From My Commonplace Book

Morris Cohen

"It is not easy thus to turn human beings into lawyers. Neither is it safe.... None the less, it is an almost impossible process to achieve the technique without sacrificing some humanity first."


"I had studied law an entire week, and then given it up because it was so prosy and tiresome."

Mark Twain, *Roughing It* (1872).

"The end of the law is peace. The means to that end is war. So long as the law is compelled to hold itself in readiness to resist the attacks of wrong and this it will be compelled to do until the end of time it cannot dispense with war. The life of the law is a struggle, - a struggle of nations, of the state power, of classes, of individuals.

All the law in the world has been obtained by strife. Every principle of law which obtains first to be wrung by force from those who denied it; and every legal right the legal rights of a whole nation as well as those of individuals supposes a continual readiness to assert it and defend it. The law is not mere theory, but living force. And hence it is that Justice which, in one hand, holds the scales, in which she weighs the right, carries in the other the sword without the scales is brute force, the scales without the sword is the impotence of law. The scales and the sword belong together, and the state of the law is perfect only where the power with which Justice carries the sword is equaled by the skill with which she holds the scales."


Continued on page 2 COMMONPLACE

From the Chair

Robert Mead

LHRB-SIS has a number of exciting activities planned for the Annual Meeting next month. As previously announced in this column, the SIS had three educational programs selected this year. Unfortunately, two of them conflict, so we encourage you to choose the one that interests you the most and attend! I also strongly encourage you to attend both the LHRB-SIS Business Meeting and Roundtable. There are abundant opportunities to get involved in LHRB projects that are both interesting and important.

B-1: Deadwood: *The Power of Film to Teach Foundations in Native American Treaty Law and United States Territorial Law* is scheduled for Sunday, July 17th, from 2:45 to 4:00 p.m. Laura Ray, Victoria Sutton, and I will examine the legal issues presented in the *Deadwood* HBO series along with the potential for using such series as tools for educational enhancement. The program is co-sponsored by the Micrographics/Audio-Visual SIS and the Native Peoples Law Caucus.

B-2: Los Archivos de las Indias: *Judicial and Legislative Information on the Spanish Colonial Period in the United States* is scheduled at the same time. Chris Vallandingham and Bruce Chappell from the University of Florida will describe the process for researching Spanish colonial law and the available sources. This topic is of particular relevance in Texas, along with other western and southern states, given the impact that Spanish law continues to have on issues such as water rights, land grants, and family law.
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“When I was about six, there was a great day in my life: Father cleared a small space for me in one of his bookcases and let me put my own books there. To be precise, he granted me about a quarter of the length of the bottom shelf. I hugged all my books, which up till then had lain on a stool by the side of my bed, carried them in my arms to Father’s bookcase, and stood them up in the proper way, with their backs turned to the world outside and their faces to the wall.

It was an initiation rite, a coming of age: anyone whose books are standing upright is no longer a child, he is a man. I was like my father now. My books were standing to attention.

I had made one terrible mistake. When Father went off to work, I was free to do whatever I wanted with my corner of the bookcase, but I had a wholly childish view about how these things were done. So it was that I arranged my books in order of height. The tallest books were the ones that by now were beneath my dignity, children’s books, in rhyme, with pictures, the books that had been read to me when I was a toddler. I did it because I wanted to fill the whole length of shelf that had been allotted to me. I wanted my section to be packed full crowded, overflowing, like my father’s shelves. I was still in a state of euphoria when Father came home from work, cast a shocked glance toward my bookshelf, and then, in total silence, gave me a long hard look that I shall never forget: it was a look of contempt, of bitter disappointment beyond anything that could be expressed in words, almost a look of utter genetic despair. Finally he hissed at me with pursed lips: “Have you gone completely crazy? Arranging them by height? Have you mistaken your books for soldiers? Do you think they are some kind of honor guard? The firemen’s band on parade?”

Then he stopped talking. There came a long, awesome silence from my father, a sort of Gregor Samsa silence, as though I had turned into a cockroach before his eyes. From my side too there was a guilty silence, as though I really had been some kind of wretched insect all along, and now my secret was out and everything was lost.

