From the Editor

This is my last issue as editor of Technical Services Law Librarian, and I would like to take this chance to say thank you to everyone who has made this an enjoyable and rewarding job. First and foremost, I need to thank Linda Tesar who has been not only a great layout designer and witty purveyor of pointed graphical bon mots, but a counselor as well. Her prior experience as co-editor of the newsletter and her willingness to share that experience saved me from many pitfalls. The ones she didn’t save me from were entirely my own doing. Secondly, I thank the ever-reliable and efficient Cindy May, the Business Manager, who has the responsibility for printing, mailing, and keeping subscriptions in order; and I thank Martin Wisneski, who as our Webmaster sees to it that every issue is available online as soon as possible. It was a joint effort every time, and I am extremely grateful for the friendly cooperation of all on the administrative team.

I would also like to thank the SIS chairs and the members of the TSLL Board who have worked with me. They have always been candid and encouraging. They have helped in selecting the strong group of columnists and have offered sound advice whenever I have asked.

Finally, I thank the columnists, those who provide the real meat in this newsletter. We have always been fortunate in belonging to an organization whose experts are willing to share their expertise. I know many of our writers would disclaim any pretension to the title “expert”, but I think it applies to all of them – talented professionals with an ability to educate their colleagues. Thanks to you all, and keep up the good work.

Now, on to the next phase. Brian Striman, our esteemed colleague from the University of Nebraska, will be taking on the editorial duties. Brian has been a frequent contributor to TSLL and a notable presence in our profession for many years. He will need everyone’s support as he works to put his own stamp on TSLL. Good luck Brian!

– Joe Thomas
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From the Chair

It ain’t over till it’s over ... but now it is. In my final column as OBS-SIS Chair I want to thank all of those who have helped to keep our SIS running over the last year. We have been hard at work preparing programs, meetings, receptions and many other activities for the conference this summer. Our At Large members, Ruth Funabiki and Andrea Rabbia, our Secretary/Treasurer Michael Maben, and our globe trotting Vice Chair/Chair Elect Georgia Briscoe have all done a wonderful job preparing for the conference in Boston. I know you will all appreciate their hard work.

OBS Election Results

The results of the 2004 OBS-SIS elections are:

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect
Richard M. Jost

Member-at-Large
Caitlin Robinson

Congratulations to Richard and Caitlin! OBS will continue to be in good hands. Many thanks to Susan Chinoransky and Shannon Burchard for agreeing to serve as candidates.

OBS Meetings in Boston

AALL restructured the number of educational program slots for the Boston meeting. This allowed for greater flexibility in meeting scheduling. Gary van der Meer and I worked to minimize conflicts between TS and OBS meetings and were hopefully successful. Here is the schedule for the Boston conference:

Saturday, July 10, 2004
OBS-SIS Board Meeting 2003-2004
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

Sunday, July 11, 2004
OBS-SIS RLIN Committee Open Discussion
12:00 PM - 1:15 PM

OBS-SIS OCLC/WLN Committee Open Discussion
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

Monday, July 12, 2004
OBS-SIS Business Meeting
5:15 PM - 6:15 PM

OBS-SIS Education Committee
7:00 AM - 8:45 AM

OBS-SIS Local Systems Committee Open Discussion
10:15 AM - 11:30 AM

Tuesday, July 13, 2004
OBS-SIS & TS-SIS Research Roundable
11:45 AM - 1:00 PM

Wednesday, July 14, 2004
OBS-SIS Board Meeting 2004-2005
7:00 AM - 8:45 AM

OBS-SIS Web Advisory Committee Meeting
7:00 AM - 8:45 AM

OBS Sponsored Programs in Boston

Four of the original six program proposals sent to the AMPSC by OBS were accepted this year.

Monday, July 12, 2004
C-3: OPAC Usability Assessment: Your Passport to an Effective Web Presence
9:00 AM - 10:00 AM

Wednesday, July 14, 2004
H-3: XML and MARC: Should We Remodel or Build Anew?
9:00 AM - 10:30 AM

I-6: Two Stepping With Technology Returns
1:30 PM - 2:00 PM

K-2: MARBI Report: What’s the Latest on MARC Standards?
3:00 PM - 3:30 PM

Georgia Briscoe is working with the Education Committee to plan our programs for the conference in San Antonio. Please share your ideas for programs with Georgia! She and the committee have already compiled an impressive list of potential topics and speakers. More ideas are always welcome!

Thanks to everyone

It has been a pleasure to work with such a talented and dedicated group of people over the last year. Vice Chair Georgia Briscoe, Past Chair Mary Jane Kelsey, Secretary-Treasurer Michael Maben and Members at Large Andrea Rabbia and Ruth Funabiki have all represented our SIS well and will continue to do so under Georgia’s leadership. Thank you as well to our great group of committee chairs Georgia Briscoe Education, Corinne Jacox Local Systems, Ismael Gullon Nominations, Eloise Vondruska Joint Research Grant, Darcy Jones OCLC, Virginia Bryant RLIN, and Anne Myers Web Advisory for their hard work. In addition, I extend my own thanks and the thanks of our SIS to Joe Thomas and Linda Tesar for their wonderful work on TSLL. It is consistently the best newsletter in our association.

