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Cataloging and classification practices in law libraries have changed dramatically from 1975 to 1990. In this bibliographic essay, the authors examine over 150 publications that deal with recent developments in descriptive and subject cataloging, classification, shared cataloging, management, and the public catalog. The review concludes with suggestions for further research and new topics on which books or articles may be written for law cataloging practitioners.

I. Introduction

Each library is pursuing its own program and goals, with no real standards, no real leadership, and no real cooperation. The result is a diversity without significant reason or benefit to our readers, our libraries, or ourselves.

— Morris L. Cohen¹

Those remarks were made in 1975. In the fifteen years that followed, a quiet revolution has taken place in the cataloging departments of law libraries across America. Libraries began to use OCLC or RLIN to support cataloging functions. The transition was made to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition (AACR2). The Library of Congress published six more subclasses of its Class K (Law) schedule, and the acceptance of the LC scheme increased with each passing year. Card catalogs were closed and replaced by computer output microform (COM) catalogs or by online catalogs.

Catalog librarians, accustomed to a realm of exacting formulae and systematic order, entered a period of constant change, and yes, occasional
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chaos. A whole new body of rules—the MARC formats (for machine readable cataloging)—became required knowledge for most catalogers. Retrospective conversion and reclassification projects disrupted normal operations. The implementation of AACR2 meant that form subheadings changed to uniform titles, and many forms of names had to be revised. Authority work and control, often haphazard or even nonexistent in law libraries prior to 1975, became crucial activities for improving access to information through the catalog. Catalogers at many institutions also learned to speak the language of and negotiate with computer programmers or automation vendors involved in supplying products or services based on the library’s machine-readable records.

There is no question that participation in the shared cataloging networks (now called bibliographic utilities) provided the major impetus for interlibrary cooperation and widespread acceptance of national standards. Looking back to 1975, the reason that was most often given for reluctance in joining the networks was the fear that one’s library would lose its autonomy. This fear seems almost ludicrous now. While it is true that some of the transitions in cataloging have not been without pain, the benefits gained through cooperation and standardization of practices have been substantial. Both the quality and quantity of cataloging output have improved, library staff and patrons have better access to information, and scholars may now move from one library to another without having to deal with a variety of homegrown classification schemes and subject headings or inconsistencies in catalog entries. With the possible exception of some of the smaller libraries, one could easily say that there has been a complete turnaround in United States law library cataloging practices since Morris Cohen made his critical statement fifteen years ago.

This article surveys specific developments in law cataloging and classification during this period, as documented in the books and periodical articles listed in the attached bibliography. The year 1975 was chosen as a starting point in order to supplement two cataloging and classification bibliographies previously published in *Law Library Journal*. Articles originally published before 1975 but now reprinted in book collections are included. In instances where more than one edition of a book was issued between 1975 and 1990, only the most recent edition is listed in the bibliography. Although the search for relevant books and articles
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continued through August 1991, publications issued after 1990 have been intentionally excluded.

The survey and bibliography are restricted to English language works that focus on the law library environment or legal materials and works on general cataloging that were published in books or journals devoted to law library science. Publications about automation or integrated systems are included only if there is an emphasis or substantial section on cataloging functions.

We have included many works published outside the United States. In recognition of the diverse needs and interests of practitioners in our profession, we have also discussed some nontraditional topics, such as indexing legal memoranda and thesauri for special subjects.

The survey begins with general works (introductions to law cataloging and classification, bibliographies and surveys of practice), followed by sections on the major topics for this area of librarianship: descriptive cataloging, subject cataloging, classification, shared cataloging, management issues, and finally, the public catalog. Full bibliographic information for items discussed in the survey is found in the bibliography that follows.

II. General Works

Several manuals and handbooks include a general introduction to cataloging and classification. In *Law Librarianship: A Handbook*, the chapter by Piper and Kwan summarizes the important issues of the 1980s, including use of AACR2, the LC classification, problems with LC subject headings, automation, standards, authority control, retrospective conversion, and the closing of card catalogs. The handbook’s counterpart in Great Britain, *Manual of Law Librarianship: The Use and Organization of Legal Literature* (2d ed. 1987), has a similar contribution written by Marion Birch. Birch discusses modern options, including manual versus automated systems, in-house or external systems, full or simplified cataloging, and different forms of catalogs. She includes descriptions of AACR2 rules relating to certain types of legal works, three significant subject heading lists, and five major classification schemes. There are also sections on authority control and on recataloging and reclassification. In Canada, two articles by Humayun Rashid—“Organizing Bibliographic Information: An Overview” and “Organizing Bibliographic Information: Manual Procedures”—present the same type of general introduction.

Other works are oriented toward particular types of law libraries. Devra Altman’s *A Manual for Small and Medium-Sized Law Libraries* contains information on simple subject and form arrangements of library materials and on minimal cataloging. Margaret Axtmann’s chapter in the *Manual of Procedures for Private Law Libraries, 1984 Supplement*
provides a general introduction to the choices confronting law firm and corporate law libraries, such as when is a catalog needed, whether or not to classify, standards, catalog format, locating cataloging copy, authority work, and costs. This chapter also includes a comprehensive list of cataloging tools. Margaret Lundahl addresses similar issues in the chapter she wrote for a Practising Law Institute course handbook, *Private Law Librarians, 1986*. More recently, a manual by Mickie Voges, published by the American Bar Association, presents cataloging information for law firms with libraries that are not maintained by persons with formal training. Voges explains the parts of a catalog card and how to transcribe this data, with clear illustrations. She discusses alternative formats, such as notebook catalogs and PC-based catalogs, and lists sources of services and software in the appendices. She gives guidance on the process of subject analysis and discusses options for organizing files of in-house legal memoranda.

In the second edition of *Werner's Manual for Prison Law Libraries*, Arturo Flores suggests a simple, nonstandard approach for providing bibliographic description using typed catalog and shelflist cards. Flores describes and illustrates the basic rules for alphabetical word-by-word filing and presents an original, easy classification outline based on place, form of material, and broad subject area. He also discusses the acquisition of commercially-produced catalog cards and book maintenance and repair.

A bibliography on law cataloging and classification was compiled by Nancy Miller and Marie Whited and published in *Law Library Journal* in 1975. It lists nearly 100 books, articles, and book reviews, some with brief annotations. For the private law library, C.W. Christensen's annotated bibliography lists sixteen books and articles on cataloging and classification published between 1959 and 1978. The final 100 pages of the published proceedings of the AALL's 1981 Annual Meeting, *Legal Information for the 1980s*, contain subject bibliographies compiled by the Association's special interest sections and committees; covered in these bibliographies are: OCLC, RLIN, and technical services automation, principally cataloging aspects. The entire proceedings of AALL annual meetings have not been published in *Law Library Journal* since 1980. However, Frank Houdek and Susan Goldner have compiled a guide to the audio and video recordings of the individual AALL programs, workshops, and institutes held since 1981. The guide is issued in a looseleaf binder and is expected to be updated annually. Entries in the guide are arranged chronologically; each entry includes title, speakers, an abstract describing the program's content, and other information. There are also speaker, sponsor, and subject indexes.

Two articles by Patricia Piper and Cecilia Kwan (1978 and 1982) and one by Ian Sainsbury (1989) survey law library practices in cataloging/
classification within the United States and Great Britain, respectively. The results from Piper and Kwan's questionnaires indicate an increased use of the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and the LC classification scheme, especially among libraries using a national bibliographic utility. The surveys, which are extensively illustrated with tables, also include data on the types of catalogs and their arrangement in the libraries surveyed. Sainsbury analyzes and compares the results of two questionnaires administered in 1983 and 1988. He identifies a clear trend away from card catalogs and toward acceptance of AACR2, except in law firm libraries. Most British law libraries used either Dewey, Moys, or "homegrown" classification schemes. Most of those that used LC classification often modified the class numbers. Sainsbury also notes an increase in the percentage of libraries that compiled in-house indexes for special collections on file.

