

the retrieval of information that sometimes gets buried in, or omitted from, the MARC format" (183), and they locate journal articles and so on.

One of the many lessons that this highly valuable book has to offer is that lazy solutions consisting in just transferring MARC fields into XML tags are not the best ones and do not put librarians in a position to envision the future with serenity. "Rather than just attempting to translate existing knowledge structures directly into XML, we have a strategic opportunity to redefine these structures in order to support future information systems. . . . We advocate the need for fundamental changes in order to achieve a viable replacement schema" (92, 93). Is the profession ready to follow pioneers and to invest time, thinking, and money in the XML revolution?—Patrick Le Boeuf (*patrick.le-boeuf@bnf.fr*), *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris*

Who Wants Yesterday's Papers?: Essays on the Research Value of Printed Materials in the Digital Age. Yvonne Carignan et al., eds. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2005. 224p. \$48 paper (ISBN 0-8108-5119-9).

Have you ever noticed that when an issue comes to one's attention, permutations of it seem to arise at every turn? Recently, while listening during my daily commute to a CD educational series on classical music, I heard the instructor bemoan the belief of some scholars that fully 40 percent of the musical works of Johann Sebastian Bach—that would be in the range of 400 works—has been lost, and that the paper they were written on was likely used to wrap cheese or to provide insulation for the roots of plants and trees.¹ During the same period, in preparation for a family move, I sorted through the entire kindergarten through twelfth-grade academic output of my two offspring and decided what among the hundreds of pages of math worksheets and other busy-work could be kept and what discarded. As I composed this review, I reflected that loss and preservation are hardly new or unusual issues, but ones that have long pervaded both the public and private spheres.

In 2001 Nicholson Baker, through the publication of his provocative *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper*, created a flurry of attention on libraries' decisions to replace fragile or deteriorating collections of newspapers with microfilm.² Although *Double Fold* and its author have been widely criticized for arguably oversimplifying or obscuring the issues, they have served a valuable purpose by fostering a great deal of professional and public discussion of the issues surrounding the preservation of original materials in an increasingly digital age. Among the responses to Baker was a symposium organized by University of Maryland librarians and graduate students from the university's college of information studies.

While *Double Fold* focused on newspapers (and library card catalogs), the symposium's organizers had a far more

ambitious objective, to address "the whole question of what original materials should be saved more broadly" (ix). The organizers' strategy, culminating in the publication of *Who Wants Yesterday's Papers?*³ was to promote a dialog between researchers from a range of academic disciplines—including humanities and the social and physical sciences—and the librarians and preservationists who face the daunting task of short-term decision-making and long-term planning in these areas. The book contains both the symposium presentations and further essays added to provide a more complete overview of various aspects of the issue. The result provides a useful introduction to the complexities of the topic of the greatly differing research needs of varying disciplines. However, it also accomplishes much more by providing both a historical perspective on library preservation (primarily in part one, "The Race against Time") and an introduction to the technical and other problems associated with digital preservation. Many of the essays are extensively footnoted, and the book also contains an annotated bibliography of sources for further research. Although there are current issues not explicitly dealt with due to the fact that the symposium took place in 2002, such as developments in the area of government documents and depository libraries and the Google digital initiatives, *Who Wants Yesterday's Papers?* provides an excellent springboard for further exploration of the topic.

Part two, titled "Digital Demand vs. Paper Pleas," explores the importance of original paper documents from the perspectives of University of Maryland professors in various disciplines. These scholars were asked what types of materials they used in their research; how important paper materials were, as opposed to microfilmed or digital materials; and whether and how their reliance on original materials had recently changed or would change in the foreseeable future. Science historian Stephen G. Brush's argument that old science textbooks, far from being outdated and useless, are crucially important takes on particular forces, considering the ongoing debate over the teaching of evolution and intelligent design; it's difficult to imagine a better illustration of how textbooks as "social artifacts" (40) provide insight into the values and convictions of their respective eras. By contrast, physicist Jordan Goodman and archivist Kara M. McClurken explore the advent of online scholarly publishing, extolling its potential for rapid publication of scientific research results and enhanced methods of peer review, while touching upon copyright and preservation issues. They also address the problems reliance upon digital information pose for the researcher, describing how historian Michael Bellesiles was stripped of his academic position and awards after being unable to reproduce some of the research data used in writing his book *Arming America: The Origins of a National Gun Culture*.³ John E. Newhagen's essay "Above the Fold: The Value of Paper Newspapers" presents several cogent examples of how "the preservation of the physical

form of yesterday's papers will be critical to preserving the meaning and content of the messages they embody" (87). A recent example is Laurel Leff's *Buried by The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*, in which Leff, a former newspaper journalist and current professor of journalism, exhaustively studied the *New York Times's* coverage of the campaign against European Jews from 1939 to 1945, analyzing how decisions about the content and placement of news article on the genocide had the effect of minimizing public awareness and outrage.⁴

Part three, "Enduring Value," features the perspectives of a variety of preservation professionals and scholars seeking to explore the issues of how we should select materials for preservation and how to preserve them (and perhaps re-preserve them through reformatting) in the appropriate format for their audience, while taking into account the resources available for such preservation efforts.

