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For fifty years, the University of Washington’s unique program in law librarianship has been turning lawyers into librarians and has produced many of the leaders of the profession. This article examines the program’s beginnings under Arthur Beardsley, its ups and downs over most of the past half-century under Marian Gallagher, its present incarnation under Penny Hazelton, and the prospects for its future role in the education of law librarians.

Introduction

Nineteen ninety marked the fiftieth year that the University of Washington’s Law Librarianship Program has been taking in lawyers and turning out law librarians. The program was inaugurated in 1939 by University of Washington Law Librarian Arthur S. Beardsley and was carried on by Beardsley’s protégée, Marian Gould Gallagher, who died last year. The current director is Penny Hazelton, U.W. Law Librarian and President-Elect of AALL.

The law librarianship program has had a profound effect on the profession, producing several generations of law librarians and law library directors. The program’s graduates have worked in nearly every state in the union and in many foreign countries. Yet it all began as a twinkle in the eye of Beardsley. Perhaps the responses to his 1935 survey of the law librarianship profession prompted him to establish the U.W. program.

I. The Thirties

A. Early Interest in Formal Education for Law Librarianship

At the time of his 1935 survey, Arthur Beardsley was a member of the AALL Committee on Education for Law Librarianship. The Committee
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was created in 1929, but it was not until the mid-1930s, under Beardsley’s influence, that it began to have a real effect on professional training. One of the Committee’s activities was devising and sending out a questionnaire to large American law libraries; 351 librarians from 121 law libraries responded to the questionnaire in 1935.¹

One of these was Edwin Gholson, librarian of the Cincinnati Law Library Association, who wrote to Beardsley in January 1936:

I have one young woman assistant, and the unemployed time of one of the courthouse janitors, to aid me in running the library. Fortunately the janitor has been with the library for forty years or more, is thoroughly familiar with the arrangement of the books, and has an uncanny knack for tracing down authorities, but a lack of early education prevents him from being of any great assistance in keeping library records.²

A few weeks later, Beardsley heard from Mary E. Marks, librarian at the University of Wyoming. She wrote that she was not sure she should return the questionnaire at all:

The law library does not have a librarian in charge. I am law librarian only by virtue of the fact that the books for the law department are purchased and cataloged by the University library. I know they keep no statistics of any kind. I believe that they do have a student in charge, but there is no systematic organization of the library. I think that Dean Arnold and acting Dean Morris feel that it is not necessary since the library is so small. For my part, I think that they should have a librarian, but the final decision does not rest with me.³

One can only imagine Arthur Beardsley’s reaction to these letters. It is tempting to think of him sitting gloomily in the dark of winter in his office in Condon Hall, shaking his head and looking forward to August, when he would present the findings of his survey at the thirty-first Annual Meeting of AALL in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

At the previous annual meeting, Beardsley and the Committee had presented their report on the need for a formalized program of education for law librarians.⁴ Beardsley’s “ideal objective” was that all law librarians be trained both in law and library science; he recommended that AALL


³. *Id*.

work with the American Library Association toward development of courses in law librarianship at several approved library schools, along with apprenticeships in larger libraries and six-month “visiting librarianships.”5 The Committee “express[ed] doubts” about some of Beardsley’s ideas, but recommended that the AALL Executive Committee “might attempt to induce” one library school to give summer courses in law librarianship, and suggested that AALL provide funding for a “student visitor” program, under which participating law libraries would exchange library workers.6

No action was taken on the Committee’s 1935 report, but the new Committee on Education for Law Librarianship was charged, in the grand tradition of committee work, with further study of the question.7 Beardsley went right to work devising and sending out his survey. When the responses began to arrive, he carefully cut out each question and answer, pasted them onto separate sheets with the name of the responding library at the top of each, and filed them by question. He then went about preparing his report. He wrote:

For some years past, law librarians have talked about a program of educational training. At various times the matter has been the subject of discussion before the American Association of Law Libraries. Such talk have been dreams which have never materialized. Nothing has been done toward formulating and carrying out such a program. The reason therefore seems to have been an unwillingness to undertake the responsibility of providing professional training, and an indifference toward the opportunities which such a program might afford.8

Beardsley was accurate in his statement that the issue of education for law librarianship had been a subject of discussion for many years in AALL. As early as 1912, remarks by John Boynton Kaiser on the subject of library school training for law library employees appeared in Law Library Journal.9 Kaiser posed the question whether library schools ought to provide courses specifically geared toward training law librarians, then replied, “My answer is not ‘Yes’ categorically, by ‘Yes’ conditionally.”10 He recommended that most library schools should provide a few lectures on law librarianship, but only one or two should attempt to establish a specialized comprehensive curriculum, which he outlined, suggesting his own book on legal research as a textbook.11

5. Id. at 225.
6. Id. at 226-27.
7. Id. at 230.
10. Id. at 52.
11. Id. at 52-53.
The training of law librarians in law, library science, and “business efficiency” was discussed at the AALL Annual Meeting in 1914. Miss E. M. H. Fleming of Indiana said, “The time is here when we must vaunt law librarianship as a permanent profession,” rather than having it be a stepping stone to the law. She emphasized the importance of library training over law training, noting that “[t]he temptation to a mild practice of law is strong with the librarian in a small community. This is because of the money question. I believe it is a mistake. Remember always to be a bibliophile. You lose caste when you practice law ...” There were those who disagreed with Miss Fleming, and a lively discussion ensued, but no definite action came of it.

In 1926, Frederick, C. Hicks, law librarian at Columbia University, made reference to Charles C. Williamson’s 1923 report on training for librarianship, posing the rhetorical question: “[H]as not the time come for definite attention on the part of this Association to the problem of training for law librarianship?” Hicks announced that Columbia was planning to offer a course of study in legal bibliography and law library administration, “if a sufficient demand for them appears.”

An extended discussion led by Hicks took place at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting in June 1930. Frederick Schenk, then President of AALL, stated that “the library schools should have a combination course in which the law librarian is recognized to some degree.” The Association voted to appoint a committee to confer with the library schools and to work out a course of preparation for law librarianship.

In April 1932, Rosamond Parma, a member of the AALL Executive Committee, was on her way to New Orleans for the annual meeting when she ran into a library school director on the train. They discussed the possibility of a specific library school course in law librarianship. Ms. Parma was eager that such a course should be started, as “it would be a distinct recognition of law librarianship.” The Committee on Education for Law Librarianship had that year sent out a survey, which Parma
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presented at the meeting. She remarked that “each law librarian does a little musing when asked what is a proper education for law librarianship, and then offers an idealized autobiography.” Parma went on to note that the librarian who falls into law librarianship must necessarily learn something about the law, whereas the lawyer who ends up in law librarianship “is inclined to get along without learning anything about the librarian’s technique.” This situation, she noted, was part of the reason why the Education Committee had been formed, although the survey and report were inconclusive, recommending only “some of both” types of training. Parma rejected as “drastic” a suggestion that every law librarian should be a graduate of an accredited law school.

Thus, the stage was set for Arthur Beardsley, who, by the time of the 1936 Annual Meeting, had become chair of the Committee on Education. His report set out two alternative methods for educating law librarians: either a formal course of study centered around a library school curriculum, or an annual AALL institute in law library service, supplemented with home study courses, internships, and exchange and visiting librarianships.

The Committee’s 1935 survey showed that, of the 351 librarians responding, fourteen percent had law degrees and forty-three percent had no law training at all. Beardsley commented:

Those who maintain that the law course is not the essential training, but who feel that the library training is the more important type of training, cannot receive very much consolation from the survey which shows that forty-eight per cent of the law librarians reporting have had no library training whatever, and only sixteen per cent are graduates of a library course.