In the early 1980s, Beth Wilson conducted a comprehensive survey on behalf of the Australian Law Librarians Group. The data from the survey revealed practices quite similar to those in England. Most Australian law library collections were cataloged (half used a divided catalog, the other half had dictionary catalogs.) Smaller law libraries used a simplified description. Many law school libraries were branches of centralized library systems, in which the cataloging was done by the main library, but the law library maintained some control over classification. Moys and Dewey were the most frequently used classification schemes in Australian law libraries.

More recently, the Canadian Association of Law Libraries (CALL) conducted the Survey of Technical Services in Canadian Law Libraries, in which results from seventy-nine libraries were tabulated. Two-thirds of the responding libraries still had card catalogs in 1985, while thirteen had book catalogs, fourteen had COM catalogs, and fifteen had online catalogs. Over half the libraries had undertaken or were planning retrospective conversion projects. The survey showed that UTLAS was the most used automated cataloging system. CALL also compared the use of LC authority records versus Canadiana name authorities and the Canadian List of Subject Headings. Nearly half of the Canadian law libraries were using the KF Classification Modified (see infra section V); at least twenty-four law libraries used some or all LC class schedules; and several reported using the L.A. County or Dewey classification schemes.

At the 1976 AALL annual meeting, one of the sessions was entitled "The Library of Congress and Its Influence on Law Librarianship." Nancy Miller, one of the panelists, presented a comprehensive, historical summary of AALL and individual law librarians' interaction with both ALA and LC, which covers the development of descriptive cataloging codes, efforts to create standard subject heading lists for law collections, and the AALL’s
leadership role in influencing LC's eventual development of the KF classification for United States law.

_The Technical Services Law Librarian_, a quarterly publication begun in 1975 (originally entitled _The Law Cataloger_), is the newsletter of AALL’s Technical Services and Online Bibliographic Special Interest Sections. The newsletter regularly includes informative articles and question-and-answer columns addressed to the particular needs of law catalogers regarding bibliographic description, subject headings, classification, MARC formats, and automation.

III. Descriptive Cataloging

Between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s, most writing on descriptive cataloging was about the development of and adjustment to AACR2. In 1974 the British and Irish Association of Law Librarians published the suggestions on rule revisions that its Sub-Committee on Cataloguing and Classification had submitted to the Library Association in the _Law Librarian_. Elizabeth Moys wrote a summary of the recommendations, which was published the same year in _Catalogue and Index_. BIALL had been critical of the subheading “Laws, statutes, etc.” and proposed instead that many detailed form filing titles be used to collocate legal primary materials under individual jurisdictions. The American bias in choice of terminology in the first edition of AACR was noted; for example, the rule dealing with administrative regulations did not address “subsidiary legislation.” The Sub-Committee also made suggestions for simplifying the rules regarding treaties. In a “Supplementary Memorandum” issued two years later, the BIALL Sub-Committee submitted further justifications for its earlier proposals in response to other recommendations made by the Australian Law Librarians Group. Use of the uniform title “Year Books” was suggested for those medieval law reports. There was also a call for less ambiguity and more detail in rules for description of manuscripts.

Representatives of the American Association of Law Libraries also were able to give their opinions in discussions with the American Library Association’s RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee. Phyllis Marion and Cecilia Kwan presented a description of this activity as reported in the 1978 AALL Annual Meeting proceedings published in _Law Library Journal_. They compared the United States law catalogers’ proposals on entry and uniform titles to those put forth by the Australian and British law catalogers and then described AACR2, which was still in draft form at the time. They also outlined the major changes to the general rules for description and presented a more detailed look at the particular rules affecting legal materials.

After AACR2 was finally published, Marion wrote a book and an article to assist catalogers in applying the new rules. _A Manual of AACR2_
Examples for Legal Materials (1981, revised in 1985) has sixty-two examples of law-related publications—laws, regulations, court reports, treaties, hearings, etc.—showing the access points and uniform titles chosen according to AACR2. Rules for description (title through notes) are not overtly illustrated. The manual includes an index to the examples, which is arranged by rule number. In her article "Sources for Determining Citation Practice for Court Reports Throughout the World," Marion focuses on rule 21.36A1. That rule states that law reports of one court should be entered under the name of the court or under the name of the reporter, depending on the accepted legal citation practice in that court's country. To help catalogers apply the rule correctly, the author points out the various reference tools and guides to legal publications (principally for the United States, Great Britain, Commonwealth countries, Western and Eastern European countries) that provide that information.

The BIALL Standing Committee on Cataloguing and Classification also evaluated the new rules in a 1981 article, "AACR2 and Legal Materials." The Committee summarized the earlier BIALL recommendations on rule revisions, noting which ones were adopted, and provided an overview of the changes in description and entry for legal publications. The Committee applauded the use of uniform titles and suggested that these be expanded or qualified for legal works to provide better structure to files under names of jurisdictions. The Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the predominance of American examples in AACR2.

Elizabeth Matthews' Access Points to the Library also describes the changes for entry under AACR2, but on a more elementary level. This little book was designed primarily to assist public services staff and patrons in the effective use of the library's catalog; however, it may also be helpful to any beginning law cataloger. The author explains the content of a catalog card and then describes how various forms of materials, such as court reports, codes, restatements, and government documents, are entered.

More experienced law catalogers, particularly those whose libraries participated in cooperative cataloging projects or used a national bibliographic utility, soon became aware of the AACR2 "rule interpretations" printed by Library of Congress (often abbreviated as "LCRI") in its Cataloging Service Bulletin. Reading through the LCRI to find guidance appropriate to the law library environment was an arduous task, however, until the 1984 publication of Cataloging Legal Literature by Peter Enyingi, Melody Lembke, and Rhonda Mittan. This manual provides practical assistance for LC-like descriptive cataloging, reproduces selected AACR2 rules and LC rule interpretations, and adds explanations and LC examples using law-related publications. There is a helpful glossary, an appendix listing uniform titles for constitutions around the world, and a detailed
index. A second edition was published in 1988, with revisions and expansions due to new rule interpretations from LC, chiefly affecting the treatment of looseleaf publications, replacement volumes, and the “Laws, etc.” uniform title. In the new edition, most of the illustrations are in MARC format, rather than in card catalog form.

In an article in *Serials Review*, Renee Chapman discussed the evolution of the “Laws, etc.” uniform title. Particular attention is given to the Library of Congress recent authorizations for the addition of certain qualifiers (e.g., “Session laws” and “Compiled statutes”) and for earliest-entry-cataloging when dealing with collections of laws for United States state jurisdictions. The author proposes that the latter interpretation be extended to other jurisdictions as well.

In Canada, Humayun Rashid closely examined AACR2 in his article “Problems of Entry for Certain Types of Legal Materials.” He discusses choice of entry (and NLC and LC rule interpretations) for court rules, collections of laws, two or more acts, codes, regulations, and subject compilations. The article is illustrated with twenty-five examples.

Other than Rule 2.5B9, which states that the number of volumes can be qualified by the term “loose-leaf” when appropriate, law catalogers found no guidance in AACR2 on how looseleaf treatises and services should be described. In a *Library Resources & Technical Services* article, Byron Cooper notes LC’s long-standing practice (clearly put forth in the 1949 Code) of cataloging looseleafs as monographs. Cooper criticizes this practice, arguing that AACR2’s definitions of monograph and serial do not unequivocally eliminate looseleaf publications from the serials category. Treatment as serials is desirable, Cooper argues, since it would help in automated serials systems for check-in of releases, would make possible the assignment of ISSNs for better control, and would be a format already adapted to handling frequent title-page changes.