Thank you all for giving me the opportunity to serve! I’ll see everyone in Boston!
In my most recent article, I remarked that it was 13 below on the way to work. Today, we may hit 80 above. Ah, Illinois, land of the four seasons, occasionally all in one day. Home of our headquarters, probably never again home to our convention, this is the season when “hope springs eternal” gets a bit of a boost.

This is also the season when we look forward to gathering together, instead of just reading each other’s contributions to Law-Lib. If this will be your first convention, take a bit of advice from one who has been there before, sometimes with more success than others. You can plan a meeting for each program slot, commit to attending each business meeting, the plenary sessions, etc. You will also, before the end of the convention on Wednesday, be dead tired, physically and emotionally. Convention centers and headquarter hotels don’t vary all that much. The cities do. The markets in Philadelphia and Seattle were wonderful to visit. In Washington, walking around a steaming city made it apparent why the deficit is as large as it is. But putting your feet into the reflecting pool and looking toward the Lincoln Memorial can bring back memories of other gatherings there, events far more important in our nation’s history. I didn’t make it to Alameda, and my most distinct memory of Orlando is having my glasses fog up every time I moved between the Convention Center and the Peabody. But in Baltimore, we were a few blocks from Camden Yard (and I hear the Red Sox will be home while we are in town), and the last time we were in Boston the history was all around us. So, take off the sweater you’ll probably need in the meeting rooms, and take some time to experience where you are, not just what you’re there to do.

However, having expressed that opinion, please come to the TS, et al., reception on Saturday evening, and don’t miss the TS business meeting on Sunday. We’ll be discussing the usual business things, talking about the TS Mentoring program, presenting the Renee D. Chapman award, etc. (As of now, it’s a secret, but say congratulations to Pat Turpening!)

We’ll be done in plenty of time for you to get some dinner and then head to the Opening Event and the Dessert Extravaganza.

We are sponsoring several programs, along with a pre-convention workshop on SCCTP cataloging. On Sunday, Alan Keely, James Heller, and Jean Pajerek will be discussing the budgeting process and that painful word, cut. On Tuesday, Ann Sitkin will lead a group talking about the future of AACR. Wednesday will see the program on international and foreign publishers, with Carmen Brigandi and Pamela Blun, and we will hear the traditional CC:DA and SAC reports from Marie Whited and Kathy Winzer, while Susan Goldner presents her last report on MARBI (for technical reasons, sponsored by OBS). Beyond that, find a program or two that interests you in a way that may not be directly related to what you do. I am privileged (no, I really don’t have to say that) to work at the reference desk occasionally, and there’s a program on “Negotiating with the Bizarre” that looks promising. In my past is the interview with the young man that wanted to find the “legal definition of a roadblock”, since he didn’t think that two police officers on the side of the road, one with hand extended in what I thought might be interpreted as a universal symbol for “STOP” meant that he couldn’t pass by without doing so. There’s also one on ABA statistics, that annual post convention activity that brings many of us so much pleasure. I hope to see many of you at the convention. I also hope you will be involved in the activities of the SIS, and maybe even win a prize in the Exhibit Hall.

Finally, since this is the last of my reports, thank you for the opportunity to serve as the TS-SIS chair. There are many phenomenal people in this SIS, many of whom I’ve worked with this year and in the past. Some I have met just this year. I remember being challenged years ago to be involved, and if this could happen to me, it can happen to you, and you will be rewarded as I have been. Volunteer to help. Cindy May will be happy to hear from you.

Gary Vander Meer
gvandermeer@niu.edu
This past Summer I was able to attend the Advanced Cataloging Institute before the AALL Annual Meeting in Seattle. One of the sessions, presented by Jolande Goldberg of the Library of Congress and author of many of the K schedules, was on LC Classification.

Ms. Goldberg addressed classification questions she had been given before the session. These questions were on various parts of the K schedule which even advanced catalogers have difficulty with. One question posed was “the Refugee question.” In a project re-classing JX4292.R4, Refugees, the question is – where do these books go?

**OPTION ONE IS** K3230.R4

*Law in general. Comparative and uniform law. Jurisprudence*

*Comparative law. International uniform law*

*Constitutional law*

*Individual and state*

*Nationality and citizenship*

*Special groups A-Z – Refugees.*

This number should be used for works dealing with comparisons of the law relating to refugees in two or more countries in different regions, or for works dealing with refugees in general in terms of transnational law.

Example 1A: *International Refugee law: a primer*

Main subject heading: Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc.