Most of the respondents supported some sort of formalized program for training both prospective law librarians and those already working in the field. However, there were a few opposed to the idea, including one librarian who advised the profession to “Get ’em while they are young schools are not necessary.”

Beardsley consulted with a number of library educators, including the president of the Association of American Library Schools, Ralph Munn,
himself law and library trained; and Dean C. C. Williamson of the Columbia University Library School, who stated that Columbia was prepared to offer a summer course in law librarianship “at any time when there is evidence of a real demand.”

Beardsley also consulted at some length with Ruth Worden, Director of the School of Librarianship at the University of Washington. He noted in his report that she wholeheartedly endorsed the idea of a formal library school course of training for law librarians. Her comments carry a ring of irony today, after fifty years of law librarianship education at the University of Washington: “[T]he idea is an excellent one. The courses should be given in connection with certain institutions where training would be possible in law libraries and in as central [a] position in the country at large as it is possible to find. I would suggest Chicago.”

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the report, one librarian stated, “It is obvious that there are just two natural centers for law library training-New York and Chicago. You may add the Pacific Coast.”

Beardsley noted that Hicks had reported to him the preceding day that Dean Williamson was ready to begin a course of study at Columbia at any time that AALL requested that he do so. In light of this, a motion was made that AALL endorse a program of education for law librarianship in an approved library school. The motion eventually carried, but not before one participant objected that:

[I]t is rather a confession of weakness to admit that prospective law librarians who already have had law should have to go to a general library school to study to be law librarians....

…I think it would be more practicable to establish a course on law librarianship in the law schools rather than to go to a school of general library training.

A second motion was made that the Executive Committee of AALL should put together an instructional institute in law librarianship for the next annual meeting. This motion was carried over the objection of a participant who felt that:

[A] library conference is the wrong time at which to hold an institute. There is too much diversion, too much confusion and too much lack of interest in what you are doing. You do not have the time or inclination to make a scientific study of anything. I think the meeting is sufficient to absorb most of the gray matter you have for that week.

29. Id. at 205.
30. Id. at 207.
31. Id. at 216.
32. Id. at 220.
33. Id. at 222.
The following year the AALL Annual Meeting was held in New York City, and the featured speaker was C. C. Williamson himself, Dean of then Columbia University School of Library Service. Williamson presented Columbia’s plan for a summer course in law librarianship, to begin in the summer of that year and to be taught by Miles O. Price. He also endorsed Beardsley’s idea of an internship, although Columbia did not include such a requirement in its initial plan. Williamson’s depiction in 1937 of the brave new world of law librarianship is prophetic in its description of what the Beardsley/Gallagher course at the University of Washington would later become:

I should not be surprised if the successful law librarians of the future should come largely from a group of men and women who have college training, legal training, and a one-year library school course, including a law library major, followed by an internship in some first class law library.

The actual three-unit course at Columbia focused intensively on legal materials—book selection, ordering, and reference work—along with aspects of administration. The course was not designed to be a full program in law librarianship; the focus was on preparing students to do reference work in a law library. Guest lecturers included Harry Bitner, Myron Jacobstein, and Meira Pimsleur. Admission requirements were liberal; some of the students did not have college degrees. Miles O. Price, writing in 1962, noted that “[an] augmented curriculum, open not only to law school graduates but to other serious, if somewhat less abundantly degreed, librarians is needed.” The course was offered every other summer from 1937 to 1961, when Price retired.

In other developments during this period, the Association of American Law Schools determined that, after September 1940, each member law school would be required to have “a qualified librarian, whose principal activities are devoted to the development and maintenance of an effective library service.”

Thus, after 1940, law schools would be expected to maintain full-time librarians, rather than merely using, as William Roalfe put it in a 1938 article, “an untrained but deserving widow of some professor, a broken down lawyer or teacher who has not made good, a clerk, or perhaps a regular faculty member who is more or less fully occupied with teaching.

34. Williamson, Plans for Training of Law Librarians at Columbia University, 30 LAW LIBR. J. 261 (1937).
35. Id. at 264.
and other duties.”

Roalfe went on to outline the type of education a good law librarian should have. He included a broad general educational background, familiarity with library science, some understanding of the law, and “some practical experience in an efficiently administered law library.” He also stressed the importance of faculty status for the law librarian, so that the librarian “commands the confidence of the faculty so far as library problems are concerned.”

B. The Beginnings at U. W.: Beardsley and “Miss Gould”

Arthur Beardsley was a thoroughgoing Washingtonian, having been born in Aberdeen in what was then Washington Territory. He began with a teaching degree, then went on to law school at the University of Washington. His myopia kept him out of the Army, during World War I, but he landed a job as librarian at Camp Lewis, south of Tacoma.

He was hired as law librarian at U.W. in 1921 and later went on, in the mid-1920s, to earn both a library degree and a Ph.D. in political science. His doctoral dissertation was entitled *Legal Bibliography and the Use of Law Books*, and he later published a course book under the same title. Around 1929, he marshalled the law library’s move from “a corner in the Philosophy Building” into Condon Hall, designing the library’s layout.

Beardsley wrote extensively about the history of Washington. He compiled a three-volume history of the Washington bench and bar and collected numerous photographs of attorneys from the area. His manuscript has been tucked away for forty years, but his son, Wallace Beardsley, reports that it has recently found an editor and expects that it will be published within the next two to three years.

Arthur Beardsley’s knowledge of history and his love of old and rare books gave him a good eye for books with value. On one occasion, he jumped at the opportunity to obtain certain issues of Washington territorial legislative journals that he knew were extremely rare, as that particular batch of journals had been published on the East Coast and carried around Cape Horn in the *Brother Jonathan*, which sank off the California coast in the late 1850s. A few copies managed to reach Washington overland.

Arthur Beardsley was a person driven to get things accomplished; he was somewhat impatient, but genuinely interested in and fond of his

39. Id. at 349.
40. Id. at 352.
students. He taught Legal Bibliography to law students, and he often invited them to his summer home on Bainbridge Island in Puget Sound, on one occasion even lending his home to a student for a honeymoon. Each year, one of the law students who worked in the library would be designated to, drive Beardsley the mile or so to work and back, as he couldn’t see well enough to drive.\(^{41}\)

By 1939 Beardsley had become president of AALL, and was taking matters into his own hands at the University of Washington. He discussed with Ruth Worden and Judson F. Falknor, Dean of the Law School, the establishment of a program in law librarianship that would lead to a specialized degree. In September 1939, Worden and Falknor recommended to University President L. P. Sieg that a one-year course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Law Librarianship be installed.\(^ {42}\) Worden and Falknor justified their request for a law librarianship program and degree by referring to the new American Association of Law Schools’ requirement of a full-time, “qualified” librarian. They argued also that, aside from Columbia’s summer course, no library school had as yet attempted to “scientifically and systematically provide thorough-going preparation for law librarianship.”\(^ {43}\)

They recommended that admission to the course should be limited to law graduates, that a foreign language requirement be adopted, and that “no more than five at the most should be admitted to the course in any one year.”\(^ {44}\)

Another compelling argument, at least from Beardsley’s point of view, was the library’s difficulty in retaining well-trained assistant librarians. For example, the assistant librarian at the time, “Miss Gould” (Marian Gould Gallagher) had just been offered the Law Librarian position at the University of Utah, and they expected that she would be leaving soon.\(^ {45}\)

The news about Miss Gould must have been particularly disappointing to Dean Falknor, who had spotted Marian Gould as a young law student and recruited her upon her graduation in 1937 to be Beardsley’s assistant. Dean Falknor took a lively interest in the law library, and his interest in the careers of Miss Gould and of a later law librarianship student, Betty Wilkins, was motivated not only by a desire to find work for his graduates but also by the necessity to groom a replacement for Arthur Beardsley.