Despite these arguments, the Library of Congress in 1983 reiterated its position under AACR2 by publishing a rule interpretation which indicated that “looseleaf-for-updating” titles should be cataloged according to the rules for description of books.3 Adele Hallam’s *Cataloging Rules for the Description of Looseleaf Publications: With Special Emphasis on Legal Materials* (first published in 1986; second edition, 1989) provided further guidance. This manual represents LC practice, although feedback and input from AALL members was sought while the work was still in draft form. Intended to supplement AACR2 Chapter 2, Hallam’s work establishes guidelines for the uniform treatment of looseleaf titles,
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including rules for handling changes in title, authors and edition statements, undetermined or expanded/split volumes, and services with component parts, pamphlets, newsletters or transfer volumes. The second edition corrects a few typographical errors and adds rules relating to accompanying software, parallel language edition statements, and notes for variant titles. Apart from the addition of a few more illustrations, the other changes are chiefly stylistic in nature.

Rare books and computer files are two other areas of descriptive cataloging that have been addressed in the law library literature. Margaret Moody described the project at Harvard Law Library for provision of very complete, detailed MARC descriptions for the library's collection of "historical materials." In Collecting and Managing Rare Law Books, John Thomas traces the recent development of cataloging standards for rare materials. His paper includes extensive discussion of proposals to ALA's Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI) for standards applicable to machine-readable catalog records for rare books, many resulting from efforts and experience with entries created for the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue project. The revision of AACR2 Chapter 9, Computer Files (formerly entitled Machine Readable Data Files), was also considered a significant development for law catalogers, particularly for the rules' applicability to the description of works accessed through the online legal research databases, LEXIS and WESTLAW. Both Daly and Matthews discuss the new rules in their 1990 articles on the subject (see infra section VIII).

IV. Subject Cataloging

A few general lists of subject headings and several specialized lists were published during the years 1975-1990. For law libraries that use the Library of Congress Subject Headings, two supplementary tools were issued in the AALL Publications Series. Tillie Krieger's Subject Headings for the Literature of Law and International Law and Index to LC K Schedules (3d ed. 1982, 4th ed. 1990) updates two earlier lists compiled by Werner Ellinger. Krieger's compilations consist of law-related subject headings and their cross-references extracted from LCSH. Alongside the subject headings, she has added beginning class numbers from the K, KD, KE, KF, KJV, and KK subclasses, making her work a partial consolidated index to the LC law class schedules. The lists also include some terms printed in brackets, which are not valid as subject headings but are used as notations in the class schedules. Melody Lembke's Legal L.C. Subject Headings Weekly Lists: Cumulation (formerly compiled by Peter Enyingi) is a list of added, revised, and deleted subject headings, complete with references and
scope notes, selected from the *L.C. Subject Headings Weekly Lists* because of their orientation toward law and social or political science. There are also sections on subject headings of current interest and on revised headings. Issued quarterly, each issue is cumulative, ending every year with a separate cumulation. The service is meant to provide a convenient means for the cataloger to supplement the latest print or microfiche LCSH edition.

In England, Sainsbury compiled *Legal Subject Headings for Libraries*, based on subject headings in use at the four Inns of Court libraries. Sainsbury added some newer terms and inserted many "see" and "see also" references to the list. He admits that the terminology used in many of the headings is naturally biased toward English law.

Many years later the Australian Law Librarians' Group (ALLG) issued *Australian Legal Subject Headings*, which was modelled on Sainsbury's list, with some obscure terms deleted and new terms added, and other headings changed to preferred Australian usage. However, in the book's introduction, the ALLG acknowledges that the usefulness of *Australian Legal Subject Headings* may be limited, due to increased use of LCSH since the Australian Bibliographic Network was established.

For the practitioner working in the law firm environment, Laura Holding's *Subject Heading Index Guide for Opinions and Memoranda of Law* may be useful. An article published in 1980 in *Legal Economics*, written by Jackie McMillan, briefly describes Holding's list and four other subject heading lists that have been used for indexing legal memoranda and suggests what criteria to use in selecting one of them.

Another list, the *Standard Subject Index*, produced by the National Association of Attorneys General, was first published in 1972, and reissued in revised editions in 1974 and 1979. This list of headings was designed to assist attorneys general offices in indexing advisory opinions and other legal materials and to encourage uniformity. The compilers used lists of headings or terms from indexes in actual published opinions from eleven different state attorneys general offices as the basis for consolidation into this single list.

A few other tools were developed for special subjects. In a manual written by Roy Mersky, David Kronick, and Leslie Sheridan, the chapter on cataloging and indexing consists of: (1) an index of health- and medicine-related subject terms with corresponding KF class numbers for use by catalogers who choose not to classify these nonlaw materials in the "Medicine," "Technology," or "Science" class areas; and (2) lists of subject terms that might be assigned as headings for works on medicine and the law.

Charlotte Mudge and Nadene Garrett compiled a headings list for use with criminology, criminal justice, and police science subjects. The list was
Based on LCSH’s eighth edition and its supplements through September 1976, with some headings from A List of Canadian Subject Headings also included. Other revisions to LCSH terms were made; for example, “Family law” is used instead of “Domestic relations.”

In a more recent compilation, Bjorn Stormorken and Leo Zwaak focused on the topic of human rights. They used terms and phrases from fourteen legal instruments concerning human rights (charters, conventions, and protocols) to develop a systematic thesaurus, which includes scope notes and related, broader, and narrower terms. It also includes separate indexes—alphabetical, KWIC, and by articles of the legal documents. Another compilation with a specialized focus, Guides to Library of Congress Subject Headings and Classification on Peace and International Conflict Resolution, was issued in 1990 by the U.S. Institute of Peace. It is meant to be used by organizations and special libraries that need to organize and retrieve materials about war and peace, and this includes certain aspects of public international law. The manual presents general information about LCSH structure and free-floating subdivision, and lists headings in three categories: topics and events, place names, and wars and other conflicts.

Aside from the basic tools, Cataloging Legal Literature (see supra section III) is a helpful manual for instruction on subject analysis generally and on LCSH in particular. The authors discuss fundamental principles and techniques for deciding what a book is about and explain specific law-related LC subject headings and subdivisions with illustrations; guidelines in the first edition are reprinted from LC’s Cataloging Service Bulletin and in the second edition from LC’s Subject Cataloging Manual.

Few studies of law-related subject headings have appeared in the periodical literature. In “Subject Cataloging Practices in American Law Libraries,” Enyingi reports the results of a 1974 survey to which 204 libraries responded. He determined which subject heading lists were used by different types of law libraries, whether or not the subject headings were modified locally, and how local subject authority files were maintained. The article also includes various law catalogers’ suggestions for improvements to LC subject headings. In a separate article, Enyingi and coauthors William Ford and Richard Iamele present a case study of the Los Angeles County Law Library’s policies regarding the modification of specific types of LC headings and the procedures they followed in establishing a card authority file for subject headings.

The 1975 AALL Annual Meeting included a program entitled “What Lies Ahead for Legal Subject Headings.” Edward J. Blume, of the Library of Congress, discussed recent revisions to LCSH and indicated LC’s intent to repair some of the irregularities of “law” subject subdivisions. He
defended LC’s use of inverted headings, as opposed to “natural language,” and stated that classificatory devices, such as in the heading TRIALS (TREASON), were useful. He expressed the desire for more precision and specificity in law headings and invited correspondence and comments. Morris Cohen, speaking at the same program, pointed out the need to reform LCSH, especially some antiquated legal terminology, and he suggested organized AALL efforts to give LC input on this. He also appealed for standardization and uniformity of acceptance in a single authority list by all law libraries.

In 1986, a thirty-year-old article by Vaclav Mostecky was reprinted in a book devoted to constructive criticism of LCSH. Mostecky examined some subject headings on international law and proposed the development of a systematic faceted list of headings showing hierarchical relationships, with “see also” references only between next-closest headings. A separate, strictly alphabetical list would be used as an index to the main hierarchical list.

In a more recent article, “Subject Searching in Law Library OPACs,” Alva T. Stone points out the lack of consistency in LCSH terms. She also discusses insufficient cross-references, particularly in regard to many “law and legislation” headings and subdivided headings.