Example 1B: *Asylum law and practice in Europe and North America: a comparative analysis*

Subject headings:

*Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc.—Europe;*

*Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc.—North America;*

*Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc.—United States.*

**OPTION TWO IS** K7128.S7

*Law in general. Comparative and uniform law. Jurisprudence*

*Private international law. Conflict of laws*

*Persons*

*Natural persons*

*Civil status*

*Nationality and domicile*

*Nationality*

*Special topics, A-Z*

*Stateless persons. Refugees*

This would be used for population displacement, civil strife, refugee populations in rogue states and the international humanitarian law pertaining to refugees. All refugees from war or war time conflicts class here – keeping in mind that war includes civil conflict and warlords. The key point to remember here is that KZ6530 is for refugees under the topic of Humanitarian law. These books have to deal with the topic of refugees in the area of humanitarian law.

Example 2A: *The international protection of internally displaced persons*

Main subject heading: Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc,

*Additional subject headings:* Refugees—International cooperation; Civil war; Humanitarian law

Example 2B: *Mass refugee influx and the limits of public international law*

Main subject heading: Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc,

*Additional subject headings:* Refugees—Protection—International cooperation; Humanitarian law

Example 2C: *Refugee protection in international law: UNHCR’s global consultations on international protection*

Main subject heading: Refugees—Legal status, laws, etc,

*Additional subject heading:* Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)

[Do a search in the Library of Congresses’ catalog for this title and follow the link to Full Text at the bottom of the full record display for more information on the subject of this work]

**OPTION THREE IS** K7128.S7

*Law in general. Comparative and uniform law. Jurisprudence*

*Conflict of Laws on Citizenship, statelessness and the legal status of stateless persons.* This number would be used when classing a work dealing with the conflict of laws relating to refugees in different regions. I think it is safe...
to say from my perusal of many online catalogs, that this number will not be the one to use for most works we encounter.

Remember that when looking at other online catalogs including the Library of Congress that many works classed in K should now be in KZ because they were classed before the creation of the JZ/KZ schedule. Also some works are not classed correctly as there has been some confusion between human rights and humanitarian law.

Also keep in mind that Class K is for comparative and uniform law, private international law (universal, i.e. inter-regional or supra-regional in scope or application), and global intergovernmental organizations as far as they do not belong to Class KZ. Class KZ on the other hand is for public international law, also universal in scope and application, including the global intergovernmental organizations belonging to the realm of public international law.

In the end as Jolande Goldberg said at the Advanced Cataloging Institute you just have to “make your own choices,” – or as we are so used to hearing, use cataloger’s judgment. This area deserves watching and possibly more clarification.

I like this column to be pragmatic, with a focus on resources to help collection development librarians in their daily work. But frankly, I’m running out of practical tips.

It’s not news to anyone that the legal publishing industry has changed dramatically in the last ten years. As a collection development librarian I’ve followed these changes closely and tried to remain optimistic about the effect of the new publishing environment on our library resources and services. Instead I am increasingly pessimistic about our ability to manage and shape our own collections rather than simply reacting to the latest developments in legal publishing.

I want to focus this column on three things that are troubling me, things that keep me awake at night.

• **Pricing** – I accept that there are sound reasons for companies to have different pricing models for different products and customers. Law librarians often say we want one price for all, but in fact we want to tailor products, services and prices to our specific situations. These days it is hard work understanding all the pricing options and negotiating the best deal for our libraries, but it would be worth the effort if we achieved a result that was cost-beneficial for our users. Unfortunately the price increases we have seen from all the major publishers in the past couple of years are backing us into a corner and forcing us to eliminate resources we once thought essential. When companies report a 15% profit and project 15% price increases at the same time that the Consumer Price Index rose only 2-3%, it’s impossible to comprehend how libraries are going to stay in business and meet the demands of their users. Our budgets simply can’t absorb the costs.

• **Branding and Product Development** – There was a time when a publisher’s name denoted a particular kind of product, either in form or in content or both. As global conglomerates have swallowed up legal publishers, those distinctions have diminished. Branding is a concept that I once thought would help maintain the unique identity of formerly independent publishers. Now it is clear that branding is a way to replace not only the name but also the essence of those publishers. Conglomerates are not interested in retaining the identity of the smaller publishers they acquire; conglomerates want to brand their own name on everything they produce. Companies now own multiple competing products in the same subject areas, and the quality of those products is diminishing rather than improving. Development of new and innovative products seems less important than the name recognition of the parent corporation.

• **Globalization** – This legacy of 20th century business expansion worries me the most, because it is driving the new look in the legal information industry. Mergers and acquisitions are expensive, and companies must recover their costs and improve their profit margins in order to satisfy their shareholders. Higher prices and branding of products are only two of the results of globalization. We are
also seeing the consolidation of sales forces, the creation of shared service centers, the reduction or elimination of personalized customer service, and a decline in general customer communications. We can’t do business as usual, because the rules and the players change regularly and without warning.

Where will it all end? Sometimes I’m convinced that a vocal and united front of consumer advocacy can stem the tide of change. At other times, and perhaps more realistically, I know that the publishing industry is merely following the indicators of a global economy and responding to the needs of an increasingly global legal profession.

There are days when I long for a kinder, gentler time, whatever that was. More often, however, I recognize that there have always been challenges in collection development, and it is by sharing and discussing those challenges with each other that we can meet them.

