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" × 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.


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.


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 microreproduction 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.


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.