V. Classification

Classification schemes for law collections have been diverse, often controversial, and the focus of much attention in recent years. In 1975 Enyingi complained that “law library literature . . . [has] an overemphasized concentration on classification that is probably the result of frustration that has developed out of striving to create a complete LC class K schedule and the realization that its completion is still far in the future.”

This sense of frustration has gradually lessened because the Library of Congress has developed and published six more “Law” subclass schedules to follow the United States and United Kingdom schemes issued in 1969 and 1973, respectively. The new subclasses are: KE, Law of Canada (1976); K, Law (General) (1977); KK-KKC, Law of Germany (1982); KDZ, KG-KH, Law of the Americas, Latin America and the West Indies (1984); KJV-KJW, Law of France (1985); and KJ-KKZ, Law of Europe (1989).

An extensively researched article by Martha M. Evans, reprinted in 1976 in Reader in Law Librarianship, recounts both the internal and external difficulties that LC faced in considering “Law,” which was the

last area of knowledge to be acknowledged by its own class schedules. The author documents the contributions of AALL committees and representatives and describes the "working papers" written by LC's Werner B. Ellinger between 1953 and 1961. Developmental grants from the Council on Library Resources furthered this work. LC ultimately conceded to law library community pressures and developed the KF (United States) schedule first. In 1969, a full twenty years after the postwar period of growth in which American law libraries began to feel a serious need to classify their collections, the Library of Congress issued the so-called "preliminary edition" of the KF subclass, Law of the United States.

Since then, several cataloging practitioners have developed various tools to assist in the use and interpretation of KF and other LC law-related schedules. Piper and Kwan's Manual on KF is an early guide that continues to be popular. A cumulative index to KF compiled by Doris Small in 1978 incorporates entries published in LC Classification Additions and Changes through June 1977 into the basic index of 1969. Curt Conklin of Brigham Young University created an alternative index to the KF subclass. Intended especially for newer law catalogers, his index used actual LCSH terms to direct the user to the classification number(s) corresponding to the same topic. The same approach is found in the 1990 subject heading list compiled by Tillie Krieger (see supra section IV). Krieger lists beginning class numbers from six schedules (KF, KD, KE, K, KJV and KK), and includes some terms (in brackets) that are not valid as LC subject headings, but are represented by notations in the class schedules.

The most up-to-date KF index, which began publication in 1982 as a title in the AALL Publications Series, is Larry Dershem's Library of Congress Classification: Class K, Subclass KF, Law of the United States, Cumulative Index. Like Doris Small's index, the list includes entries from LC's Additions & Changes, but its usefulness is greatly increased by its looseleaf format and quarterly updates. In 1984 Dershem's cumulation of the KF schedule was published, and subsequently he has compiled and updated cumulated editions for other LC law schedules: K (General) and KD (United Kingdom) in 1985, KE (Canada) in 1987, KDZ, KG-KH (Latin America) and KJV-KJW (France) in 1988, and KK-KKC (Germany) and KJ-KKZ (Europe) in 1990.

Acknowledging the practices of many larger law libraries, particularly law school libraries, which acquire and classify materials on international law, political science, and other social sciences, Dershem has compiled

three additional looseleaf cumulated schedules: Class J, Political Science; Subclasses H-HJ, Economics; and Subclasses HM-HX, Sociology. Lillie D. Caster has written a practical handbook on the use of LC Class H (Social Sciences). Some of the topics she examined are dedicated Cutter numbers, successive Cutters, internal tables, “subarranged like” and “general special” notations, and the various types of geographical subdivisions and tables used in the scheme. Guides to Library of Congress Subject Headings and Classification on Peace and International Conflict Resolution (see supra section IV) includes most of the JX subclass, along with selected other LC class numbers, and a consolidated index to all of the listed class numbers.

Smaller law libraries have shown some interest in simplified or abbreviated versions of the KF schedule. One of these, which is considered adequate for a law firm library of over 10,000 volumes, is found in Joy Plunket’s chapter in a 1977 Practising Law Institute course handbook.

Two articles of the 1970s deal with the use of the LC schedules for law by nonlaw libraries. Suzanne Tipler described a project to help eliminate a law materials backlog at Oakland University’s general library. Books on United States law were classified in KF by a single cataloger, who became the library’s KF expert. Some foreign law materials were forced into social sciences or history schedules or alternative numbers already in the LC schedules (HG for banking law, BX for canon law). Other foreign law materials received letter designations from the Class K Draft Outline, followed by numbers derived from the KF schedule. In an article addressed to social sciences librarians, Wade and Hyatt admit that nonlaw libraries now adopting the K classes have many practical problems, one of which is that they have been placing law materials in H and J and elsewhere for over fifty years. It is doubtful that these libraries would want to change current LC copy to the older class numbers in H and J; on the other hand, the time and resources needed to reclassify the older materials may be hard to come by. Nevertheless, the authors recommend that social science catalogers adopt the K class fully, since more and more law treatises are being published, and the K class will accommodate the most precise legal topics not found in H or J.

Apart from works comparing LC’s law classification to other schemes or discussing reclassification projects, few detailed descriptions or criticisms of the recent LC K subclasses have been written. One exception is the writings of Jolande E. Goldberg, the classification expert chiefly responsible for developing some of the LC schedules. Two of her 1981 articles deal with KK-KKC, Law of Germany. The article in International Journal of Law Libraries compares the East and West German legal systems and gives illustrations of the synchronization between the
corresponding KK and KKA subclasses (KK providing the base, or model, from which KKA was derived and sometimes expanded). Her 1981 article in *Law Library Journal* includes a detailed review of the topical arrangement of the two subclasses, KK and KKA, with some discussion of subdivision and form tables. Goldberg’s lecture at the 1983 AALL Conference in Houston was later expanded into another paper on the German law schedule and published in *Parlament und Bibliothek*. In this article, she traces the practical difficulties and theoretical dilemmas related to the gradual development of all the LC law schedules and describes LC’s deliberations and rationale behind the basic subject divisions within KK-KKC, which was the first LC schedule for a civil law system.

In still another *LLJ* article, “Library of Congress Law Classification: The Regional Schedules,” Jolande Goldberg discusses the Law of Europe schedule. After recounting the history of law classification policies at LC, she explains how the concept of regionalism was developed and presents a detailed examination of the major sections of KJ-KKZ, its form division tables and index.

E. Ann Rae’s essay in *Law Libraries in Canada* presents quite a different historical account and description of the KE, Law of Canada, schedule. She describes the cooperation between the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada in 1973-74 in producing a draft of the KE subclass. Some needs of Canadian libraries were accommodated; for example, optional arrangements are given in footnotes or parenthetical numbers, and there is a separate section for Quebec, with its civil law tradition. The National Library of Canada made many concessions to LC, however, particularly in the decision not to publish a bilingual edition and in following LC’s requirement that KE subjects generally follow the arrangements already established by the KF and KD schedules. The author concludes with the likely reasons why most Canadian law libraries still prefer not to use the LC schedule for Canadian law, even ten years after its publication.

In fact, some United States law libraries and most law libraries outside the United States do not use the LC classification. In Canada there has been a growing trend, especially among law school libraries, toward using the *KF Classification Modified for Use in Canadian Law Libraries*. This publication is often called “KF Modified,” and has also been known as “KF-Manitoba Adaptation” (because Shih-Sheng Hu, the director of the University of Manitoba Law Library, first proposed its development in 1968). The schedule rejects the primary division along strict jurisdictional lines and instead classifies all common law treatises together. In an addendum to the aforementioned paper by Rae, a separate essay by Judy Ginsberg summarizes how and why “KF Modified” was developed and
lists the techniques by which the basic KF numbers were modified. More details can be found in Rashid's 1984 article, "One Decade Later: KF Canadian Adaptation Scheme." Rashid explains that practitioners and students of common law prefer arrangement by form and subject rather than along strict jurisdictional lines. Several examples detail the ways in which KF numbers are expanded or modified to make room for Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand works. Rashid also mentions a "KF Modified" Users Group within the Canadian Association of Law Libraries and the Editorial Board, which considers and approves additions/changes to the schedule. Since 1982 the York University Law Library has been issuing the schedule in looseleaf format, and users subscribe to regular updates.