So I’d like to turn the next column over to our readers. How are you responding to the changes in legal publishing and pricing? Send me your thoughts, tips, and success stories by August 1 at mmaxtmann@stthomas.edu. I look forward to hearing from you!

---

**Description & Entry**

George A. Prager  
New York University  
prargerg@juris.law.nyu.edu

**Laws of Multiple Jurisdictions**  
(Addendum to *TSLL* v.29, no.3)

In my last *TSLL* column, I discussed what I thought would be the best way to catalog a work entitled: *The Swiss federal code of obligations: with the Turkish alterations*. Although the work includes a commentary, I’m excluding it from discussion here as it’s not given primary importance in the chief source of information. Since the text of the Swiss law seemed to be emphasized in the chief source, I opted for main entry under Switzerland, with uniform title (240) for the Swiss law, and a jurisdiction-uniform title added entry for the Turkish law. The text indicates Turkish modifications to the Swiss code in brackets of the form [ ]; and other symbols to indicate words of the Swiss text omitted in the Turkish adoption, and Turkish additions to the Swiss text. So I think you could go either way on this one, and not be wrong.

Another thought: can we consider this a collection of laws governing more than one jurisdiction (AACR Code 21.31B2), and thus enter it as a collection (title main entry, with jurisdiction-uniform title added entries for the two laws)? The definition of “collection” as given in the LCRI [Library of Congress rule interpretations] Appendix D, Glossary is as follows:

> “If one main entry heading would be appropriate: two or more independent works published together and not written for the same occasion or for the publication being cataloged.”

Aside from the commentary, the book really only has one text in three languages, though that one text gives two different laws…

Well, I wish I could give a definitive answer for this one, but I think it boils down to the dreaded “cataloger’s judgment.” I would have a slight preference for main entry under the Swiss law, with a second choice for main entry under the Turkish law (almost as strong a case), and a third possible if not plausible choice for treating this as a collection of laws under 21.31B2.

**Integrating Resources: Use field 247 for former uniform titles?**

A discussion on the pcc-ircat listserve in early April 2004 raised a question of at least philosophical import to law catalogers: When a serial becomes an integrating resource (or vice versa) but doesn’t change its title proper, we are
instructed to add a uniform title on the record for the later resource (RI 25.5 “Uniform titles: Conflict Resolution: Integrating Resources). What should be done with the uniform title if the title proper of the newer resource changes so that it no longer matches the title proper on the record for the older bibliographic resource?

Luckily, titles of integrating resources, while somewhat changeable, are usually more distinctive than serial titles, so that a conflict between the two is not a common occurrence. (I certainly have never encountered it.)

James Caudwell, who originally brought up the question, cites the following real life example (irc-cat: Apr. 6, 2004, 2:11 p.m.): The serial: Directory and list of the lodges (in the British Isles) of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Manchester Unity Friendly Society” changes its form of issuance to become an updating loose-leaf which first bears the same title proper, so that a uniform title needs to be assigned to the latter work: title proper plus parenthetical qualifier (1992). In December 1996, the title proper of the new work changes to: “Directory and list of the lodges in the United Kingdom of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Manchester Unity Friendly Society.”

Most importantly, the new title proper of the resource should replace the earlier title in the 245 field, and the earlier title moved to the 247 field, and a subfield “i” added to the 247 field, giving the dates during which it was used (LCRIs 12.7A2 and 12.7B4.2). Since there is no longer a conflict with the title proper of the serial, the uniform title is no longer needed. If a user were to seek the bibliographic record through the known uniform title heading, the new 247 field containing the earlier title minus the qualifier most likely would provide sufficient access. Would there be cases where the former uniform title would still provide a useful access point, and so should be retained? That might theoretically be possible, but it is likely to be quite a rare occurrence.

As fields 247/547 are to be used only for added entries/notes relating to the former title proper (RI 12.7B4.1), an added entry for the former uniform title would most suitably be put in field 246, with a suitable note in the subfield “i.” Also, the linking field (785) on the serial record referring to the later resource needs to be updated, with the former uniform title being replaced by the new title proper on the integrating resource record.

At the recent BIBCO/CONSER Operations Committee Meetings at the Library of Congress (May 6-7, 2004), the question was raised as to whether or not LCRI 25.5B should be revised to remove the requirement for use of a uniform title and qualifier when a serial becomes an integrating resource or vice versa with the same title proper? Committee members seemed to be in favor of the status quo, but if there is sufficient desire to change the policy, Judy Kuhagen stated that LC would be quite willing to do so.

2004 Updates to AACR2

As announced at the above meetings, the 2004 update to AACR2 should be published in a few months. Since AACR3 is in all likelihood only a few years away, the changes in the 2004 update are not expected to be too significant. At least three of the changes are putting in practice what is already in the LCRIs: Chapter 1.0 will begin with “What is being cataloged?”, and include basis of description for all modes of issuance; 12.1E1 will expand the current provision for other title information of serials to apply to integrating resources as well; rules 21.2 will be reordered to clarify that the “major/minor” changes distinction applies only to serials and to series-like phrases. The Library of Congress plans to simultaneously implement the AACR2 2004 update and its own revised LCRIs on September 1, 2004 and will revise its own rule interpretations in line with the amendments. Other relevant documentation will also be updated in as timely a manner as possible, including the Integrating resources module and related SCCTP [Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program] course.