---
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who was approaching retirement. Beardsley, on the other hand, didn’t know Miss Gould “from a hole in the ground,” as she put it, and he was initially opposed to her appointment as his assistant. Falknor prevailed, however, and Miss Gould went to work in the law library in the summer of 1937. She found it to be “great fun,” and she began to think seriously about getting a library degree. Dean Falknor had continued his interest in Miss Gould’s career, and he was able to get assistantship funding to enable her to go to library school while working half-time at the law library.

At that time, the University of Washington’s School of Librarianship offered the Bachelor of Arts in Librarianship degree, a forty-five-credit course. A special certificate in library work with children was offered. Prospective students were advised that those “with serious physical defects, personality difficulties, or ill health” need not apply, nor would anyone over the age of thirty be considered unless he or she had “satisfactory experience in library service.” Marian Gould qualified on all counts, and she began library school in the fall of 1938.

Arthur Beardsley had a rather low opinion of librarianship as it was taught and practiced outside of law libraries. He was horrified when Miss Gould would return from class with reports of her assignments; he failed to see the relevance to law libraries of her book reviews of children’s literature. (He was enthusiastic about only one thing she learned that year: how to prevent curling in telephone books by attaching cheesecloth to the pages with flour-and-water paste.) Beardsley felt that, as law librarian, he himself could provide the kind of training in legal bibliography, reference, collection development, and administration that he wanted for his assistants.

By the fall of 1939, after Miss Gould had earned her library degree and was again working full-time as his assistant, Beardsley was meeting regularly with Dean Falknor and Library School Director Worden about setting up a law librarianship course, and they were all eager to get started. In their September 16 letter to President Sieg, Falknor and Worden asked that the program be inaugurated immediately, as “undoubtedly two or three desirable students” from the past few law classes would be interested.

50. Letter to Sieg, supra note 42.
President Sieg was enthusiastic about the proposal from the beginning. Within two days he responded with a memo to “My dear Miss Worden,” giving his “wholehearted” approval, subject to confirmation by the University Curriculum Committee. 51 Shortly thereafter, a notice appeared in Law Library Journal, announcing the new one-year course at the University of Washington as a cooperative project of the law and library schools. Admission was to be limited to not more than five students. 52

In October 1939, Ruth Worden wrote to Anita M. Hostetter, Secretary of the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association, outlining the new course and asking for any suggestions as to its content. 53 Hostetter replied that there was “a real place for such a curriculum in a western library school,” but that she had reservations about the separate degree for law librarianship students, noting that the curriculum appeared to be no more specialized than the library school’s curricula for children’s and school librarianship. 54

The separate degree issue would come back to haunt the program on two later occasions. But in 1939, no one else involved in setting up the new course had any problems with a separate law librarianship degree, and “two promising students,” Betty Wilkins and Edgar Bodenheimer, signed up for the new course that fall.”

II. The Forties

A. The First Class

The first year’s program consisted of three courses in cataloging and classification, two reference courses, history of books and libraries, and four courses specifically geared toward law libraries and taught by Dr. Beardsley, whom the library school began to list as a faculty member. The law librarianship students were given instruction in cataloging from Mary Hoard, Arthur Beardsley’s cataloger, who had both law and library degrees. In addition, “practice,” or field work in a law library, was part of the curriculum.

51. Memorandum from L. P. Sieg to Ruth Worden (Sept. 18, 1939) (University of Washington Archives, Librarianship School file) [hereinafter referred to as U.W. Librarianship School archives].
52. Law Librarianship Course Offered at University of Washington, 32 LAW LIBR. J. 430 (1939).
56. Letter to Hostetter, supra note 53.
Betty Wilkins graduated from the University of Washington law school in 1938, the year after Marian Gould. Of her class of 106, 3 of whom were women, only 33 graduated, due in large part to economic conditions. There were few jobs available in 1938, for law graduates or anyone else. Dean Falknor, again looking to the future of the law library, came to Betty Wilkins’s rescue as he had to Marian Gould’s, and offered her a half-time job filling in for Miss Gould, who at that time was beginning library school and could only work mornings.\(^{57}\)

Wilkins gladly accepted. A year later, she became half of the first class of law librarians under the Beardsley program, the class of ’40. The other half was Edgar Bodenheimer, who had both a German law degree and one from the University of Washington. Bodenheimer went on to become Law Librarian at the University of Utah in 1944, and later to teach law at Utah and the University of California at Davis. Wilkins remained in Seattle.\(^{58}\)

Around the time that Betty Wilkins was beginning library school in 1939, Marian Gould left the University of Washington on what was to be a year’s leave of absence to go to the University of Utah law library and catalog some of their old treatises. She had such a good time that year that she resigned her position at U.W. to become the Law Librarian at Utah.\(^{59}\)

The Engineering School at Utah had arranged for Marian Gould to teach contracts to its students, but once the School discovered she was a woman, they reneged. She did, however, teach Introduction to Law and Legal Bibliography at the law school. One factor in her decision to stay in Utah may well have been the presence in her class of young Wayne Gallagher, a first-year law student. They were later married, and his name, in a roundabout way, now graces the Marian Gould Gallagher Law Library at the University of Washington.\(^{60}\)

Meanwhile, back in Washington, Betty Wilkins earned her Bachelor of Arts in Law Librarianship in 1940 and went to work as circulation and reference librarian at the U.W. Law Library under Arthur Beardsley. She remained in that position for three years, eventually leaving to raise a family. But this was not the end of her history with the U.W. Law Library. She returned after an absence of over twenty years to become assistant librarian and, eventually, head librarian until her retirement in 1985.\(^{61}\)

Betty Wilkins remembers Arthur Beardsley as “a stern figure, but a good librarian.” He accepted her a little more easily after Marian Gould

---
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60. Id. at 43-45.
61. Id. at 213-14, 226-27.
had broken the ground ahead of her, but Beardsley always made it clear that “it was his library.” Beardsley’s chief interest, she says, was in rare books and in the history of the Washington bench and bar. Part of her job involved scanning rare book catalogs, although Beardsley reserved for himself the final decision on purchases.\(^6^2\)

In 1941, the law librarianship program graduated two other students under Beardsley’s tutelage, Eleanor Barrows and her identical twin sister, Evelyn. Eleanor became a reference librarian at the U.W. law library and worked there until her retirement in 1984.\(^6^3\)

**B. The Return of Marian Gallagher**

Meanwhile, over in Utah, Marian Gould Gallagher was beginning to miss Washington State:

> You see, all the water in Utah is in reservoirs, and I can remember one night going across the street where there was a space in this square block, maybe it was two or three square blocks. I went out there one night when they had a full moon and walked clear around the reservoir trying to make the moon make a path on it—you know the way it does on Puget Sound. And it wouldn’t do it... I liked Utah very much. But after five years, I started missing the water. So I started thinking maybe I should get out of there. I came home in 1944 when Dean Falknor called and asked me to come back and take Beardsley’s place.”\(^6^4\)

Arthur Beardsley’s son, Wallace, feels that his father’s resignation as law librarian was encouraged by Dean Falknor to make room for Marian Gallagher. Beardsley was not in the best of health; he suffered from heart trouble and inadequately controlled diabetes. When he left the law library in 1944, he went on to the chairmanship of the Washington State Code Commission and into law practice as a Deputy Prosecuting Attorney for King County. By the time he resigned, Beardsley had given twenty-three years of his life to the law library.

When Beardsley left law librarianship in 1944, he never looked back. When he died in 1950 at the age of 61, he was no longer a member of AALL; however, he was given a posthumous honorary membership a few years later.\(^6^5\)

Marian Gallagher became law librarian at U.W. and inherited Beardsley’s law librarianship program, although students were sparse.