Because some law libraries in the United States and Canada still use the Los Angeles County Law Library's Class K, Law, it should be noted that a consolidated edition was published in 1989. The 1989 edition cumulates the revised edition of 1965 with all the additions and changes through 1988. The new version lacks both the introduction and the index because Los Angeles County uses its card subject authority file as an index. There are, however, class numbers for newer topics such as environmental law, abortion, and public interest law.

It has already been noted that both the Dewey Decimal and the Moys classification schemes are widely used in British law libraries. An article by P. Gangadhara Rao compares the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth edition DDC subclasses for law (340-349), and concludes that the eighteenth edition adopts new terminology and has major revisions in the sequence of main topics. The author examines and illustrates three specific problems: the same number assigned to different subjects because of conflicting instructions in tables use, separation of constituent countries from their wider regions when the geographic subdivision is used, and defects in expressiveness and relativity. In the article "Law Options in Dewey 19," Joyce Gardner presents the three variations, with a table of twenty-five examples, which the nineteenth edition DDC schedule mentions as alternatives to the standard, or preferred, scheme. She concludes that the National Law Library (of Papua New Guinea) and other large libraries likely to participate in cooperative cataloging ventures should adhere to the standard scheme, which groups material by branch of law, next by jurisdiction, and then by subtopics. For other libraries committed to DDC, the author recommends option A, which places all laws of the local jurisdiction in 340-348, and laws for all other countries in 349. However, if the library is not obligated to use Dewey, Gardner suggests that the Moys classification be preferred!

The Moys Classification Scheme for Law Books, popular in many Commonwealth countries, was first published in 1968; the second edition
came out in 1982; and a third edition is being planned. Moys treats common law countries as a unit, with all other jurisdictions as separate legal systems. Material is then divided into primary sources arranged by form, then secondary sources arranged by subject. General works fall into the following categories: Jurisprudence, Comparative Law, International Law, Religious Systems, or Ancient and Medieval. The author presents two different notations simultaneously, one similar to LC (K-KKZ) and the other similar to Dewey (340-349). There is a separate section for European Communities law and an extensive index with “use,” “used for,” and “related term” references, and some scope notes.

Some mention should be made of the work of the distinguished British classificationist, W.A.F.P. Steiner. In 1974 Oceana published the scheme he created for the Squire Law Library, University of Cambridge. It is an alphanumeric scheme, with the main classes (jurisdictions) given as large letters, subject divisions as lower case letters, form divisions as number arrangements, and author letters comprising the last part of the call numbers. The schedule includes a sixty-six-page list of subject headings, which also serves as an index, since there are references to corresponding subject division class numbers. Further details on the Squire Law Library schedule can be found in a brief article by Keith McVeigh in The Law Librarian. Steiner addresses certain theoretical problems in “Some Problems of Classification in International and Comparative Law.” He compares four homegrown class schemes for which he was either a creator or consultant; these schemes are used by the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (London), Squire Law Library, European University Institute (Florence), and Swiss Institute of Comparative Law (Lausanne). Among the questions he discusses are whether the first order of subdivision is by legal concept or by topic, how European integration and European communities are handled, and where materials on conflict of laws and unification of law are classified.

An article by Jan Stepan, published in Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, has a detailed description of the scheme created for the Swiss Institute of Comparative Law. Designed for a collection of about 200,000 volumes, it is an alphanumeric classification consisting of main classes (General & Comparative, Groups of Jurisdictions, Individual Jurisdictions, Public International Law, Ancient & Religious Law) subarranged by subject and further subdivided by form. Stepan describes using law library experts from various countries as advisors and discusses

---

6. See Notes and News, 21 LAW LIBR. 46 (1990). According to a preliminary cataloging record issued by the British Library, the third edition is to be published in 1991 by Bowker-Saur, with a change in title: MOYS CLASSIFICATION AND THESAURUS FOR LEGAL MATERIALS.
the changes to the classification deemed necessary once the schedule began to be used. The text of the classification system is included at the end of the article. A local classification scheme developed for use at the Columbia University Law Library is described by Charles Szladits in a 1982 supplement to the American Journal of Comparative Law.

Many other "homegrown" schemes have been devised for particular special collections or subjects. Simone Kleckner describes a scheme for arranging the extensive collection on European integration held by New York University Law Library. Between 1976 and 1978, three classification plans devised by Cohen, Lee, and Stepan—on law and development, vital statistics regulations, and children's rights—were issued in the Law and Population Monograph Series sponsored by the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Each plan is a key number classification designed to help governments or organizations compile and review legal materials in a standard format, thus making it easier to make comparisons among different nations. In "Classification of Roman Law: Problems and a Suggested Classification Scheme," Wajenberg and Gorecki trace the history of Roman law and its influence to illustrate their proposed KBD schedule. In an article on canon law, they discuss the primary source materials in historical context and present a proposed KBG classification scheme. In a 1985 Law Library Journal article, Anne K. Myers describes a decimal classification scheme for maritime law. This scheme, which is printed along with examples and scope notes, was created for the 6,000 titles then held by the Center for Oceans Law and Policy at the University of Virginia.

Two other specially devised schemes were created for temporary shelf arrangement of foreign law materials prior to the development of LC law schedules for what has come to be called "the rest of the world." In the second edition of the plan used by Brigham Young University Law Library, Mueller and DeVergie explain the use of alphabetic characters for regions and countries (taken from the Class K Outline Scheme (Synopsis) published by LC in Additions & Changes list 157), followed by Cutter number tables for 105 broad topics (e.g., C58 for Civil rights), then subarranged by a Cutter number for main entry, and finally by the book's publication date. Reynolds and Thorson describe a different temporary scheme used at their general college library. They assigned the letters KZ for most foreign law materials, followed by the region’s or country’s national bibliography number as found in LC’s class Z schedule, and then a Cutter number for main entry. The authors chose KZ because it was unlikely that LC would be assigning those letters to any future subclass. (This assumption proved to be incorrect. Library of Congress announced in 1991 that it had begun
the revision of class numbers for public international law, which would become subclass KZ, Law of Nations. 7)

In addition to the various classification tools and studies on their development and use, there were a few journal articles published comparing and contrasting the more widely used schemes. Elmer Hess described the history, structural differences, strengths and defects of the LC law classification systems, and those of the Los Angeles County Law Library and the University of Chicago Law Library (also known as the Benyon scheme). Sng Yoke Fong has compared the LC and Benyon schemes, listing the advantages and disadvantages of converting an already classified collection to LC. And finally, in a 1988 feature article in the Canadian Association of Law Libraries Newsletter/Bulletin, Judy Ginsberg and six other practitioners outline the reasons for choosing each of the chief schemes (KF Modified, Moys, Dewey, homegrown, LC, and L.A. County Law Classification) used by Canadian academic, private, and public law libraries.

VI. Shared Cataloging

In a 1967 article (reprinted in 1976), Joseph T. Vambery describes principles of shared cataloging. He discusses future plans to automate cataloging and to develop the LC catalog card service and CIP programs. He contends that if law libraries are to maximize benefits from these services, they should embrace standards and accept AACR, LCSH, and the LC classification scheme. He also states that the trends in cooperative cataloging may provide the impetus for organized efforts to lobby the Library of Congress to correct some problems, particularly in law-related subject headings and the JX subclass.

In a 1975 article about law library automation, Oscar Trelles devotes several pages to functions of machine-readable cataloging, specifically examining OCLC and BIBNET. The 1976 AALL Annual meeting included a program entitled “Networks and Law Libraries.” Moderator Morris Cohen reported on the December 1975 meeting of thirty librarians at the annual Association of American Law Schools meeting, at which the idea of a law library network was explored. This consortium was to create a computerized database to support cataloging, card production, acquisitions, and interlibrary loans, and later branch into many kinds of cooperative projects. Whether or not such a consortium or network would

function independently or as part of an existing network (like OCLC) was a much-debated issue.