Preferred Form of Notes

Robert Bremer of OCLC has proposed that whenever possible, prescriptive language be used for two types of common notes in bibliographic records for online serials: Field 530 (Additional physical form available note) and field 538 (System details note). As Robert points out, use of uniform language whenever possible for these notes would have several significant advantages: it would simplify the cataloging process and the training of cataloging staff, and facilitate future machine manipulation of the data. Excluding all the variations containing typographical errors, he found nearly 200 forms of note indicating that a serial is accessible online, and what looks to be at least that many forms of note indicating mode of access for a serial is through the World Wide Web. He has several suggestions for the 530 note, depending upon the situation. For the 538 Mode of access note, he recommends using: “Mode of access: World Wide Web.” (This section is based upon a presentation Robert gave at the CONSER meetings on May 7, and his report dated November 2003 entitled: Proposal to Standardize Routine 530 and 538 Notes in Bibliographic Records for Online Serials (http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/notes.html ; last viewed May 25, 2004).
It seems unbelievable to me that almost three years have passed since I became MARBI Representative. It has been a wonderful, if sometimes frightening, experience in a challenging and surprisingly interesting position. I want to thank you for the honor of representing you at the MARC table.

I leave with at least one piece of unfinished business. The section symbol [%] is still not available for use in MARC records. (Neither is the paragraph symbol for that matter.) Although there is talk about implementation of the full UNICODE, no timetable for it has been announced. So we are left with the question of whether we should try again.

In case you are wondering what in the world I am talking about, let me give a little background. Because MARC 21 is a communications format with such a wide and varied group of users, it employs a limited range of characters. The introduction to the Character Set chapter in MARC 21 Specifications for Record Structure, Character Sets, and Exchange Media states:

A very large repertoire of characters is defined for use in the MARC-8 environment, including over 15,000 Chinese, Japanese, and Korean ideographs. For standard MARC 21 interchange, the use of UCS/Unicode UTF-8 is limited to this same repertoire, a subset of UCS/Unicode. This is necessary for interchange until all systems fully accommodate the full UCS/Unicode repertoire of characters. The restriction will be periodically reviewed for additional opportunities in the developing character encoding environment.

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/specifications/speccharintro.html>

The specifics are important only to true techies. What is important to us is that the § is not included, even though over 16,000 other characters are allowed.

Diane Hillmann, now at the National Science Digital Library, Cornell University, has been the champion of the § for years, arguing its case at every opportunity. In fact, she got it approved for inclusion in the MARC character set years ago, as an amendment to Proposal 93-10 (yes, this was in 1993). But the § was dropped, apparently because its use was too difficult for the utilities/vendors to implement. Read Diane’s MARC Remarks column in March 1994 if you want the whole story (TSLL 19:3). Even though she is no longer working in a law library, she has not given up. In San Diego she told me that we should try again.

At this same time in 1993, it was decided that no more characters would be added to the MARC character set until UNICODE was fully implemented. But nine years later, in June 2002, two symbols were added at the request of the British Library – the Euro and the Eszett. (They are not being implemented in this country, just in Canada and Great Britain.) This seems to offer us some hope. However, whether or not we would be successful is an open question.

If you think this is important to pursue and can produce records to document its need, I will help my successor draft a proposal for MARBI. Please let me or my successor know what you think. If you want us to try again, please send us an estimate of how many of your records are affected and some samples to support the argument. Because there is substantial resistance to this in MARBI, the proposal is doomed to fail if we cannot make a strong case. But if we can prove the section symbol’s importance in our catalogs, we can give it a good try.

I’ll end this column with the same words Diane used in 1994, “watch this space for further developments.”
Double Takes on Preservation

Preservation is the basic business of libraries. Librarians preserve knowledge for future generations. That is what we do. And yet, how often do our libraries have no money or time for preservation? It is very time-consuming and it can be tedious. It is not cheap. It must be done with great care. A recent survey in Technical Services Law Librarian indicated that the preservation column was the least popular of the columns in the newsletter. One of the drawbacks of this column could be that it tackles a problem of enormity beyond the scope of any newsletter. Having said that, I will make the disclaimer that this column cannot conquer all of the challenges preservation presents and I will venture forth with a few suggestions:

What is the best response to these facts?

If there is no money for preservation, grant writing might be an approach. The following URL lists some grant sources:

http://www.mlin.lib.ma.us/mlblc/ldev/preservation_grant.shtml

It is written especially for New England, but there are agencies listed that are not in New England. It gives the deadlines for a goodly number of grants. Again, my good friend Google assisted me. If you search for preservation grants, be sure to specify library preservation grants. Otherwise you might find information on historic buildings. If that is what you are seeking, then you won’t be disappointed.