\(^{62}\) Telephone interview with Betty Wilkins, *supra* note 46.

\(^{63}\) Oral History, *supra* note 46, at 258; Alumni Records (LLP file); Telephone interview with Betty Wilkins, *supra* note 46.

\(^{64}\) Oral History, *supra* note 46, at 42, 46.

\(^{65}\) Telephone interview with Wallace Beardsley, *supra* note 41.
during the war years. One wartime student, Regina Adams, met with a bicycle accident during her last quarter and did not finish. The first Gallagher graduate was Betty LeBus, class of ’49, who began her career at the U.W. Law Library and later went on to become law librarian at Indiana University, the University of Wyoming, and the University of Miami.66

Although the program was sparsely attended during the forties (and even into the sixties, when there were several years without any students at all), no attempt was ever made to recruit students. Since 1939, the law librarian’s position at U.W. has included stewardship of the law librarianship program, but the stewardship has been a function that Marian Gallagher and those who followed her have officially done in their spare time. No additional salary was ever paid for this work, either by the library school or the law school.67

Teaching the four courses per year, devising and grading assignments, and integrating the students into the daily life of the law library were time-consuming parts of Marian Gallagher’s work, and she was almost relieved in the years when no applications were submitted for the program. She said that she sometimes felt like hiding out when the new students would arrive in the fall. This feeling didn’t last long, however, as “it was real easy to get attached to them.”68

Throughout the forties, the curriculum remained much the same as Beardsley had arranged it, with two courses, Advanced Legal Bibliography, and Selection and Processing of Law Library Materials, taught in the autumn quarter; Legal Reference and Research in winter; and Law Library Administration in spring. By 1946, the suggested maximum age for admission to the School of Librarianship had been raised to thirty-five, but “personality defects” and ill health were still limiting factors in admission.69

During the forties, efforts were made by the school to upgrade its two bachelor’s degrees to the master’s level. In May 1949, the University’s Faculty Senate approved the degrees of Master of Library Service and Master of Law Librarianship, subject to action by the Graduate Council. Nothing came of this, however, until three years later.70

66. Alumni Records (LLP file); Memorandum, supra note 58.
68. Gallagher interview, supra note 49.
70. Agenda for University of Washington Faculty Senate Meeting (Oct. 2, 1952) (LLP file) [hereinafter Agenda].
During the forties, Earl Borgeson was working his way through law school doing library work. As graduation loomed and he saw his fellow law students siphoned off to work in small firms, or going to work as insurance adjusters, he began to think about combining his law and library interests. He looked through a few issues of Law Library Journal and wrote letters to the authors of articles that interested him, asking how a young man could get a start in the profession. Everyone he heard from and spoke to about law librarianship told him he had two choices: Miles Price’s summer course at Columbia, or Marian Gallagher’s one-year program at Washington. He chose the Gallagher option because of its reputation and comprehensive curriculum, and he became the class of 1950.  

### III. The Fifties

#### A. The Early Fifties

As Borgeson was the only student that year, classes were conducted in Mrs. Gallagher’s office in Condon Hall. Betty LeBus had graduated from the program but was still working in the law library, and she became, as Borgeson puts it, his “teaching fellow without portfolio.” They both worked in the library and often engaged in lively discussions that complemented the classroom instruction; thus began a lifelong friendship.

A major component of the Selection and Processing class in those days was what Earl Borgeson calls the “model law library” project, in which the student was given a fictitious budget and asked to determine what books and how many copies to buy, and to set up an acquisitions system for a new law library. Borgeson went on to several positions in major law libraries, as well as coordinating courses and internships for law librarians from the People’s Republic of China and South America. Although he is retired now, he maintains an active interest in the law librarianship program and has been one of its most consistent supporters through the years.

Other students from the early fifties include Riley Paul Burton, Mary K. Sanders, Jackie Bartells, Jack Leary, Viola Bird, and Diana Priestly. Mary K. Sanders did her field work in pre-statehood Alaska, at the Anchorage and Juneau district court libraries. She and another student

---
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discarded old legal material, rearranged the libraries, and set up check-in systems. Mary resumed her position at the U.W. reference desk following graduation.  

Viola Bird took twenty-two years to get through law school; she began in 1927, but took time off to raise a family before earning her law degree in 1950. She spent two years in the law librarianship program, earned her degree, went off on a summer vacation, and upon her return, found a note from Marian Gallagher asking her to take Mary Sanders’ place as assistant law librarian. Viola Bird remained at U.W. for twenty years and was active in AALL, serving a term as president in 1971-72. She was named Distinguished Alumnus for 1981 by the U.W. library school’s Alumni Association.

Diana Priestly, Viola Bird’s classmate during her last year in the program, received the Distinguished Alumnus award in 1988. She became Canada’s first dual-degree law librarian, starting and later encouraging a trend toward law-trained librarians in Canada’s law schools. She went into law librarianship because her mother had always wanted her to be a librarian and “in those days, you listened to your mother.”

**B. The First Attempt to Eliminate the Law Librarianship Degree**

By 1953, the University of Washington’s library school’s two degrees had been upgraded to the Master’s level. But Viola Bird and Diana Priestly, the first U.W. law librarianship students to earn the new Master of Law Librarianship degree, almost didn’t receive their degrees. Someone had suggested that a separate degree for law librarianship was not needed, and formal action was taken by the University to merge the degree into a general Master of Librarianship degree.

Robert L. Gitler became director of the School of Librarianship at the University of Washington in 1946. Under his leadership, the library school moved toward offering master’s degrees in place of the second bachelor’s degrees, following a nationwide trend toward acknowledging that library students were in fact studying at the postgraduate level. Although Gitler left in 1950, the groundwork had been laid, and by 1952, the library school was prepared to offer the new Master of Library Service and Master of Law Librarianship degrees.

---
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The move toward master’s degrees for librarians coincided with increasing attention in academic law library circles to the need for librarians with both law and library training, librarians who could take their place as full members of law school faculties. Numerous articles were written on this subject in the late 1940s and early 1950s.79

In conjunction with this move to a master’s degree, the Law Librarianship program was rearranged to extend over four quarters rather than the three quarters previously employed for the bachelor’s degree. Students would thenceforth take Advanced Legal Bibliography in the autumn quarter, Legal Reference in the winter, Directed Field Work in the spring, and Law Library Administration and Selection/Processing in the summer. Thought was given to allowing students without law degrees into the program, but this suggestion was never implemented.80

In 1949, approval had been given for the two new degrees of Master of Librarianship and Master of Law Librarianship. However, the U.W. Graduate Council, which had final approval authority over the new degrees, modified the proposal to “combin[e] the two degrees under a single offering”: the Master of Librarianship degree.81

No formal action was taken in 1949, however, and the situation remained in limbo until 1952, when master’s degrees were to be offered for the first time. In the fall of 1952, Marian Gallagher saw an item on the agenda for the University Senate Meeting of October 2, 1952: a proposal that the separate law librarianship degree be eliminated. She sent a quietly outraged note to law school Dean George Stevens, asking simply, “How come you let this happen to US?”82

Dean Stevens, one of many law schools deans and faculty members over the years who have provided extraordinary support for the law librarianship program, immediately contacted the University Curriculum Committee, requesting that he and other law school faculty be allowed to present their views on the issue of a separate Master of Law Librarianship degree at the Committee’s next meeting.83

Marian Gallagher prepared a memorandum for Dean Stevens on the history of the Law Librarianship Program, setting forth at length the
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justification for a separate program and separate degree. Gallagher met the issue head-on, referring to earlier objections made by the University librarian to the effect that the prime functions of a law librarian are no different from those of any other librarian, and that ‘medical librarians need not be doctors; engineering librarians need not be engineers; and law librarians should not necessarily be lawyers. 1184 She answered: ‘This argument fails to recognize the law library as an integral part of the teaching facilities of the law school. The law library is often called the law school’s laboratory, because it contains the only tools with which the faculty and students can work.’ 85