Matthews wrote two articles about using OCLC in law libraries. "Cataloging Legal Materials Online" describes using OCLC and producing catalog cards, and discusses OCLC's potential influence on resource sharing. "Effect of OCLC on Workflow in Law Libraries" presents the results of a survey of 135 law libraries that were using national bibliographic utilities in 1978. Matthews found that OCLC was the system most used. Levels of satisfaction, how much record editing was done, involvement in reclassification projects, staff training, changes in staffing, and comments on specific problems are some of the points covered by the survey.

Access to the shared cataloging records in bibliographic utilities has not been restricted only to the larger libraries. In a 1979 Practising Law Institute course handbook, Mary Salovaara describes the use of OCLC by the Kirkland & Ellis Law Library via its cluster membership in ILLINET. She lists the enhancements to various functions (search and retrieval, display formats, authority data, and quality control) planned for the 1980s. The proceedings of the 1980 AALL Annual Meeting include a program on "Cost-Effective Participation in a Bibliographic Utility by a Small Library," which provides a general overview of the dial-up, dedicated line, and consortium approaches to membership in OCLC, RLIN, and WLN, followed by case studies on the consortium approach to OCLC and dial-up access for RLIN. Two articles in a 1982 issue of Illinois Libraries continue this theme. In the first article, Margaret Lundahl describes her experience using OCLC for cataloging and interlibrary loan at a law firm library that added about 500 new titles each year. She states that the quality and quantity of her library's cataloging improved, and that she was proud of the opportunity to contribute to the database original records that met national standards. In the second Illinois Libraries article Sandra Gold, Marie Del Bene, and Betty Roizman relates how three law firm libraries, all located in the same building in Chicago, shared access to OCLC via a portable terminal. The authors explain their rationale for this method, how the proposal was presented to their firms' administrators, and the process for implementing the system.

Two case studies concerned with quality control in the OCLC database were also published during this period. In a 1979 article, Christian Boissonnas examines the modifications that Cornell Law Library needed to make on 300 OCLC records (half LC records, half member-input records) while applying local standards compatible to national standards. The time spent modifying records was recorded to calculate the costs incurred by using incomplete or erroneous cataloging copy. Although more editing was
required for non-LC records, the author concludes that use of OCLC can be considered cost-effective, particularly for libraries committed to high-quality cataloging and desiring to reduce the number of records for which backlogging or original cataloging must be done.

In an article in *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, Henry Barnard listed twenty-nine individual OCLC records as samples of the challenges faced by copy catalogers in law libraries. Most of the editing involved choice or form of entry, outdated or less-than-specific subject headings, outdated or missing LC class numbers, and problems with interpretation of rules for special types of publications, such as casebooks, individual acts, law reviews, or supplemented works.

Several articles focus on using shared cataloging networks for cataloging microform titles. Diane Hillmann outlines recent improvements regarding searching and identifying microform titles in RLIN, the use of the "create *" command to create a microform record from a hard-copy record already in the database, and the problem of older microform records, which may lack reproduction codes or other fixed field elements that affect clustering and index information. Adrienne DeVergie recounts her experiences cataloging thousands of microform titles on OCLC. Prior to 1983, about twenty-five percent of the major microform titles were cataloged on OCLC, fifty percent had cataloging copy for the corresponding print editions, and twenty-five percent required complete original cataloging. DeVergie complains about the lack of a microform qualifier to limit search results and the lack of uniformity in description. (OCLC had advised its members to follow LC practice—describing the original publication and physical details in the body of the entry, with the microform details in a note position—however, some libraries had followed AACR2 chapter 11 instead.)

In a 1984-85 *Law Library Journal* article, Linda Cross discusses complexities faced by staff at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Library when they used OCLC for cataloging a microfiche collection of state session laws. Her article includes an analytical table of OCLC control numbers for these microfiche serial titles to assist other libraries considering such a project.

A few articles focus on the Research Library Information Network (RLIN), formerly the BALLOTS system, which originated at Stanford University. In "BALLOTS at Boalt," Kent Schriefer and Linnea Christiani describe an in-depth study conducted in 1978 at the law school library of the University of California at Berkeley. The authors offer details of internal procedures, including pre-catalog searches, editing or revising RLIN records, and inputting original records. The authors found MARC records from LC to be the most reliable; RLIN-standard records needed
some editing; nonstandard records required the most revision. In another 1978 article, Melanie Norten and Donna Hirst compare RLIN and OCLC at the University of Iowa Law Library. Norten and Hirst first compare the procedures for searching for copy, editing copy, and producing cards in a manual and an automated environment; then describe the following differences between RLIN and OCLC: size, development and quality control of their databases, member libraries, searching methods, hit rate, and other library functions. Ultimately, they chose RLIN, primarily because of its flexibility in searching and because of its research library orientation (many of RLIN's members are from the largest academic law libraries).

Choosing a Bibliographic Utility, published in 1989, includes a chapter by Phoebe Ruiz-Valera, which documents the use of RLIN by a smaller law library. Ruiz-Valera briefly describes the experience of the Library of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York with various RLIN functions, and reports an overall staff satisfaction with both the quality and quantity of RLIN-related routines. In “A User Friendly Guide to RLIN for Friendly Users,” Flores specifically addresses the needs of reference librarians, but his description of basic search commands, logical operators, and search results might also be useful to catalogers new to RLIN and to occasional, “search-only” users. One search result is illustrated in four different display formats.

The planned or existing machine-readable authority records in RLIN, WLN, and UTLAS were described by speakers at a program of the 1980 AALL Annual Meeting entitled “Authority Control, or the Key to Survival in the Eighties.” The proceedings included information about sources of authority records, how they are maintained, and their impact on system quality control and on local libraries.

Many of the larger law libraries in Canada use UTLAS. In his article “Organizing Bibliographic Information [Automated Procedures],” Rashid introduces the UTLAS cataloging support system and discusses derived (copy) cataloging, original cataloging, automated authority control, and card production. Full MARC records for different types of legal publications are included. Rashid points out that law libraries will not benefit from any financial savings by using the shared cataloging network, but they will gain increased accuracy and standardization.

In a view from “Down Under,” Lynn Pollack discusses surveys and reports that indicate an interest among Australian law libraries in establishing regional resource-sharing networks to be linked nationally through the Australian Bibliographic Network (ABN). The author's library, the Law Courts Library in Sydney, had only a few months' experience using ABN and was contracting out its original cataloging and
authority work to another agency. Ten law libraries contributing to ABN in
1983 located cataloging copy in the system for eighty to ninety percent of
their titles, but they complained about the use of LCSH in the records and
intended to lobby the ABN Standards Committee to allow use of the
Australian Legal Subject Headings. Members of the Australian Law
Librarians’ Group were also interested in a project to upgrade law reports
and legislation records to AACR2 standards for input into ABN, and in
using ABN to produce union lists of looseleaf services holdings.

VII. Management Issues

From 1975 to 1990, most professionals working in cataloging,
particularly those in larger law libraries, made the transition from law
cataloger to head of cataloging, catalog manager, or director of cataloging
services. The shift toward management is due partly to the fact that much
copy-cataloging can now be delegated to paraprofessionals, and partly
because this area of librarianship has become increasingly complex and
technical, requiring much more decision-making, planning, and problem-
solving on the part of the librarian. The major managerial topics reported
in the law library literature are: development of policies and procedures for
departmental cataloging and indexing; planning for data conversion, both
from AACR to AACR2 and from manual to machine-readable records;
devising methods or selecting services for catalog maintenance, authority
control or ‘data cleanup’; and planning and implementation of COM, CD-
ROM, or online catalogs.