There are, not surprisingly, books on grant writing, such as:


Check your online public access catalog for what you might have in-house. And don’t forget Amazon. Amazon.com has over 50 titles on grant writing. An example is


How Foundations Work is a relatively expensive work. A less expensive title is


And, yes, there is even a “Complete Idiot’s Guide” to grant writing.

Academic libraries and corporate libraries might have access to someone who can help them write grants. This could eliminate some of the time involved, being one of the largest obstacles to preservation. It would also put the grant writing into the hands of someone experienced with the process.

If time is one of the largest obstacles, how can it be overcome?

It takes an enormous amount of hubris to say anything about this challenge. It appears to be even of greater magnitude than the challenge of money. Nevertheless, I will take a stab at it. When addressing this issue, I think of getting help. (This is what the grant writer seeks to do as well.) The Virginia Beach Public Library System has gotten help in the form of well-trained, dedicated volunteers who extend the life of the books in this system. Well-trained, dedicated volunteers seem to be a key to getting work, for which there is no time, done. Volunteers with experience in book repair, maybe retired bookbinding industry people, would be invaluable finds. People with an art background could be very helpful. Future librarians with an interest in preservation could be a possibility. Students with artistic talent could provide a lower-cost preservation work force. The theory is that volunteers help both themselves and their organization. Volunteerism is a popular force in this country. It would be good to harness it.

An even more obvious answer to the time quandary is one that we all are probably doing, using book binders. Binders do the majority of our preservation. Some binders do very involved conservation as well. They save us vast amounts of time. Their new software saves us time and makes our work easier. Many people think of binderies when they think of preservation. This is the sum total of preservation in libraries, in many instances.

And no, I haven’t solved the big preservation challenges. I have just made a couple of simple suggestions. However, I can make this column more responsive to your needs if you will let me know what they are. E-mail me at swambold@richmond.edu I will try to address your concerns and we can have a conversation.
Criticism—Painful, Priceless

I vividly remember tearing open the long-anticipated reply to my first article submission. In my hubris and naiveté, I expected to read something like, “Wow, this is the most timely and well-written piece I have ever seen! Why have you deprived the world of your genius for so long?” Instead, the letter said something to the effect of, “This was a fresh topic—last year. Oh, and by the way, enough with the passive voice already.” Devastated is too strong a word to describe my reaction, yet disappointed is much too weak. I probably resembled many an American Idol contestant immediately after a performance—eagerly searching for approval in the judges’ eyes, yet often dealt a barbed retort.

When one aspires to be a writer, criticism is inevitable. It stings even if it is not delivered Simon Cowell-style. But just because criticism is hurtful does not mean it is bad. Quite the opposite; it is an essential part of authorship. So the question becomes not will we be criticized, but how will we handle it?

Receiving Criticism

Honest criticism is hard to take, particularly from a relative, a friend, an acquaintance, or a stranger.

—Franklin P. Jones

When receiving criticism, attitude is key. Too often we take it as a personal attack. While that may sometimes be true with your interpersonal relationships, it is rarely true with your writing. Learn to look at constructive criticism in a positive way and view it as a learning tool. Remember that an editor’s ultimate intent is to make your writing successful.

But is all criticism valid criticism? No. How others react to your writing is very subjective—editors are not all-knowing. For instance, Dr. Seuss’ first book was rejected by 28 publishers. The trick, then, is to identify criticism you can use to improve your work. Here are some hints:

• Are you getting the same comments over and over again? If so, try making the suggested changes.
• Don’t let your ego get in the way. Our natural response is to say all criticism of our work is wrong, but force yourself to keep an open mind.
• Give yourself time to digest the comments. Suggestions that seem illogical in the heat of the moment may seem more reasonable two or three days later when you have calmed down.

Of course, your work must remain your work and not be commandeered by someone else. But I like this quote from Catherine Ryan Hyde: “I often say that you must never, ever, under any circumstances, change your work just because someone tells you to—unless, of course, they’re right.” When faced with constructive criticism, the real question you must answer is “Do I agree?” Considerable reflection is needed to answer that question honestly. If you refuse to make the changes that an editor asks for, be prepared to explain why.

Soliciting A Personal Critic

Before you criticize someone, walk a mile in their shoes. That way, you’ll be a mile from them, and you’ll have their shoes.

— Jack Handey, Deep Thoughts

It is one thing to deal with criticism that finds you. It is another thing entirely to seek it out on your own. Who in their right mind walks into a pack of wolves wearing hamburger underwear? But that is just what I am suggesting. William G Tapply points out several advantages to searching for and grooming a personal critic who will review your work before you submit it. Your personal critic is a set of fresh eyes that can spot things in your writing that you cannot. But there are certain qualities you must look for and cultivate in your personal critic. Honesty is the most important. While your mother or your friend may give very supportive feedback, it may not be all that constructive. Seek out colleagues who can comment intelligently on your ideas.