She noted also that the Association of American Law Schools had adopted the requirement that all member schools have a qualified full-time librarian, and she pointed to the trend toward faculty status for law librarians, indicating an increased demand by member schools for law librarians with specialized training. 86

Dean Stevens met with the Curriculum Committee and was referred to the Graduate Council. He prepared an eloquent defense of the separate degree program:

Under the present proposal, for the degree of Master of Librarianship, there are two separate and distinct admissions requirements, following two separate and distinct curricula, with different objectives, leading to the same degree … [S]ince entrance requirements are different, since the curriculum is different, since the objective is different, I think it is confusing and inaccurate to end up with the same degree …

This School has granted a degree of Bachelor of Law Librarianship. The degree is unique. It has attracted considerable attention among the members of the Association of American Law Schools who want legally trained, as well as library trained, librarians. This School, both by curriculum and by degree, offered an ideal combination. 87

Graduate School Dean Stoke commented in response that the degree had likely been rejected because out of three to four hundred degrees conferred by the library school over the years, only seven of those were law librarianship degrees?’ Dean Stevens answered:

The law librarianship program has not been pushed to date because it has [until now] been in an experimental state. It has been tried and proven. There is every reason to believe that the number of students
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who will seek this program will steadily increase, especially if the
special degree factor is retained. Stevens also noted the recent trend toward fully trained law librarians
even outside academia—in law firms, bar associations, city and county law
libraries, and government agencies.
A special subcommittee of the Graduate Council was formed to study
the problem, and on December 17, 1952, it recommended establishment of
a separate Master of Law Librarianship degree, rejecting as “not
compelling” arguments that the University already offered too many
specialized degrees. The subcommittee noted that the program had a
specialized curriculum and distinct entrance requirements and was more
than a major within the librarianship degree: “Law Librarians do not
specialize as custodians of books, but are essentially research people. In
most instances the Law Librarian does some teaching, and in some cases is
a regular member of the Law School faculty.”

The Executive Committee of the graduate school and the Curriculum
Committee recommended approval of the Master of Law Librarianship
degree on February 9, 1953; Viola Bird and Diana Priestly received their
degrees in August of that year.
Throughout the fifties, the University of Washington program
continued to turn lawyers into librarians. Kathleen Godfrey came to the
program from a position as associate attorney with the firm of Covington &
Burling in Washington, D.C., looking for a career that would impinge less
on her personal life. James McArdle arrived in 1955 motivated by “a
desire to hide behind the veil of academia.” McArdle has been the
Librarian at the King County Law Library in Seattle for the past
twenty-nine years.

Dan Henke, now law library director at the University of California
(Hastings) in San Francisco and a member of the class of ’56, reports that
the most useful aspect of his training for law librarianship was “Gallagher’s
flashing blue eyes when handling faculty prima donnas.”

The program began to receive more public attention during the fifties.
Marian Gallagher published an article in 1953, describing the program and
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explaining its small number of graduates by noting that the course had, until only recently, focused on training library assistants for the University of Washington Law Library. The program was just emerging from the experimental stage and had never before been advertised. She concluded with a classic description of the ideal law librarianship student:

Industrious, alert, charming, attentive to detail, refined, imaginative, unafraid of briefing for a judge or getting filthy shifting books, dependable, receptive to taking and following orders, able to direct underlings to inspired heights, incorruptible, sincerely interested, attractive (and if women, not interested in persons who think a woman’s place is in the home), amusing, cheerful, imperturbable, diplomatic, and Summa Cum Laude.96

In 1951, the AALL Committee on Education and Placement reported, “The number of lawyers attending library school has increased considerably since 1949, so that there are now available for employment more with both library and law degrees than ever before.”97 The report listed the schools offering law librarianship training, citing the full-year course at the University of Washington as “[t]he most ambitious project.”98 By 1957, Miles Price commented that “the roster of [Marian Gallagher’s] graduates begins to read like a roll of honor in the profession.”99

IV. The Sixties

The 1960s were a relatively quiet period for the program. *Law Library Journal* published a lengthy symposium in 1962 on “Educating Law Librarians.”100 Articles were contributed by Marian Gallagher, who described the U.W. program,101 and by Earl Borgeson.102

During this period, students taking Advanced Legal Bibliography spent the quarter updating the law school’s “Legal Research Guide,” a manual for first-year students and law library patrons. In Selection and Processing of Law Library Materials, students were given a budget to build the collection of an imaginary law library, working with budgeting and
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acquisitions systems. Law Library Administration covered budget requests, interlibrary cooperation, records and circulation systems, remodeling, and personnel. Legal Research and Reference involved individualized research projects such as compiling annotated bibliographies for book selection and preparing instructions for subject indexing.¹⁰³

Students graduating in the 1960s included Al Coco, who later went on to become law librarian at the University of Denver College of Law, where he set up a Master of Law Librarianship course as a joint degree program with the Graduate School of Librarianship and Information Management. The program ended when the library school closed.¹⁰⁴

Patrick Kehoe, Professor of Law and Director of the Law Library at American University in Washington, D.C., entered the program in 1967, after nine years as a student assistant at the U.W. Law Library.¹⁰⁵ Among his other publications, he is coeditor of the manual, Law Librarianship: A Handbook.¹⁰⁶

Following in the footsteps of Edgar Bodenheimer, the first foreign-trained student in the law librarianship program, a number of students from foreign countries went through the program in the 1960s. Myrna Feliciano of the Philippines went on to become the library director at the University of the Philippines College of Law. Jatindra Mukerji, with a law degree from Allahabad University in India, became law librarian at Seton Hall and at the Supreme Court Library in Brooklyn, New York. Tai Ro Lee of South Korea is now Professor of Law and Academic Vice President of Seoul National University. Sng Yok Fong returned to Singapore, where she became head of the law library at the National University.¹⁰⁷

V. The Seventies

A. The Law School and Law Library Move Off Campus

The 1970s began quietly enough, with no clue that by the end of the decade the separate degree would come under attack for the third time with, on this occasion, fatal results.

James L. Hoover, Law Librarian and Professor of Law at Columbia University, has fond memories of his legal bibliography class: “Four of us sitting around [Marian Gallagher’s] desk in the old building the perfect
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educational environment.” He began library school in 1973 and was in on “the big move,” when the law school was transferred from old Condon Hall, in the middle of the campus, to the new building, west of the main campus.108

Laurel Clapp, now Law Librarian and Professor of Law at Cumberland School of Law, Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama, signed on for the class of ’70 after rejecting a job offer from a law book publisher to become an associate editor, at a salary of $5,400 a year. (Even the promised increase to $6,000 after three years wasn’t enough to tempt her.)109 Jon Schultz was attracted to the program because of its reputation for placement and quality, and because his law school library director told him it was a “good racket.” Schultz has parlayed his “racket” into a position as Professor of Law and Director of the Law Library at the University of Houston.110 Walter McLeod, class of ’72, and former director of the law library at the University of Idaho, was introduced to the program by the dean of the University of Montana Law School, who recommended Marian Gallagher as “the preeminent Law Librarian of the United States.”111 Albert Brecht had been advised to come to the U.W. program because “it was the best and it didn’t cost too much.” A former AALL president, Brecht is now Director of the Law Library and Professor of Law at the University of Southern California. His classmate, Thomas Heitz, has left law librarianship to become librarian at the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York.112

A. Michael Beaird was the only law librarianship student in the class of 1975, but he was joined in classes by Jane Stewart, now the “dean” of law firm librarians in Seattle, who already had a library degree and was a law firm librarian at the time.113

The class of ’76 was the largest one yet, with six students, including Penny Hazelton, who is Law Librarian and Professor of Law at the University of Washington, director and teacher in the Law Librarianship Program, and president-elect of AALL. The program began in the summer quarter, and Penny Hazelton and many of her classmates had to study for and take the bar examination while carrying a fifteen-credit class load in library school.114 In spite of the work, her class had a good year:
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“Everyone always felt special because Mrs. Gallagher is special; ... there was a camaraderie right away.”\textsuperscript{115} The class of ’76 was not aware of activities taking place behind the scenes, which were to culminate in eliminating the degree they were on their way to earning.

