation microfilming unit and those allowed by outside contracting, and costs. Lastly, she presents a picture of the management time and administrative headaches involved.

Carolyn Harris, Columbia University, describes several of the cooperative programs in existence and gives a cogent analysis of the issues that must be considered when deciding to establish a cooperative preservation microfilming program. At the end of the paper, Ms. Harris provides ten “Axioms for Cooperative Projects.” These axioms are well worth considering prior to instituting almost any cooperative program.

Gay Walker, Yale University, projects the future and envisions preservation microfilming and digital image technologies coexisting for the benefit of researchers. The paper provides an interesting discussion of some of the technology already available, although expensive, as well as a glimpse into a future where digitizing and microfilming are carried out simultaneously.

The sixth paper by Patricia McClung, Research Libraries Group, is a reprint from Library Resources & Technical Services. In it, Ms. McClung reports on a 1984 study done by seven RLG libraries of the costs involved in preservation microfilming. While the study is now six years old, the techniques used are well described. The appendix which provides the worksheet for estimating project costs is quite valuable, especially to anyone contemplating such a cost study.

Each of the papers is well written and highly readable. The publication provides an excellent introduction to the many aspects involved in preservation microfilming.
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