Tell them specifically that you do not just want to hear, “Good job!” Tell them you want to know what does not work, what seems inconsistent or inaccurate, what sounds “off.” Tapply says, “Serious writers do seek advice. They welcome criticism. Serious writers want to hear ‘good job’ only from
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library cataloging staff:

**Annual report on drug use among adult and juvenile arrestees**
1998-1999

**Changed to:**
*Arrestee drug abuse monitoring, annual report*
2000-

**The California bench**
(OCoLC 34509546)

**Changed to:**
*The bench*
Vol. 44, no. 1 [i.e. 2] (spring 2004)-
(OCoLC 54800559)

**Land use law & zoning digest**
(OCoLC 1795344)

**Changed to:**
*Planning & environmental law*
Vol. 56, issue 1 (Jan. 2004)-
(OCoLC 53982970)

**New York Law School journal of international and comparative law**
(1983)
(OCoLC 10603145)

**and:**
*New York Law School journal of human rights*
(OCoLC 17937400)

**Absorbed by:**
*New York Law School Law Review*
(OCoLC 2737481)

**Official journal of the European Communities. Legislation**

**Changed to:**
*Official journal of the European Union. Legislation*
Vol. 46, L27 (1 Feb. 2003)-

**Texas forum on civil liberties & civil rights**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (fall 1993)-v. 8, no. 1 (spring 2003)

**Changed to:**
*Texas journal on civil liberties & civil rights*
Vol. 8, no. 2 (fall 2003)-

The following serial cessations were identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library acquisitions staff:

**Law practice management** (Chicago, Ill.)
(OCoLC 20285898)

**Changed to:**
*Law practice*
Vol. 30, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2004)-
(OCoLC 53911421)

**New York Law School journal of information and notices**
Vol. 46, C25 (1 Feb. 2003)-

**Official journal of the European Communities. Legislation**

**Changed to:**
*Official journal of the European Union. Legislation*
Vol. 46, L27 (1 Feb. 2003)-
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**Research Roundtable at AALL**
I hope you are able to come to the Research Roundtable in Boston. This year it will be held on Tuesday, July 13, 2004, from 11:45 AM to 1:00 PM. Frank Houdek, editor of *Law Library Journal*, will be there to share some insights, and Diana Jaque will talk about book reviewing. As always, there will be time to share your own project ideas and discuss research concerns.
These pertain to the changes in policy announced last spring and expressed in Subject Cataloging Manual H955. Henceforth works on English law get the subject heading “England”.

What was changed and why:

Established practice for American law catalogers has been to use “Great Britain” for works on the law of England. This was not officially sanctioned but was a well established practice. It reflected the (not entirely unreasonable) perception that the English ran Great Britain, that English law was British law, and that Scotland’s law was a local deviation from normative British law. This was somewhat arrogant and insulting, and while it might have reflected political realities it didn’t reflect the formal relationships of the legal systems.

General (non-law) subject cataloging policy has been to use “Great Britain” for works on the United Kingdom as a whole, and to use England for works limited to England. Thus a law book with the subdivision “Great Britain” would indicate either a book on Great Britain as a whole, or a book limited to England while non-legal materials on England received the subdivision “England”.

The established custom of the law cataloging community not only violated the official rules governing subject headings, it was dumb as well. It made it impossible to distinguish between works that dealt with the law of the entire United Kingdom (either directly or comparatively) with works limited to England. The recently increased autonomy of Wales and especially Scotland, as well as the evolution of the EU into a jurisdiction further complicated matters.

What is the difference between England and Britain?

At the start of the middle ages, England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland had unique legal traditions. In stages, England came to dominate the British Isles, and from the start of the 17th until the early 20th centuries, all four countries were ruled by a single monarch and for purposes of international relations were a single country (and except for the Republic of Ireland, still are). However they never had a single legal system (though Wales was close to being totally integrated with England) even during the periods when the parliament in London was charged with legislating for all of them.

Wales and Ireland are part of the common law tradition shared with England and the United States (Louisiana and Puerto Rico excluded) even though one is part of England and the other is for the most part an independent republic. Scotland is basically the junior partner in the United Kingdom with England, but has a totally different legal system derived from Roman law.

England and Wales.

England conquered Wales in the 13th century and in 1536 Wales was merged with England, and for all purposes the Welsh legal system was replaced with the English common law system. Administratively and legally, Wales has been merely a region of England for almost 500 years, even though linguistically, politically and socially it is a distinct country.

From a legal perspective, Wales is a part of England. They have one legal profession and integrated courts. In almost all areas, one law governs...
England and Wales. One can argue that the Kingdom of “England” is really the Kingdom of “England and Wales”. Statistics are usually compiled for England and Wales together. Wales is less than 20% of the combined kingdom of England and Wales. Few books are published about the law of Wales (except historical works and about the recent developments of administrative and constitutional law), and all discussion of English common law subjects inherently include a discussion of Wales.

Logically, if a book does not go out of its way to discuss Wales, and does not present at least 20% of its material on Wales (under the traditional LCSH 20% rule) as well as indicating a more than to be expected consideration of Welsh materials, I suggest that it isn’t rational to bring out Wales in the subject heading. Any book on the law of England as a whole discusses the law applicable in Wales. It would be better if “—Wales” were used only for works that discuss Welsh law more than can be expected from a typical treatment of English law. This analysis is compatible with formal LC policies, but is not required (nor prohibited) by the Subject Cataloging Manual.