At the end of the silence Father began talking, and in the space of twenty minutes he revealed to me the facts of life. He held nothing back. He initiated me into the deepest secrets of the librarian’s lore: he laid bare the main highway as well as the forest tracks, dizzying prospects of variations, nuances, fantasies, exotic avenues, daring schemes, and even eccentric whims. Books can be arranged by subject, by alphabetical order or author’s names, by series or publishers, in chronological order, by languages, by topics, by areas and fields, or even by place of publication. There are so many different ways. And so I learned the secret of diversity. Life is made up of different avenues. Everything can happen in one of several ways, according to different musical scores and parallel logics. Each of these parallel logics is consistent and coherent on its own terms, perfect in itself, indifferent to all the others.

In the days that followed I spent hours on end arranging my little library, twenty or thirty books that I dealt and shuffled like a pack of cards, rearranging them in all sorts of different ways. So I learned from books the art of composition, not from what was in them but from the books themselves, from their physical being. They taught me about that dizzying no-man’s-land or twilight zone between the permitted and the forbidden, between the legitimate and the eccentric, between the normative and the bizarre. This lesson has remained with me ever since. By the time I discovered love, I was no greenhorn. I knew that there were different menus. I knew that there was a motorway and a scenic route, and also unfrequented byways where the foot of man had barely trodden. There were permitted things that were almost forbidden and forbidden things that were almost permitted. There were so many different ways.”

Karen Beck
Elected LH&RB Vice Chair/Chair Elect

Karen S. Beck of the Boston College Law Library has been unanimously elected as Vice-Chair/Chair Elect of the Legal History Rare Book Special Interest Section for 2005-2006. She will be Chair of the SIS in 2006-2007.

Karen is the Curator of Rare Books and Legal Information Librarian and Lecturer in Law at the Boston College Law Library, where she has worked since 1996. She received her B.A. in English from Pomona College, her J.D. from the University of Southern California, and her M.L.S. from UCLA. She has been a member of AALL since 1992, and is currently a member of the Research Committee. She has been a member of the LHRB-SIS since 1996 and served as interim Secretary/Treasurer in 1999-2000.


The final election tally was 78 votes for Karen, none opposed and no write-in candidates.

Congratulations Karen!

–Robert Mead
Legal History & Rare Books SIS
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Editor’s Corner

Yes, I know that the masthead says “Spring 2005” and—as the over 90 degree readings on my thermometer have verified—Spring is now long past. We are running behind on getting this issue out, but running behind is pretty much par for the course for this newsletter. The good news is that it should be available on our website before most of you leave for the Annual Meeting, unless you are traveling by train like me in which case you will probably be in route when this gets posted.

Our President did an excellent job highlighting the various LH&RB programs that await us at the Annual Meeting. I will add an additional event to his list: The AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers, scheduled for Tuesday, 19 July, at 9:00 am, promises to be an excellent program and I urge your attendance.

In our next issue of LH&RB, we hope to feature reviews of the various LH&RB activities at the Annual Meeting. The deadline for the next issue will be 29 August. Remember that we always welcome articles, commentaries, book reviews and other material. Actually, “welcome” doesn’t go far enough—we in fact actively beg for such material. Please send submissions to either of the Editors.

See you in San Antonio!

-Mark Podvia
Deadwood: A Program Preview

“Deadwood: The Power of Film to Teach Foundations in Native American Treaty Law and United States Territorial Law” promises to be an intriguing program at the 2005 Annual Meeting. The Micrographics/AudioVisual and Legal History/Rare Books Special Interest Sections and Native Peoples Law Caucus are sponsoring this 75-minute panel presentation.

Briefly reviewing instructional design elements and benefits of the audiovisual enhancement of learning, the program will then examine key aspects of the 1874-1879 development of territorial government in the Black Hills and virtually simultaneous federal government’s renegotiation of the Treaty of Laramie with the Sioux. Demonstrating audiovisual learning features, the program will play vignettes from the HBO series “Deadwood” as it explains federal government responses to territorial encroachment and mine claims, local efforts to gain federal recognition of land claims and territorial government, as well as federal government tactics to pressure the Sioux to cede their Black Hills.

Program Coordinator and Speaker Laura Ray is the 2004-5 Chair-Elect of the LHRB SIS, a two-time Past-Chair of the M/AV SIS, and the Educational Programing Librarian at the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. She earned her MLS from Case Western Reserve University, and her MA and BA in History from Cleveland State University. A medical librarian for a decade before turning to law in 1989, Laura has presented numerous workshops and lectures at national and regional medical and library conferences since 1982, addressing a myriad of topics on the WorldWideWeb and Internet, legislative advocacy, audiovisual enhancement of learning, educational design and learning styles, as well as legal, medical, and information research. Laura is currently working on a PhD, concentrating on Antebellum slave health care.