\textbf{B. Trouble on the Horizon}

While Penny Hazelton and her classmates were making their way through the program, an accreditation team from the American Library Association visited the University of Washington School of Librarianship, a visit which would have far-reaching consequences for the law librarianship program.

The School of Librarianship was a part of the Graduate School, so the accreditation team spoke with a number of people there. The team also met with officials, including Morgan Thomas, Associate Dean for Academic Programs at the Graduate School, who became a driving force in the elimination of the M.L.L. degree.\textsuperscript{116} One person the team did not meet with was Marian Gallagher. No one from the team came to the law school to talk with her or to observe her classes. She remembered seeing them only once, at a lunch at the faculty club. Someone else explained the law librarianship program to them.\textsuperscript{117}

When the accreditation report was issued in January 1976, the evaluation contained only brief mention of the law librarianship program. The committee described the law librarianship course as distinctive and unique, but it expressed concern that the program was, perhaps excessively, built around one person. It encouraged the library school to consider integrating the law librarianship courses more completely into the overall library school curriculum.\textsuperscript{118}

Marian Gallagher could read between the lines and saw the implied threat to the separate degree program; however, “it didn’t worry me,” she said with irony, “because I knew it wouldn’t work.”\textsuperscript{119}

She knew that the library school, along with other schools and departments at the university, was operating in an era of shrinking budgets, and the university administration was looking for ways to cut back on the number of degree programs. But at first she didn’t feel that the law librarianship course was in danger because there was no additional cost to
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the library school; she received no extra salary beyond what she earned as law librarian for teaching and supervising the law librarianship students.120

The law school bore the costs such as office supplies, photocopying, and use of classrooms and facilities. The law school deans and faculty were the first to spring to the defense of the program; they remained some of its most ardent and articulate supporters throughout the drama that led to the elimination in 1983 of the separate M.L.L. degree.121

Meanwhile, the class of ’77 (all five of them) was having a wonderful time, unaware that storm clouds were brewing. Tim Kearley and Sally Wise describe their class as a very congenial group,122 and Marian Gallagher remembered them as “the sociable class.”123 They had a great time, but they also must have learned something, as three of them went on to become law library directors.124

An ad hoc Graduate Degree Committee was formed for the purpose of investigating and making recommendations for the School of Librarianship’s programs in the Wake of the 1976 accreditation report. In July 1977, they reported their findings to Morgan Thomas, Associate Dean of the Graduate School. The Committee noted that the Master of Law Librarianship program did a good job of training “the few individuals who select that program,” but that relatively few special courses were offered, and these were all taught by one person. The Committee recommended that the general Master of Librarianship program be extended to two years, and that perhaps law librarianship could become an area of specialization, rather than a separate degree.125

Peter Hiatt, Director of the School of Librarianship at the time of the report, was concerned enough to write to Morgan Thomas in January 1978, seeking his support.126 Hiatt indicated that the library school was opposed to any proposal to merge the two degrees, noting that the program was unique and had earned immense respect among law librarians.127

Hiatt also noted that Marian Gallagher was contemplating retiring in a few years and the law school was in the process of selecting a new dean.

---
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suggested that decisions on the future of the law librarianship program should be postponed until the issue could be discussed with the new dean and Marian Gallagher.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{C. A Negative Vote and Its Consequences}

The Executive Committee of the Graduate School was not prepared to wait. At a special meeting on April 25, 1978, two committee members expressed concern about the law librarianship program’s dependence on Marian Gallagher, one stating that the program should be allowed to lapse unless a scholar of her caliber could be found to run it. \textsuperscript{129} When the Executive Committee met again on May 2, it voted unanimously to discontinue the program leading to the degree of Master of Law Librarianship, effective September 1978.\textsuperscript{130}

No representative of the School of Librarianship had been present at the May 2 meeting. As of May 25, no official word of the decision had reached the library school, but rumors abounded. Peter Hiatt protested to Graduate School Dean Ron Geballe the lack of official notice, characterizing as “unacceptable” the apparent decision to eliminate the degree.\textsuperscript{131}

When Law School Dean Ernest Gellhorn found out what was happening, he protested to Morgan Thomas the failure to include the law school in discussions of the law librarianship proposal. He obtained Thomas’s agreement to postpone any action on the matter until the law school had an opportunity to respond in writing to the proposal.\textsuperscript{132} A deadline of October 31, 1978, was set for submission of the law school’s report.\textsuperscript{133}

On June 14, Dean Gellhorn wrote to University Provost George Beckmann, notifying him that the law school’s recommendation would be forthcoming by October 31. In this letter, he deplored “the failure to include the Law School and its Librarian (who has been the principal instructor and guide for this nationally recognized program) in the process by which this proposal was developed.”\textsuperscript{134}
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Gellhorn gave Marian Gallagher and the law school’s Graduate Studies Committee, headed by Professor William Burke, the duty of evaluating the proposal to abolish the degree, directing them “to consider the merits of the proposal, not the process,” and to report to him by October 1, 1978. Professors Burke, Gallagher, and John Haley worked throughout the summer and fall of 1978, in conjunction with Library School Director Peter Hiatt, to come up with a suitable response to the proposal. As they conferred, a class of six students was finishing up their year in the program, and the largest class yet, the class of ’78, eight students strong, was set to begin.

On September 28, Burke’s committee submitted its report to Dean Gellhorn. The committee set forth its strong disagreement with the proposal to terminate the separate degree program. They objected to any requirement that the law librarianship students complete the library school’s new two-year program, a program which had begun the preceding June. The committee noted that the proposal for merger was illogical, as a single degree program ought to carry uniform requirements for admission and graduation. The law librarianship program required a law degree for admission, said the committee, because the course content was designed for lawyers, and most of the graduates in the past had gone into academic law libraries where they were expected to participate as full faculty members. Furthermore, the committee argued, it would be too much to expect a student who had already spent seven years in higher education to extend his or her library education an extra year.

The report contained an explanation of why law libraries and law librarians are so important to law schools, and it evaluated the significance of the separate program:

A major reason for our conclusion that the MLL should not be terminated as an identifiable separate degree is our belief that programs of such quality and prestige are significant components of this University’s reputation for academic distinction. As evidenced by the graduates of the Law Librarianship program, few of the University’s other degree programs equal its quality or national and international reputation. None, we believe, surpasses it.
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The committee set forth in detail the achievements of the program’s graduates and noted: “That this information is not more widely known within the University is a consequence of the modesty of the person now responsible for the program and its outstanding achievements.” The committee concluded that the separate degree should be retained.140

Morgan Thomas received this report from Dean Gellhorn and forwarded it to Provost Beckmann, along with his own comments. Thomas questioned whether a law degree was an essential prerequisite to the three law librarianship courses offered by the library school, argued that the quality and prestige of the program would not be impaired by placing the three law librarianship courses under the Master of Librarianship umbrella, and noted that students could make their own judgments as to whether six more quarters of schooling was too much after the three-year law school course. He recommended consolidation of the M.L.L. into the Master of Librarianship degree, effective September 1980.141

In December 1978, Gellhorn met with Thomas and Geballe and began to negotiate a compromise resolution of the conflicting recommendations regarding the degree. Suggestions included allowing library students with law degrees up to eighteen credits toward the sixty-three credit (six quarter) general librarianship degree, and including the word “law” somewhere on their degree.142

During the course of these negotiations, Burke and Gallagher notified Dean Gellhorn of their opposition to any compromise that would eliminate the designation of a separate degree.143 Gellhorn clarified the law school’s position that the separate degree designation must remain, after Burke and Gallagher pointed out that neither the Graduate School Executive Committee nor the Ad Hoc Review Committee had ever actually reviewed the M.L.L. program, nor had they made any attempt to provide a factual record supporting their recommendations to eliminate the program.