University” is helpful for developing policies and procedures. She presents
a detailed summary of her local procedures manual, including planning,
statements of mission and goals, description of routine processes (with
sample cards and forms), and methods for keeping the manual up-to-date.
Her Cataloging Procedures Manual, published in 1987 in the AALL
Occasional Papers series, is oriented toward a library that maintains a card
catalog; however, it could be helpful to many types of law libraries as a
model to follow for developing one’s own handbook of procedures.

In “The N.Y.U. Law Library Catalogue Revisited,” Julius Marke
reminisces about the project that led to the 1953 publication of Catalogue
of the Law Collection at New York University. This article has a good
description of the effort involved in cataloging a law library collection.
Nearly 25,000 titles (which grew to 45,000 titles before the project’s end)
had to be cataloged in a relatively short period of time. The law library
hired four professional catalogers and several support staff, and Professor
Marke was intensely involved in completing the NYU Law Library
classification scheme, which had originally been sketched out by Fred B.
Rothman.
In a 1981 article, K.M. Hoover stresses the importance of check-in records, or "vertical files," and shelflists. Her article is addressed to state, court, and county libraries, which may not always have complete records. Hoover describes the methods and procedures for developing the card shelflist into an effective tool for collection management.

Indexing legal memoranda has been mentioned in section IV. Two representative articles and one "how to" book provide the managerial view on this topic. Marcy Dunning's article introduces techniques for providing access to special materials often maintained by law firm libraries, such as internal legal memos, substantive pleadings, important articles, outside cases, and decisions. She recommends that subject vocabulary lists and other data on the cataloging entry be tailor-made to the interests of the firm. The suggested arrangement for these documents is assencion numbering, rather than classification. Marie Wallace's article in Legal Economics is a more comprehensive overview of procedures for managing legal memoranda files. She advises that the firm's attorneys be involved in both the planning process and the ongoing writing of abstracts for the legal memos. The article is extensively illustrated. Kline D. Strong's Retrieval Systems for Lawyers is geared toward smaller and medium-sized law firms that do not have a professional librarian. This book discusses methods for organizing and controlling valuable research memoranda, opinion letters, forms, checklists, articles, and outlines that would otherwise be lost. Strong discusses types of indexes, whether items should be numbered, and how to store data. He presents two subject headings lists (one short and simple, the other more detailed), and ends with practical advice on how to make the system work.

A few articles focused on the conversion of bibliographic information from one form to another. In a paper entitled "AACR 2," Marion states that as law libraries implement the new rules, they will no longer use form subheadings, will greatly reduce the use of corporate bodies as main entries, and will need to change many personal name forms. Cataloging managers will have to consider whether to freeze the old catalog, whether to revise catalog entries or continue using the pre-AACR2 forms, whether to create split files with linking cross-references, and whether to recatalog serials for entry under title and re-cutter these works. Marion recommends adhering to uniform national standards when making these choices, especially if the library functions in a cooperative cataloging environment. This subject was taken up again at the 1979 AALL Annual Meeting in the program "Implications of the AACR2 for Law Libraries." One panelist weighs the advantages and disadvantages of starting a new catalog and provides various options (with illustrations) for integrating the new headings into the same file as the old headings. These options include
manual correction of the old headings, interfiling the old headings with the new, and using split files with linking cross-references.

Linda Cohen describes the procedures that the SUNY at Buffalo Law Library used to convert bibliographic descriptions of materials held in their Sea Grant Program collection from lists generated on a word processor to full catalog records produced through OCLC.

Even for collections that are fully cataloged, much planning and decision making is required when preparing to convert a library’s records to machine-readable form. In a case study of the California State Library Law Library’s experience with retrospective conversion, Chizuko Kawamoto shows how a close examination of manual file features helps automation planners anticipate problems and then develop policies and methods for efficient retrospective conversion projects. An earlier case study appears in an *International Journal of Law Libraries* article written by Chin Kim and Frederic Mansfield. The authors discuss a project at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to convert shelflist data to their local computer system, in preparation for automating circulation functions and closing the card catalog. Particular challenges for the law library included a simultaneous project to classify or reclassify materials and having to deal with government documents that lacked standard catalog descriptions. In a recent *Technical Services Quarterly* article, Veronica Maclay describes the planning and processes involved in incorporating full records for U.S. government documents into the Hastings Law Library online catalog; the library had used OCLC as its source for cataloging copy but was considering a change to MARCIVE, Inc.

Retrospective conversion projects are also the subject of a work by Mary F. Miller published in the AALL Occasional Papers series. Miller presents the results of a 1986 survey of U.S. law school libraries, including this information: collection size; bibliographic utilities used earlier, now, and in the future; tape-loading practices; proportion of collection converted; participation in shared cataloging projects; and further retrospective conversion plans. A recon ‘profile’ for each of the 159 respondent libraries is printed on a separate page of Miller’s work.

Several articles discuss catalog maintenance and authority control. In “Quality Control for Archival Tapes,” Matthews describes how the Southern Illinois University Law Library upgraded its OCLC archival records by deleting duplicate records, adopting a latest-use retention policy, and cancelling holdings for withdrawn titles. These measures ensured the integrity of a COM catalog produced from the tapes and will also have a beneficial effect on the library’s future online catalog. A 1989 *Law Library Journal* article by Michele Dalehite stressed the importance of authority
control even in an online catalog. Dalehite defined authority control as the application of the intellectual process of establishing names and subjects in consistent forms for bibliographic records and the provision of authority records with appropriate cross-references. She explains the categories of authority control that can be automated, particularly those that can be contracted out to a vendor; defines terms such as global change, flips, validation of MARC codes, manual review, and deblinding; and provides a checklist of specifications to develop for automated authority services, including the request-for-proposal and processing of a set of test data. Joseph Wynne describes the use of SOLINET's (now defunct) LAMBDA system for executing some of these automated authority "fixes" at the University of Virginia Law Library. Another case study, "Vendor Processing and Local Authority File Development," by Stone, evaluates the performance of Blackwell/North America's automated authority services as applied to the bibliographic records held by Florida State University Law Library.

Planning for and implementation of COM, CD-ROM, or online catalogs is the last management topic we consider. Library administrators, who are not as familiar with the USMARC language as are their catalog librarians, often find themselves engaged in the selection of an automation vendor. A 1990 Law Library Journal article by Jo Calk attempts to translate the basics regarding MARC tags, indicators, and subfield codes. Calk gives sample specifications that use MARC terminology to describe the services or functions of the vendors' software. The article includes a helpful glossary. In "Uses of OCLC Archival Tapes and Planning for Online Catalogs," Matthews analyzes the results of a questionnaire completed by ninety-five academic law libraries in 1987. She includes data on current or planned local online or COM catalogs, access to programmer services, methods employed for correcting machine-readable records, proportion of the collection's titles converted, and use of other bibliographic utilities in addition to OCLC. In an article written ten years earlier, Dennis Hyatt discusses the University of Oregon Law Library's rationale for producing a COM catalog and its experiences using the Blackwell/North America database for the product.

Martha Crane describes a CD-ROM-based catalog designed to support interlibrary loan and cooperative collection development among sixteen law libraries in "The New England Law Library Consortium: Resource Sharing with CD-ROM Technology." Crane outlines the procedures followed for selecting the vendor and creating the catalog. Problems encountered included differences in CD-ROM drives, inconsistencies in member libraries' standards for bibliographic records, and incomplete holdings information on some library archival tapes. Search capabilities of the union
catalog are described, with special features such as "shelf browsing" and the ability to search only the records of a particular library's database.

Some law libraries have automated their local catalogs by using microcomputer software. Helen Burwell describes the rationale her law firm library used to select INMAGIC. She discusses INMAGIC's applications, including cataloging functions, document indexing, and information security. In England, John Pemberton documented the University of Buckingham Law Library's experience using the PC-based software LIBRARIAN. Pemberton discusses the number of records the program can handle, response time, and software customizing to suit the library's needs. Although not in standard MARC format, some features made the LIBRARIAN program attractive, including a subject index that points out class numbers and the ability to combine search terms in a single inquiry. In a more recent Law Librarian article, Guy Holborn discusses the cataloging module of TINlib and its use at the Lincoln's Inn Library. Among the functions he describes are TINlib's real-time processing, customized record formats, and a "windowing" feature, which also includes a cut-and-paste function. Holborn reports that library staff enjoy searching in the TINlib catalog, which is flexible and user-friendly.

