

In Miss Stewart's book, the summary and evaluation come at the beginning, and the review is broken into two parts. The first part, which is chronologically arranged, takes up ninety-four pages and is based on some 284 references. The second part, a topical summary, takes sixty-seven pages to list some forty-two features by which the reading machines are classified. These range from cost of the equipment, through the various optical and mechanical features, to end with use costs.

The chief value of these two volumes lies in their chapters of recommendations and their bibliographies. The former will be fertile fields for doctoral candidates looking for subjects for dissertations. They will also be used by industry to help lay out research projects on present and future equipment. The two bibliographies bring together just about all that one could find in this field up to 1957. I suspect that many students will be shuffling these lists into manifold arrangements for some time to come.

The outstanding shortcoming of both books lies in the lack of illustrations. The descriptions of equipment and techniques cry for pictures and diagrams. The evaluation of equipment and processes in both books is somewhat undiscriminating. There is little weight given as to who made what judgment when. There are surprisingly few errors when one considers what a wide range of time and subject matter is covered. One that will amuse those who know him is the appearance of Frank and Frederic Luther, both writing about Dagon.

*Library Trends*, VIII (1960), no. 1 (*Photoduplication in Libraries*. Edited by James E. Skipper.)

Photoduplication has been the subject of single articles appearing in four previous issues of *Library Trends*. Now it has an issue of its own. Of the ten papers presented here, seven are on the administrative aspects and three on the technological phases of the field. Of an administrative nature are: Lester K. Born, "History of Microform Activity"; Lawrence S. Thompson, "Microforms as Library Resources"; John A. Riggs, "The State of Microtext Publications"; George A. Schwegmann, Jr., "The Bibliographical Control of Microforms"; H. Gordon Bechanan, "The

Organization of Microforms in the Library"; Robert E. Kingery, "Copying Methods as Applied to Library Operations"; Miles O. Price, "Photocopying by Libraries and Copyright: A Precis."

Of greater interest to the technologists in the field are: Robert H. Muller, "Policy Questions Relating to Library Photoduplication Laboratories"; Charles G. La Hood, Jr., "Microfilm as Used in Reproduction and Transmission Systems"; Peter Scott, "Advances and Goals in Microphotography."

This issue is recommended reading for all who are interested in microfilming. Librarians responsible for organizing microform reading rooms will benefit by Bechanan's report on Harvard's progress in this line. Heads of library photoduplication laboratories will be thankful to Muller for his survey of their problems. Commercial microphotographic agencies about to embark on projects aimed at libraries would do well to study the articles by Thompson, Riggs, and Schwegmann. This issue will be on library school reading lists for some time to come.

*Microtexts as Media for Publication: The Papers and Discussion of a Symposium Held at Hatfield Technical College on the 10th November 1959 . . . Hatfield, Herts., England: Hertfordshire County Council, 1960. 87p. 9s.*

Hatfield is located twenty miles north of London (about as far from its center as Scarsdale is from Times Square) and is the source of an increasing number of important publications on photoduplication. In January 1958 a Symposium on Microtexts and Microrecording was held, and its papers published. A Symposium on Modern Copying Techniques followed in January 1959, resulting in another booklet. The third publication is perhaps of greatest interest to librarians. It consists of papers presented on microfilm, microfiche, and Microcard, and considers them from the standpoint of their suitability for publication of scholarly material.

The first paper is on "Microfilm—The Versatile Academic Tool" by Eugene Power of University Microfilms. It contains a wealth of information based on twenty-five years of experience with this medium. This is followed by Dr. L. J. van der Wolk's report on "Publishing on Microfiche." This presents a

persuasive plea for sheet microfilm, which embodies some of the best features of ribbon microfilm and micropaper. Included in the paper is a "Survey of Microfiche Publishing Activity" listing the outstanding companies prepared to produce microfiche. The last paper is on "Microcard" by C. D. Gelatt of the Microcard Corporation. As far as this reviewer knows, this is the first time that we have been able to read something by the man who did so much to implement Fremont Rider's basic ideas. Besides noting the Microcard Corporation's current program, he mentions some future developments: a facility for the production of Microcards by small units such as libraries, and a print-out device for Microcards.

These papers are followed by a transcription of the discussion period that is as interesting and valuable as the previous section. There are four appendixes. The first is a report of a meeting with Fremont Rider in May 1959 which gives some interesting footnotes on the early history of Microcards. In the course of this meeting Dr. Rider makes some statements that may be open to question, especially by some of his competitors. Appendix II is a "Supplementary List of Micro-Opaque Cards and Microfilm Publishers." Appendix III is the "Statement of Views" formulated by the Council on 3 December 1959, reporting their opinion that "the 5" x 3" micro-opaque card should be regarded as the standard form for the publication of material to be issued in a microtext edition of a number of copies produced at one time." Appendix IV is a Microcard edition (two cards) of the proceedings prepared by Recordak Division of Kodak Ltd.

*Microtext in the Form of Opaque Cards and Transparent Microfilm/Review of Progress 1959.* By Geo. H. Davison. Moorgate, Rotherham, Yorkshire, England: Swinden Laboratories, The United Steel Companies, Ltd., [1960]. 82p. On request.

In 1954 Mr. Davison began his annual review of progress on Microcards with a three-page report. In 1958 he added microfiche, and his survey had grown to twenty-two pages. The current issue is still produced by mimeograph, but is a worthy addition to any library engaged in acquiring micropaper and microfiche editions. A file of this series will

be of utmost value to anyone writing the history of the development of these two processes. The 1959 review has a wealth of material—well indexed—that would require much painstaking digging to unearth from a long shelf of material that would most likely not be in most libraries.

"The Literature of Document Reproduction." By Allen B. Veanor. In *The Literature of Library Technical Services* (University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers, No. 58), pp. 25-37. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Library School, 1960. On request.

Mr. Veanor is specialist for documentary reproduction at the Harvard University Library. He notes two trends in photoduplication: "First is the significant role which office reproduction methods are beginning to play in the library. Second is the disappearance of the sharp cleavage between micro-reproduction and full size copying. . . ." This puts a greater burden on librarians in that it requires a wider knowledge of technical writings.

Included in his bibliography are some seventy titles, covering a very wide spectrum of the literature on the subject of photoduplication and its tangential fields. Each item is given a brief and helpful annotation. This is a "must" item for all library schools, as well as recommended reading for those who have been out in working libraries for many years.

*John Benjamin Dancer. . .* By L. L. Ardern. (Library Association Occasional Papers, No. 2) London: The Library Association, 1960. 22p. illus. On request.

This little booklet will be of interest to those who want to know more about Dancer, the originator of microphotography. Letters and other documents are quoted at length, and an outline of his many achievements and activities is given. There is a frontispiece portrait of Dancer in 1860 that is not as stiff as those usually published, and a tail-piece illustration of the first microphotographic slide that he made for sale in 1853. An appendix lists the 106 microphotographs known to be extant out of some 485 listed in a contemporary catalogue of his productions.