Speaker Robert Mead is the 2004-5 Chair of the LHRB SIS, and the Head of Public and Faculty Services at the University of Kansas Wheat Law Library. He earned his JD and BA in History from the University of New Mexico, and his MLS from Emporia State University. A native New Mexican, Rob is interested in the role of lawyers and judges as part of the myth of the West, and has written about the subject for the Kansas Historical Society.

Speaker Victoria Sutton is Professor of Law at the Texas Tech University School of Law, where she teaches Environmental Law, Law and Science, Native American Law, Law and Biotechnology, Law and Bioterrorism, and Constitutional Law. She earned her JD from American University Washington College of Law, her PhD in Environmental Sciences from the University of Texas at Dallas, her MPA from Old Dominion University, and her BS in Zoology and BS in Animal Science from North Carolina State University. Victoria is an enrolled member of the Lumbee Indian Nation, and served as Secretary of the National Native American Bar Association in 2001-2. She has received several awards for her teaching, and has published numerous books, law review articles, and invited editorials on law and science, environmental law, American Indian law, Constitutional law, and law and bioterrorism.

--Laura Ray, Educational Programing Librarian, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law

George Washington University Announces Online Exhibition

The George Washington University Law School Library has posted its first online exhibition, "The Duel." The exhibition can be found on GW's Special Collections website: www.law.gwu.edu/burns/rarebooks/duel.htm.

--Jennie C. Meade, Bibliographer and Rare Books Librarian, George Washington University Law School Library
Cataloging:
"Imperfect Copy:
Worm Holes Throughout":
Copy-Specific Notes in
Rare Book Cataloging

In my first column, I discussed the differences between the descriptive cataloging rules for rare books (DCRB) and the standard descriptive cataloging rules (AACR). DCRB is at the core of rare book cataloging. Beyond DCRB, there are certain rare book cataloging conventions that catalogers and their institutions may or may not choose to implement. One of the most potentially helpful — though time-consuming — of these conventions is the use of copy-specific notes, also called local notes.

Copy-specific notes record information that pertains only to a particular copy of a work. Types of information frequently included in copy-specific notes for rare books include the condition of the book, binding descriptions, and evidence of provenance. Such notes are particularly important in rare book cataloging because there is more variation among individual copies of rare books than among individual copies of modern books and because users care more about the differences that exist. Consider binding, for example. In the hand press era, there was no standard binding for a given edition, as there is with modern books, since binding styles were usually determined by individual booksellers and/or book buyers. Furthermore, the craftsmanship involved in early book bindings makes them more interesting to users.

DCRB provides for, but does not mandate, copy-specific notes. Rule 7C18 states:

Make notes on any special features or imperfections of the copy being described when they are considered important. Carefully distinguish such notes from other kinds of notes that record information valid for all copies of an edition. (For many older publications, however, it will not be readily ascertainable whether the characteristics of a single copy are in fact shared by other copies.) Features that may be brought out here include rubrication, illumination and other hand coloring, manuscript additions, binding and binder, provenance (persons, institutions, bookplates), imperfections and anomalies, and copy number.

"When they are considered important" is a phrase catalogers immediately recognize as meaning that a "rule" is really optional; the decision to use a copy-specific note in any given circumstance is left to cataloger's judgment or to institutional policy. This flexibility benefits catalogers and libraries. Individual catalogers can best judge the importance of a given feature of a book, since they are the ones examining the book. Likewise, individual libraries can best judge not only what features their patrons consider important, but also the most appropriate way to allocate limited cataloging time.