England vs Ireland

Ireland had never been a unified territory when the English crown was recognized (by the Pope, not the Irish) as sovereign over Ireland in the 13th century. While Ireland survived for the most part and most of it is today a sovereign republic, the English did destroy the indigenous Irish legal system, so that today Irish law, especially in areas of private law, is based on English common law. For private law prior to Irish independence (and for Northern Ireland today), there was little Irish literature in the areas governed by common law and English law books routinely were sold in Ireland. It should be noted that in area of public law and criminal law, there is much “distinctive” about Irish law, but that is usually very clear from the title of the book.

Even at present, I suggest that the presence of Irish cases in an English law book should not result in adding a subject heading for Ireland or Northern Ireland unless that author makes a point of mentioning the presences of Irish materials, or unless the Irish materials are at least 20% of the work. Anyone researching Irish law will check English cases, especially prior to Irish independence, and the subdivision “—
Ireland” should indicate something uniquely Irish about the work. An author writing about Irish law (either in the republic or Northern Ireland) usually makes that very clear. It would be a mistake to respond to occasional references to Irish law by adding a subdivision for Ireland.

**England vs. Scotland vs. Great Britain**

Scotland was totally independent until 1603 when Queen Elizabeth I of England died ending the Tudor dynasty, and the English throne passed to her nearest legitimate relation, King James VI Scotland who became James I of England. For roughly 100 years, England and Scotland had a “union of the crowns”, one king but with separate parliaments and bureaucracies (e.g., in theory, King James of England could have declared war on King James of Scotland, by declaring war on himself). In 1707 Scotland agreed to a merger of parliaments with England thereby creating a single country of “Great Britain”, albeit one with two distinct legal systems. Lawyers and politicians debate whether this merger created a federation albeit with a single parliament as opposed to a unified state with limited regional autonomy for Scotland (such issues are not for catalogers to decide, though until recently subject rules tended to reflect the former while descriptive rules assumed the latter). While its legal system reflects several hundred years of English influence (some would say interference), Scots law is based on Roman law rather than the common law tradition of England, Ireland, Wales and most of the United States and Canada.

Most books on Scots law make it very clear that they are dis-cussing Scots law. However many books on English law say they are writing about “British” law (remember, that’s how we got into this mess to begin with). The list in SCM955 is a good guide of when to be suspicious (if the topic is on the list as one usually governed by English/Scots law, be dubious if the author claims to be writing on British law). Books on Scots law generally cite Scottish courts and statutes whose titles clearly indicate their applicability to Scotland. The absence of citation to Scottish legal sources or of any reference to Scotland should make a cataloger suspicious that book is “English” rather than “British” regardless of what the author or title page assert. Another hint is the presence in the data base of works on the subject with a geographic subdivision for Scotland, e.g. the presence of headings for “[subject]—Scotland” should make one wary that a book on that subject that doesn’t mention Scotland is about England rather than Britain.

Comparative law works get separate headings for England and Scotland, rather than “moving up” to the next broader term “Great Britain.” This is brilliant and CPSO should be complemented. A work comparing England and Scotland is a quite different work than one on those areas of law governing Great Britain as a whole. Also there is no guarantee that “Great Britain” will remain the next highest jurisdiction, since it is quite possible that England and Scotland will end up as separate but equal states of a united Europe (even if they continue to have the same monarch).

**What’s next.**

The current subject heading rules resolve almost all the issues, and are flexible enough to accommodate any potential political changes, e.g., a breakup of the United Kingdom in conjunction with the European Union evolving into a sovereign federation of which Great Britain, or perhaps England and Scotland separately, will be members. The rules work for all past historical periods, unlike the previous rules which sometimes resulted in anachronisms that made us look silly to users.
What's All the Hub-bub?

“The HUB,” the daily newspaper for the 2004 AALL annual meeting in Boston, will be YOUR hub for up-to-date information throughout the 2004 AALL Annual Meeting. Published Sunday through Wednesday, The HUB will feature articles of interest to the profession, highlight the accomplishments of scheduled speakers, keep you up to date on SIS and Committee meetings and special sessions. Humorous anecdotes, historical tidbits, photos, and even original cartoon submissions are all welcome and encouraged. Trying to find your way around the Hub? You will also find articles about the Boston area, including local activities and sites of interest, tourist attractions, cultural events, and dining.

If you are interested in submitting an article or other information to the Daily prior to the convention, kindly send items to the Co-Editors, Stephanie Burke and Michelle Pearse at the addresses below. E-mail submissions are strongly encouraged. The deadline for publication in the Sunday, July 10th edition is Monday, June 14th. During the convention, the submission deadline for the Monday through Wednesday editions is 1:00 p.m. of the preceding day. The HUB office will be located Room 305 of the Hynes Convention Center.

We look forward to hearing from you!
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