Richard J. Cox, of the School of Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh, who contributed the afterword to *Who Wants Yesterday's Papers?*,² suggests that the answer to the question posed by the book's title is not, as the Rolling Stones concluded in their 1967 recording, "Nobody in the world," but rather that everyone wants them, and they want all of them.⁵ According to Cox, the major error of such critics as Baker is the failure to recognize that selection is an imperative, because not everything can be saved. Cox opines, "archivists and librarians have not sufficiently explained themselves or provided adequate reasons for some of their preservation activities. . . . we cannot take for granted that we or our discipline will be understood or appreciated by external observers."⁶ As a catalyst for discussion of these important issues, *Who Wants Yesterday's Papers?*² poses many more questions than it answers and provides avenues for further exploration and debate on the issues of the way society uses and values information. —Susan Herrick (*sherrick@law.umaryland.edu*), *University of Maryland School of Law, Baltimore*

References

1. "J. S. Bach: Concerto in G Major for Violin, Viola and String Orchestra," www.rbpmusic.com/bach.htm. (accessed Jan. 5, 2006).
2. Nicholson Baker, *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper* (New York: Random House, 2001).
3. Michael A. Bellesiles, *Arming America: The Origins of a National Gun Culture* (New York: Knopf, 2000).
4. Laurel Leff, *Buried by The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*. (New York: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2005).
5. "Yesterday's Papers Lyrics—The Rolling Stones Lyrics," www.rolling-stones-lyrics.com/papers.html (accessed Jan. 6, 2006).
6. Richard J. Cox, *Vandals in the Stacks? A Response to Nicholson Baker's Assault on Libraries* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002), 194, 196.

Brief Reviews

The Next Library Leadership: Attributes of Academic and Public Library Directors. By Peter Hernon, Ronald R. Powell, and Arthur P. Young. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2003. 192p. \$50 paper (ISBN 1-56308-992-0).

Acknowledging the shortage of librarians entering the management ranks of academic and large public libraries, this book addresses a topic of great interest to the profession and fills a need in the library literature. Beginning with a brief chapter supporting the claim that there is a shortage of librarians, the book continues with a literature review that provides a good introduction to the topic of leadership in libraries and makes some distinctions between the attributes needed by managers versus those needed by leaders.

Three subsequent chapters list and analyze the qualities needed by Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), and public library directors. Each of these chapters treats the topic as a separate research study that begins with lists of potential attributes, a survey of leaders in the profession, and follow-up interviews of selected individuals. Whereas the lists of desired attributes arrived at through the surveys were agreed upon by those surveyed, there are clear differences of opinion when individuals are queried. The next few chapters compare the lists of attributes identified by ARL, ACRL, and public library directors, address tools that can be used to assess the leadership qualities and abilities of individuals, and review methods for attaining leadership skills, such as work experience, leadership institutes, and mentoring, although the authors do not endorse any particular method. Finally, a brief chapter concludes with a discussion on the use of headhunters to identify and recruit potential leaders.

Overall this book will be useful for librarians who would like to pursue leadership opportunities, and also for libraries that are recruiting for leadership positions.—*Rebecca L. Mugridge* (*rlm31@psu.edu*), *Pennsylvania State University, University Park*

An Ounce of Prevention: Integrated Disaster Planning for Archives, Libraries, and Record Centres, 2nd ed. By Johanna Wellheiser and Jude Scott, with the assistance of John Barton. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow; Toronto: Canadian Archives Foundation, 2002. 283p. \$33 paper (ISBN 0-8108-4176-2).

Wellheiser and Scott have thoroughly revamped and expanded Wellheiser and Barton's 1985 first edition, an indispensable manual of its day. Retaining their Canadian-centric focus but encompassing a worldwide scope, the authors incorporate up-to-date approaches to disaster prevention, protection, preparedness, response, recovery, rehabilitation (for collections, records, facilities, and systems), and post-disaster planning for water-damaged collections and records, including CDs and computer media as well as paper-based materials.