Problems can arise when the decision is left entirely to individual catalogers — that is, when libraries have no policy regarding the use of local notes. One obvious problem is that if a library has two or more rare book catalogers, one may spend inordinate amounts of time recording every detail of the binding, inscriptions, marginalia, etc., while another makes no notes at all. Consistency within the catalog is important on a practical as well as a theoretical level. Consider the hypothetical case of a researcher finding the following notes in two separate records in the same library's catalog:

A true narrative of the trial of Sir Henry Wyndham, for criminal conversation with Ernestina Louisa Erskine, wife of Captain Archibald Erskine — notes as cataloged by Thelma Thorough:

500 Signatures: A-S'T².
500 Publisher's device on t.p.
500 Limp vellum binding, ties lacking. $5 AcU-L
500 Imperfect: lacks leaves C1 and C4; leaf H3 torn. $5 AcU-L
500 Ms. notes in margins. $5 AcU-L
500 Bookplate of Ulysses N. Witherspoon $5 AcU-L
The tryal of Hugh Jenkins for piracy, murther, villainous robberies and barbarities, &c., committed by him, near the coast of the East-Indies and several other places on the seas – notes as cataloged by Quentin Quick:

500 Signatures: a² A-R⁴ S².
500 Head- and tail-pieces; initials.

The researcher would naturally assume – more so than if none of the records in the catalog had copy-specific notes – that The tryal of Hugh Jenkins a) has unremarkable binding, b) has no imperfections or manuscript additions, and c) has unknown provenance. She would never guess that the difference in the number and types of notes simply reflected which catalogor created each record. If our hypothetical researcher were particularly interested in bookplates, for example, she would not bother to look at The tryal of Hugh Jenkins, although it might have an extraordinary bookplate of a well-known contemporary lawyer that Quentin ignored as a matter of routine.

It may not even be a matter of some catalogers making lots of notes and others making very few. Two or more catalogers may each make approximately the same number of local notes but differ on which types they consider important. Even in a library where only one cataloger handles the rare books, having a policy on local notes is a good idea. Such policies can ensure consistency over time. They can also make the cataloging process easier than if the cataloger has to make a judgment call as to whether to include each possible note for every book.

My library does not yet have a written policy on local notes (though it is on our to-do list), and I will admit that I make lots of provenance notes and few binding notes. Why? Well, I could claim that provenance is of more interest to my library’s users, but really it is largely because I find leather distasteful and don’t like to examine bindings to determine what species of animal they were made from. I mention this to illustrate how, in the absence of institutional guidelines, catalogers can make decisions based on completely unexpected factors. Of course, policies don’t eliminate the need for cataloger’s judgment. A guideline such as “Make a note for remarkable bindings” still requires the cataloger to distinguish between the remarkable and the ordinary, but at least it would lead to greater consistency than the unstated, personal guideline, “Make a note about bindings that don’t gross you out.”

Aside from outlining what situations warrant copy-specific notes, a library’s policy needs to address the MARC coding of such notes. As DCRB rule 7C18 mentions, copy-specific notes must be distinguished from notes that pertain to all copies. There are at least three ways to do this with MARC coding: a 590 Local Note field in the bib record, a 500 General Note field in the bib record with the library’s code in subfield $5 (as shown in the examples above), or a note in the holdings record (field tags may vary by system). Above all, a library must consider its system requirements; a field or subfield that cannot be accepted, read or displayed by the system is clearly not a viable choice.

Assuming system requirements are met, each of the options has advantages and disadvantages. The advantage to the 500 or 590 field is that, since it is in the bib record, patrons will see it more easily. The main disadvantage to local notes in the bib record arises when libraries import records from the utilities. If the cataloger neglects to delete another library’s local notes, patrons who see those notes will naturally assume they apply to the local copy – unless they are formulated so clearly as to remove all doubt, e.g., “Library of Congress’s copy lacks t.p.” In a worst-case scenario, a record could be found in the local catalog with such a generic 590 note, e.g., “Library’s copy signed by the author,” that even staff wouldn’t know for sure whose copy it applied to. In a properly coded local 500 note, the library’s code would be in the subfield $5, which would at least tell staff what library the note applied to. However, the subfield $5 usually does not display in the OPAC, so this would not help patrons seeing the note.

Notes in the holdings record are much less susceptible to inadvertent importation by or from other libraries. And if a library records local notes exclusively in the holdings record, any such notes found in the bib record can be deleted automatically. A possible disadvantage to having
notes in the holdings record is that they are usually
not searchable by patrons or even staff. In fact,
users may not even see them if they do not opt to
look at the holdings. However, this is not always a
disadvantage. If a library does not want certain
local notes seen by the public, a suppressed field in
the holdings record is usually the best place for
such notes.

