much economic data and have organized them in a presentable fashion. They have not analyzed the data in a rigorous fashion, though they make no claim for having done so. For the most part, then, they have accomplished their first objective.

Apart from the observations that libraries, publishers, and authors should be subsidized, probably by the federal government, and that continuing research be conducted to establish continuing dialog, the reviewer found little to indicate that the authors had "developed the data into proposed joint actions." Accomplishment of their second objective, then, is less apparent.

The authors include an impressive list of project contributors: an advisory committee, consultants, and panel of reactors, imparting the impression of credibility and authority. An interesting table on alternative methods for disseminating scientific articles was authored by Joseph Becker.

The reviewer does not wish to demean the importance of this book on the basis of its methodological limitations. It is the first of its kind on a serious economic problem. Its conclusions, whether methodologically justified or not, are intelligently drawn with considerable insight and provide us with much to ponder. It is a useful book.

William E. McGrath, Director of Libraries, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.


This is a landmark document in the nation's evolution to a post-industrial society. This report is the product of a committee charged by former president Gerald Ford in March 1976 to review and define information policy issues, to determine the status of various information policy studies underway in executive branch agencies, and to report on how the federal government should organize itself to deal with information policy issues. The major recommendations of the committee were: that there
should be as a national goal the development of a coordinated National Information Policy; that there should be in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Information Policy (either by creating a new entity or by refocusing and/or restructuring one or more existing entities); that there should be created an interagency Council on Information Policy chaired by the director of the Office of Information Policy; that the Office of Information Policy should be assisted by a representative advisory committee.

The Committee on the Right of Privacy began its study taking a narrow view of information (i.e., data about individuals collected and maintained by federal agencies). It became evident early on that this view was inadequate, so a meeting was arranged by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) in July 1976 between members of the committee and representatives of various types of libraries and information services and public and private agencies.

Given its charge and the deadline of September 1976, it is clear that the committee could have done little more than catalog the issues. This it has done with admirable clarity, arranging fifteen issues into five clusters: government information; information in commerce; interaction between technology and government; international implications; preparing for the information age.

As we move toward the White House Conference, our mails will bring and our desks will be covered by an unequaled avalanche of "Reports from Washington," brought to us with the compliments of NCLIS. This document will not win a writing award, but we will see none in the avalanche of more importance.—C. James Schmidt, Director of Libraries, State University of New York at Albany.


Louis Booker Wright is one of the few remaining eminent research scholar-librarians in the tradition of Reuben Gold Thwaites. Research associate virtually in charge of the Huntington Library for sixteen years and director of the Folger Library for twenty, he was connected with a galaxy of intellectual enterprises, organizations, and institutions. For these activities he has been heaped with honors, including twenty-eight honorary doctorates. This is the second brief autobiographical book he has written since 1974.

Wright's accounts of the conversion of both the Huntington and the Folger, pre-eminent among our private research libraries, are of considerable interest, since he participated in both developments almost from the beginning. To convert even a great private library to research strength requires a great deal of thought and effort. When Indiana University was given the Lilly Library, Cecil Byrd (one of the finest bookmen in this profession) observed to me that to fill in the gaps between the great books and solidify it into a research collection would take about thirty years. Indiana is still working on that very process.

At the Huntington, Wright took a strictly pragmatic approach, including the acquisition of microfilm, to solidify the fields of strength in Huntington's collection and acquire the ordinary books and reference books necessary to allow academic scholars to work fruitfully with the original collection. Converting Huntington's original staff, infused with the collector's attitudes and values, to an outgoing, service-minded library staff, equipped to cope with the sometimes brutally utilitarian, self-centered demands of university scholars, was even more difficult.

When he came to the Folger in 1948, it was in disrepute, disrepair, and disarray, with service denied to many qualified scholars, books biblio-piled but not cataloged, and guards over the collection wearing guns. The same process used at the Huntington was applied to the Folger with success. The emergence of both libraries into the intellectual world was greatly facilitated by programs of permanent research scholars and rotating research fellowships to encourage the development and use of the library. Wright correctly states that the importance of private research libraries will loom more important as the strength of the university research libraries dwindles. Indeed, in the 1980s, we all may tend to revert to the conditions of the Folger when Wright took it over—collections unsolidi-