Meanwhile, the eight-person class of ’79 was coming through. Lei Seeger, Director of the Law Library at the University of Idaho, was a member of that class; she had decided to enter the program before Marian Gallagher retired.144 Lorraine Rodich of that class now works for the
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California Court of Appeals as the “issue tracking” attorney. During library school in 1978-79, Deborah Norwood worked part-time for the Ninth Circuit Branch Library in Seattle and went on to become Branch Librarian there. She did field work at a Seattle law firm under Viola Bird, who had “retired” to law firm library work. Norwood was selected last year to head the Washington State Law Library.147

**D. Reprieve**

The next class was coming into an unsettled situation unaware. In light of all the uncertainties, the library school was given a reprieve in late January 1979 and allowed to admit law librarianship students for another year, the class of ’80, on the same basis as before.148

In the course of giving the go-ahead for this action, Morgan Thomas did an odd thing. He sent a memo to Peter Hiatt, setting forth the reasons why he had granted the reprieve, noting that he had agreed to delay action until he received the law school’s comments on the proposal.149

Although he had received these comments in the form of the Burke committee’s report several months before, and in fact had submitted the report to the Graduate School Dean with extensive negative comments, he nevertheless informed Hiatt that he had not yet received any response from the law school. He stated that in light of this alleged failure on the part of the law school, he was staying execution of the program so as not to penalize the students. But he added that the Board of Regents would shortly be receiving the Executive Committee’s recommendation for termination of the M.L.L. degree.150

Further meetings and attempts at compromise were undertaken. On April 3, 1979, the faculty of the School of Librarianship went on record as opposing abolition of the M.L.L.151 On May 24, Law School Dean Gellhorn argued at a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Graduate School that the burden of proof ought to rest with the Executive Committee to justify its recommendation to eliminate an important and successful degree program.152

---
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Gellhorn also wrote to Geballe on June 6:

Lest there be any question or doubt, I also wish to reiterate the Law School’s strong recommendation that a separate Master’s Degree in law librarianship be continued. As currently structured it is extraordinarily successful, and is viewed by those most knowledgeable in the field as being a model for library graduate degree programs. Its rigor and quality are well established. Its contribution to [library] education, to legal education, and to the reputation of the University has been enormous.\textsuperscript{153}

Further meetings were held in October of 1979. By this time, George Schatzki had taken Ernest Gellhorn’s place as dean of the law school. Schatzki, Gallagher, and Hiatt went to an October 18 meeting with Geballe and Thomas, prepared to discuss the proposal on the table at that point, which was a concurrent degree program between the law and library schools leading to the J.D. and Master of Librarianship degrees; however, this proposal was not seriously considered by the graduate school representatives. The proponents of the separate degree restated the rationale for requiring law librarians to have law degrees; Morgan Thomas reiterated his views on the need for elimination of the separate degree; and the meeting ended at an impasse.\textsuperscript{154}

The meeting had been quite acrimonious, and there was such tension in the air that, after it was over, Schatzki, Gallagher, and Hiatt stood on the steps of the administration building and, as Marian Gallagher remembered it, “had a fit of hysteria. By that time, we thought the situation was ridiculous. While we didn’t really feel like laughing, it was so funny that we did.” She rode back to the law school with George Schatzki, marveling that he was so angry, in light of his background as a labor negotiator. She was pretty angry herself.\textsuperscript{155}

On October 30, Peter Hiatt rejected Geballe’s request that the library school faculty meet prior to the next graduate school executive committee meeting to discuss the situation. Hiatt objected to tampering with a fortyyear-old degree that had brought prestige to the university and the library school, and he characterized as “far from sufficient” the apparent reasons for such tampering: pressure for uniformity and the reduction in numbers of separate graduate degrees.\textsuperscript{156}

On November 6, 1979, the graduate school Executive Committee voted unanimously to recommend to the Regents that no students be admitted to

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{153} Memorandum from Ernest Gellhorn to Ron Geballe (June 6, 1979) (LLP file).\textsuperscript{154} Notes by Peter Hiatt on Meeting of October 18, 1979; Letter from Marian Gallagher to William Burke and John O. Haley (Oct. 31, 1979) (LLP file); Oral History, supra note 46, at 157.\textsuperscript{155} Oral History, supra note 46, at 157-58; Gallagher interview, supra note 49.\textsuperscript{156} Memorandum from Peter Hiatt to Ron Geballe (Oct. 30, 1979) (LLP file).}
the M.L.L. degree program after 1982. 117 On November 30, Dean Schatzki requested that Provost Beckmann postpone any action on the degree until details could be worked out as to what would take its place.158

Meanwhile, word had leaked to the outside world of the goings on at the University of Washington. Marian Gallagher made a strategic decision to allow events to proceed without mobilizing the alumni of the program or other librarians. She wished to give Dean Schatzki’s proposal for additional time and further discussion with Provost Beckmann a chance to proceed on its own.159 It soon became clear, however, after further discussions between Schatzki and Beckmann, that the die was cast, and the program as it had existed for almost forty years was finished. Marian Gallagher was planning to retire in 1981, and she and Schatzki agreed that after the law school had recruited her replacement, discussions could be reopened regarding a joint degree to replace the separate degree program.160

The Board of Regents met in December 1979 and officially endorsed the graduate school’s recommendation that admission of students into the M.L.L. program cease by September 15, 1982. 161 Nevertheless, Marian Gallagher reported to U.W. Law Librarianship alumni in March 1980 that there was still hope for a compromise solution to save the program. If not, she added, “we intend to take Earl Borgeson’s advice and let the whole thing ‘die with dignity.’”162

IV. The Eighties

A. Events Limp Along

In the meantime, Wes Cochran of the class of ’80 was working toward graduation that summer. He and classmate Dave Melillo met for classes in Marian Gallagher’s office, where she would give a semi-lecture, then begin what Cochran calls her “Socratic intimidation”: hard, probing questions designed to “zing” unattentive students. It was, he says, a tremendous experience. 161 Cochran went from the program to a reference position at Loyola University. His history with the law librarianship program was not
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complete, however; he returned in 1983 to teach classes along with Marian Gallagher during her last teaching year at U.W.\textsuperscript{164}

The spring of 1980 was a time of tight budgets at the University of Washington, and cutbacks resulted in the loss of a number of teaching and staff positions in several departments, including the School of Librarianship.\textsuperscript{161} Peter Hiatt stepped down as director of the library school, and Margaret Chisholm was appointed acting director, effective July 1, 1981.\textsuperscript{166}

Meanwhile word of difficulties at U.W. was spreading. The School of Librarianship in general, and the law librarianship program in particular, received during this period a number of testimonials and letters of support from alumni and others.