Why would a library bother to make copy-specific
notes but then suppress them from public view?
Perhaps there is information that is considered
likely to make an item a target for theft, such as the
signature of a famous author. Although it might be
tempting to refrain from making notes in such
situations, the information is likely to be useful to
staff, who can view suppressed notes. Also, there is
a potential security reason for making local notes
about valuable books: in the event that an item is
stolen and later recovered, any copy-specific notes
in the record may help establish ownership of the
recovered item.

To return to the issue of searchability, another
decision to be made is whether to add traceable
local headings for copy-specific information. The
subfield $5$ can be applied to fields other than the
500 note field; for example, it can be used in 655
fields to trace genre headings such as Autographs
(Provenance) or Clasps (Binding), or in 700 fields to
trace the names of previous owners.

Headings for 655 fields in rare book and special
collections cataloging have been established and
collected in several thesauri by the Association
of College and Research Libraries, including two that
are particularly useful for copy-specific information: *Binding Terms* and *Provenance
Evidence*. 655 fields with terms from these thesauri
are coded with the second indicator 7 (Source
specified in subfield $2$); subfield $2$ is coded *rbbin*
for terms from *Binding Terms* and *rprov* for terms
from *Provenance Evidence*. For example:

655 #7 Pigskin bindings (Binding) $z$ Germany
$y 15^{th}$ century. $z$ rbbin $5$ AcU-L
655 #7 Donors’ bookplates (Provenance) $z$
$rprov$ $5$ AcU-L

Genre terms in 655 fields use a controlled
vocabulary thanks to the thesauri. Personal and
corporate names in 700 and 710 fields, on the other
hand, are much more difficult to control. Since
inscriptions, bookplates, etc., often contain no more
than a name, it is often impossible to establish with
certainty that the name represents the same person
or body as a heading in the authority file - if
indeed there is an established heading at all. The
difficulty of authority control is one reason some
libraries may choose not to trace name headings
related to provenance or to do so only in a limited
number of situations, such as in the case of major
donors.

Libraries that do choose to trace such names face
yet another decision: whether to include a relator
term or code. Relator terms are words or phrases
that describe the relationship of a person or body to
the work, such as compiler and editor. They fell out
of wide use when the Library of Congress stopped
using them in standard cataloging. However, LC
and many other libraries still use both general and
copy-specific relator terms in rare book cataloging.
Copy-specific relator terms are usually related to
provenance and include former owner and donor.
Alternately, libraries may choose to use relator
codes, such as *fmo* for “former owner” or *dnr* for
“donor”. Relator terms are entered in subfield $e$;
relator codes are entered in subfield $4$. For
example:

700 1# Osgood, DeWitt Satterfield. $e$ former
owner. $5$ AcU-L
or

700 1# Osgood, DeWitt Satterfield. $4$ fmo. $5$
AcU-L

Of course, the argument against the necessity of
relator terms in standard cataloging, namely that
the relationship of the person or body to the book
should be obvious from the description and/or
notes in the AACR2 record, can also be made
against their use in rare book cataloging. However,
they do make the functions immediately obvious to
patrons who might otherwise have to read many
lengthy descriptive and note fields to determine
what a given person or body had to do with the
book.
The use of copy-specific notes is an issue that deserves careful consideration by libraries with substantial rare books and special collections. While the easiest way to deal with the wide variety of options available would be to make a blanket policy against using copy-specific notes under any circumstances, the potential advantages of such notes makes them worth the trouble of adding at least some of the time. And the various degrees to which local notes may be used, as well the variety of methods available for adding such notes, makes the formulation of a policy on the matter worthwhile for any library that does a significant amount of rare book cataloging.

—Sarah Yates, Cataloging Librarian, University of Minnesota Law Library

Member News

Dr. Joel Fishman, Assistant Director for Lawyer Services for Duquesne University Center for Legal Information/Allegheny County Law Library, has had a busy spring. Kudos to Joel for receiving the 2005 SCCLL Connie E. Bolden Publications Award! Awarded every third year since 1993, the Bolden Award recognizes a member of the SCCLL-SIS who has made a significant contribution to the profession through scholarly publication – in this case, Joel’s extensive publication of books and articles dealing with Pennsylvania law over the past twenty-five years.