In an article about the use of NOTIS at Northwestern University Law Library, George Grossman addresses problems encountered when a law library shares an integrated system with other campus libraries. He also takes a comprehensive look at the system's strengths and weaknesses for cataloging functions and its impact on departmental workflow procedures.

VIII. The Public Catalog

Most of the policies and routines addressed thus far—shared cataloging, management issues, descriptive and subject cataloging—culminate in the creation of the cataloger's most important product, the public catalog. Even classification, the other principal contribution of the law cataloging staff, relies to some extent on the public catalog, since patrons and public services staff must often consult the catalog to find out where treatises and other secondary sources are classified.

At least four of the previously discussed publications devote some space to the public catalog. Matthews's little guide, Access Points to the Law Library, interprets AACR2 rules for the noncataloger in an effort to help users anticipate the headings under which works may be listed in the catalog. Hyatt's report about the University of Oregon Law Library's COM catalog indicates that the new catalog format was readily accepted by the public. One advantage of the COM catalog is that copies can be placed in many locations, no matter how remote. Currentness is sometimes a problem, however, because it is harder to keep the COM catalog up-to-date.
than the card catalog. Joseph Wynne mentions that the LAMBDA system once used at the University of Virginia Law Library also functioned as an online catalog for public services. Although there were some problems with the display formats, being able to search by terms within subject headings was a positive feature.

In her article “Subject Searching in Law Library OPAC’s,” Stone points out several areas in which the NOTIS public catalog might be improved. She describes difficulties with searches and displays for government agency names and titles of laws used as subjects. She argues that keyword searching will be advantageous in a law library catalog but has reservations about introducing call number search capabilities to the public. The public catalog was the focus of Lauren Pinsley’s 1988 Law Library Journal article, “Making the Card Catalog a More Vital Resource in the Academic Law Library.” Pinsley discusses how law students generally approach using the card catalog and explores several ideas for improving access to legal information. For example, she proposes that “see” references corresponding to West digest topics be added to subject authorities for the appropriate “valid” subject heading used in the catalog. She also suggests that there be added entries for the standard citation titles of law reviews, reporters, services, etc; for example, the cite “B.U.L. Rev.” would be a searchable term in the catalog, and the record for the Boston University Law Review would be retrieved.

Of all the suggestions for improving the usefulness of the public catalog in law libraries in recent years, perhaps the most innovative idea is that of adding catalog entries for the full-text titles contained in LEXIS and WESTLAW. In “Technical Services Aspects of Data Base Integration into the Law Library,” Marion notes that the valuable online services available in the library never appear in the library’s catalog. The omission of LEXIS and WESTLAW from the catalog is also a disservice to acquisitions staff, who would benefit from a more thorough picture of what titles the library holds. The author considers possibilities for using one terminal to switch between the library’s online catalog and the online search databases, thus providing electronic links between the controlled vocabularies of the different databases.

At least two academic law libraries proceeded to convert this idea into a reality. William Benemann presents a case study of the methods used by the Golden Gate University Law Library for adding bibliographic descriptions to the catalog for sets and serials available through WESTLAW and LEXIS. Various techniques were used, depending to some extent on whether the library owned the same title in hardcopy. Since AACR2 had no rules that definitively addressed this type of material, Benemann chose to pattern some of the catalog entries after the format
used by the Library of Congress for cataloging microform versions of printed works. By the time Matthews began her project at Southern Illinois University Law Library, she was able to apply the AACR2 revised Chapter 9 (Computer Files). Her article "Integrating Remote Computer File Databases into the Collection with Bibliographic Description" describes the interim measure of producing hundreds of LEXIS unit cards on which were typed title, corporate body, and subject headings for individual files or titles. After consultation with OCLC regional trainers and database quality control staff, the Southern Illinois University Law Library developed and modified its procedures. Applying Chapter 9 rules and the MARC format for computer files, the staff gradually converted these earlier unit cards to full catalog entries for all the LEXIS files.

The Law Program Committee of the Research Libraries Group has supported a project for adding such records to RLIN. The University of Minnesota Law Library has the assignment of cataloging the WESTLAW files. In her article on this subject, Gail Daly explains the rationale for providing bibliographic descriptions for the 1,120 WESTLAW titles and describes the informational and financial assistance from West Publishing Company. She also details the established cataloging guidelines, which are illustrated by two sample MARC records, and mentions future plans to develop a mechanism for regularly updating records, to provide set processing for RLIN cataloging users, and possibly to share the records with OCLC.

IX. Summary and Recommendations

Daly points out that "cooperative cataloging of the full-text files of the legal research databases is a project unlike anything the law library profession has attempted." It was possible because the participants adhered to national standards, consulted with authorities such as the Library of Congress and the RLG BibTech Committee, and sought the cooperation of the national bibliographic utilities.

Without question, the last fifteen years have been characterized by dramatic growth in both cooperation and standardization in law library cataloging. Law libraries have adopted AACR2 and the MARC formats and have been active participants in shared cataloging through the bibliographic utilities. In the United States, acceptance of the LC classification continues to increase, and librarians have even become proactive in the effort to develop the LC schedules. (The recently formed Consortium for Law Classification may truly be called a "cooperative" in the economic sense of the word; the law libraries making up the Consortium have pooled their resources to provide financial assistance for the completion of LC law schedules.) More than a few law libraries have
closed or frozen their card catalogs, and with the implementation of integrated online systems, some of the traditional barriers between cataloging and other library staff have been reduced.

What developments in law cataloging can we expect in the next ten or fifteen years? While it may be difficult to make such predictions, one can suggest further research, ideas for new projects or publications that might fill a gap or continue the progress described in this article.

Starting at the broadest level, a new survey of cataloging and classification practices might be a worthwhile project; ten years have elapsed since the last time all types of United States law libraries were surveyed on this topic. In the descriptive cataloging area, further studies are needed that give the law library perspective on the "multiple versions" cataloging question, the qualification and application of uniform titles, and choice-of-entry rules for administrative regulations. A "how to" manual on applying LC guidelines for cataloging looseleaf publications would probably find a publisher and a market, particularly if the manual contains numerous illustrations, including some looseleaf titles from the fields of business and medicine.

Three ideas regarding subject analysis come to mind. The Library of Congress has asked for suggested changes to LCSH, to simplify procedures and improve online searching; law-related subject headings might be studied toward this end. The law library view of the new MARC Format for Classification would also be of interest. How will the LC law subclasses, with their complex form tables and regional schedules, fit in with this format? A new handbook on use of the KF schedule, or perhaps one that deals with all the LC law subclasses, might be written. There have been many changes or refinements in practice since the last such manual was published almost twenty years ago.

Managing automation and new possibilities for public catalogs continue to be hot topics. Case studies might examine some of the following questions, focusing on the law library environment. What are the alternative sources of MARC records, and the advantages and disadvantages of "dropping out" from the bibliographic utilities? How do catalog maintenance and global change functions compare in certain online, CD-ROM, and microcomputer-based systems? What kinds of experiences have law libraries had with mounting other online databases onto the same menu as the local OPAC?

Cooperative projects involving the cataloging of law-related large microform sets or the retrospective assignment of LC class numbers to older cataloging copy may occupy some law libraries and vendors in the 1990s. Reports on such projects would make good journal articles. And finally, although a law library cataloging procedures manual was published
as recently as 1987, it might be useful to have a “model” procedures manual that is oriented toward an online system, rather than a card catalog environment.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of the new directions possible for law library cataloging and classification. The authors hope that the foundation on which the new directions are based will be strengthened by the contribution of this article and bibliography.
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