And the list keeps growing! Here are Joel’s recent publications:


And last but not least, in his capacity as co-director of the Pennsylvania Constitution Web Site, Joel reports that Duquesne has received $15,000 from the Pennsylvania Department of Economic and Community Development for a digitization grant entitled “Digitizing Pennsylvania Constitutional Law Documents.” Senator Jay A. Costa, Jr. assisted in obtaining this grant for the law school. This grant will enable the digitizing of the journals and debates of the constitutional conventions of 1776, 1790, 1838 and 1874. There is approximately 20,000 pages that will be scanned and made available at the web site, www.paconstitution.duq.edu. The grant will also cover the revision of the web site. This grant supplements an earlier grant from the PA Bar Trust Fund which provided funding to put up the 1967-68 constitutional convention documents. It is hoped that the project will be completed by the end of the summer. For more information, get in touch with Joel at fishman@duq.edu.

Congratulations to our SIS Chair Robert Mead, Head of Public & Faculty Services at the University of Kansas Wheat Law Library! He has been awarded tenure and promoted to Librarian II.

Moving up in the world: LHRB-SIS webmaster and former chair Kurt X. Metzmeier has been named Acting Director of the law library of the University of Louisville Louis D. Brandeis School of Law. He will be temporarily replacing current director David Ensigh who has been named acting dean of the law school. Kurt, who is wrapping up the third edition of his book The Kentucky Legal Research Manual, is excited about the opportunity, but has assured his new dean that he won't spend the entire budget on rare books. (Ed. note: go on and do it, Kurt, we won't tell!!)

Paul Pruit of the University of Alabama's Bounds Law Library reports that the library will be
publishing #5 in its award-winning series of Occasional Publications. Commonplace Books of Law: A Selection of Law-Related Notebooks from the Seventeenth Century to the Mid-Twentieth Century should be available in July, and as before, copies will be free of charge. Interested parties are encouraged to get in touch with Paul at ppruitt@law.ua.edu or at (205) 348-1107.

LHRB's own Secretary/Treasurer Katherine Topulos has an article forthcoming in Volume 24, Issue 1/2 of Legal Reference Services Quarterly: "English Legal History Research: A Guide to Core Academic Law Library Materials." The paper was based on her presentation at a LHRB-sponsored panel on "Legal History from the Reference Desk: Connecting the Past to Today's Information Needs" at the 2002 AALL Annual Meeting in Orlando.

--Karen Beck, Curator of Rare Books, Boston College Law Library

Recent Acquisitions

Fred Shapiro reports that the Yale Law Library has received an extremely generous gift of approximately 3000 books, mostly relating to the social sciences, given by Professor W. Michael Reisman, Myres S. McDougal Professor of International Law at Yale Law School. These books formerly belonged to the late Harold Laswell, who taught in the Law School and Political Science Department at Yale from 1946 to 1971 and was one of the most important political scientists of the twentieth century. The most notable book in this collection is a true first edition of Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan (1651). Also very noteworthy are first editions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Confessions (1782) and William Petty's An Essay Concerning the Multiplication of Mankind (1682).

And I am pleased to report that the Boston College Law Library has acquired an illuminated manuscript Officium Beatae Mariae Virginis, a Book of Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, donated by Daniel R. Coquillette, J. Donald Monan, S.J. University Professor at the Law School. Dating from Italy in the late 1300s or early 1400s, the manuscript is written in black and red on vellum. It features intricately illuminated or painted initials, and colored floral borders illuminated with gold. The inside cover of the manuscript is signed AEx Dono ComitiYGrimaldi de BellinoY1788, and could have belonged to the famous Grimaldi family of Monaco. The manuscript will be on exhibit in Spring 2006, but faculty and friends got a sneak peek at a "Meet the Manuscript" reception on May 18. For more information, visit http://www.bc.edu/schools/law/newsevents/2005-archive/32205/.

--Karen Beck, Curator of Rare Books, Boston College Law Library

LH&RB San Antonio Happenings

Deadwood: The Power of Film to Teach Foundations in Native American Treaty Law and United States Territorial Law and Los Archivos de las Indias: Judicial and Legislative Information on the Spanish Colonial Period in the United States—Sunday, July 17th, 2:45 pm (Please note: the two programs will be meeting at the same time!)

LHRB-SIS Business Meeting—Sunday, July 17th, 5:30 pm

LHRB-SIS Roundtable—Monday, July 18th, 10:15 am

The AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers—Tuesday, July 19th, 9:00 am

Values, Video, and Vignettes: Using Video Oral History Techniques to Document the Unwritten Histories of AALL—Wednesday, July 20th, 3:00 pm