Sng Yok Fong of the class of ’68 wrote from Singapore:

\begin{quote}
I would like you to know that the University of Washington School of Librarianship commands high respect in Singapore as well as in other parts of the world. The special Law Librarianship programme is ... unique and [the] best established one of its kind under the able leadership and profound teaching of Professor Marian Gallagher.\textsuperscript{167}
\end{quote}

During this period, the law librarianship curriculum was reorganized so that courses would begin in the fall quarter and end in mid-August of the following year, in order to accommodate library students in the regular program, some of whom were following a two-year course of study.\textsuperscript{168}

Marian Gallagher was planning to retire in 1981. By the fall of 1980, Robert C. Berring had been named as her successor. Events limped along throughout the summer and fall of 1980, with the prospect of demolition of the program hanging over everyone’s head. In July, Dean Geballe made the statement that the possibility still existed for an option in law librarianship under the general master’s degree, and that “we do not regard the substantive aspect of the issue as ‘closed.’”\textsuperscript{169}

On December 16, Provost Beckmann met with Gallagher, Schatzki, Chisholm, Hiatt, and Thomas to discuss the future training of law librarians at the university. There was consensus that all parties, including
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the graduate school, were “strongly and fully committed to ensuring a continuity in the training of high-quality law librarians at the University of Washington,” and that a revamped program would be developed jointly “as soon as possible” by the law and library schools.170 In January 1981, Marian Gallagher wrote to the program’s alumni, assuring them that obituaries for the program were premature and that negotiations for its resurrection were proceeding. The phrase, “as soon as possible,” she said, “means as soon as Bob Berring can participate in the negotiations.”171

B. Berring Arrives

Bob Berring was no stranger to devising programs in law librarianship, as he had made end runs around the regulations at the University of California at Berkeley in order to attend library school during his final year of law school at Boalt Hall in 1974. U.C. Berkeley, appalled with the paperwork required, institutionalized a joint degree program in law and librarianship. Bob Berring eventually returned to Berkeley where he is now law librarian at Boalt Hall and was, until June 30, 1989, Dean of the School of Library and Information Studies there.172

But in 1981, Bob Berring didn’t foresee a future at Berkeley. He had been selected as Marian Gallagher’s successor at U.W., and he was looking forward to the challenge of running the library and influencing the future of the law librarianship program. Berring had found Marian Gallagher to be “inspiring, amazing”; he first heard her speak in 1974 and says, “I’ll never forget it.” Berring had never been at a school where the position of law librarian was held in greater esteem than at the University of Washington. He felt that he was a lucky man.173

Berring had some definite ideas on how the program could best operate. He wanted to promote a much more “aggressive” style of research, to place students on field work assignments exclusively at the bigger and more distinctive libraries, and to market the program differently, actively recruiting students from law schools. He also wanted to expand the number of non-law-trained library students in the legal bibliography course. His immediate concern, however, was to keep the program from going under altogether.174

173. Berring interview, supra note 172.
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On July 29, 1981, Marian Gallagher’s retirement was celebrated at a ceremony and reception at which President William Gerberding officially renamed the law library the Marian Gould Gallagher Law Library. Bob Berring met Margaret Chisholm at the dedication of the law library, and they began the process of setting the new course of the law librarianship program.\(^{175}\)

Berring began a series of discussions with Gallagher, Schatzki, and Chisholm, and by December 1981 they came to the reluctant conclusion that it would take years to restore the separate degree. They suggested that the program continue essentially as before, under the umbrella of the Master of Librarianship program, with the students taking fewer credits and a different number of quarters in residence and receiving a certificate in recognition of special expertise.\(^{176}\)

On December 19, 1981, Berring and Gallagher sent out a joint memorandum to law librarianship alumni and fieldwork hosts, notifying them that the program was not dead. Things were looking up; Berring added that “our biggest problem is the widespread perception that the program is ceasing and that the Library School is marked for early extinction. Both of those perceptions are incorrect and I will endeavor to keep them that way.”\(^{177}\)

In March of 1982, Berring received the formal assurance he had been requesting from the new graduate school dean, William C. Richardson, to the effect that the program would continue. Richardson wrote:

> We are all agreed that this Program is a valuable one, and will continue as a pathway under the Master of Librarianship degree. Recognizing the uniform, specialized, and advanced prior education of entrants into this Program, the content of the Program will differ from that for other graduate students who are pursuing the Master of Librarianship degree.\(^{178}\)

Ewan Richardson requested a specific plan from the School of Librarianship, outlining the credits required for the program.

In response, Berring and Chisholm came up with a simple, one-page description of the “new” law librarianship program. It would require a law degree for admission, and students would take a program of forty-five units, which would begin with the autumn quarter and conclude the


following summer, and would include the three law library courses and fieldwork. Students would earn the Master of Librarianship degree, with special recognition in the form of a certificate signed by the appropriate deans.\textsuperscript{179}

The library school faculty approved the program description, and on May 5, 1982, Margaret Chisholm forwarded it to Dean Richardson.\textsuperscript{180} The class of 1983 was the last class to receive the Master of Law Librarianship degree.

Responses to a questionnaire sent to the program’s graduates in 1989 indicate near unanimity that the separate M.L.L. degree ought to be reinstated. The graduates reasoned variously that the separate degree reflects the specialized background which the students bring into the program, recognizes the distinct nature of the course work, and provides a signal to the world that the graduate has something different from a regular library degree. One graduate summed up the situation: “It has never been explained to me so that I understand the reason for discontinuing the M.L.L. Until I receive a pedagogical reason for the change I will always believe it was a foolish decision brought about by a political squabble between the graduate school and the program.”\textsuperscript{181}

Although by May 1982 the degree situation had been settled for the time being, the program itself was not fated to have a quiet, stable existence for the next few years. Six days after the new plan for the law librarianship program was sent to Dean Richardson, Bob Berring sent Director Chisholm its letter of resignation as law librarian.\textsuperscript{182}

\textit{C. Berring Departs}

Bob Berring had been recruited to the University of Washington by Law School Dean George Schatzki. Berring says that Schatzki came to U.W. dedicated to making it one of the top law schools in the country, and the prospect of being in on a new beginning, for the law school and the law librarianship program, was one of the principal reasons why Berring accepted the position. But Schatzki resigned his position in protest over budget cuts shortly after Berring arrived, and when the University of California at Berkeley offered Berring the law librarian position that he had previously turned down, he decided it was time for him to go.\textsuperscript{183}
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The program was once again left in unsettled circumstances. Applications had diminished in light of the widespread misperception that the program was dead. During his year at U.W., Berring had only one student in the class of ’82; that student went on to become a sports physiologist, 114 However, during Ids year as head of the program, Berring managed to get the word out that the program was still alive, and by July, eleven students had applied for admission to the class of ’83.185

Berring was scheduled to begin his new job at Berkeley in August 1982, and it was arranged that Marian Gallagher would come back that summer to see the one student through the end of his course.186

The students in the class of ’83 Were the last to graduate from the School of Librarianship; in August 1983, the regents changed the name of the library school to the Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

One of the four students in the class of ’83, Antonio Santos, heard about the U.W. program from Myrna Feliciano, class of ’65. Tony Santos is now law librarian at the University of the Philippines; he and Myrna Feliciano are working to set up a law librarianship training program in the Philippines and are discussing the possibility of establishing an Association of Asian Law Librarians.187

When Bob Berring left, Betty Wilkins, of the first graduating class of 1940, who had come back to work at the U.W. Law Library in 1965, became acting director; however, she didn’t want to teach in the law librarianship program.188 In the spring of 1983, Wes Cochran, of the class of ’80, was hired as associate librarian, and he and Marian Gallagher teamtaught the law librarianship course. The Cochran/Gallagher team lasted for one year; in the fall of 1984, Cochran began a year as sole instructor. In 1985, he returned to his family roots in the South to become the director of the University of Mississippi Law Library.189

Meanwhile, the search continued for a permanent law librarian for the University of Washington. In the fall of 1984, Penny Hazelton was the Head of Research Services for the U.S. Supreme Court Library. She was having lunch in Washington, D.C. with her friend, the dean of Lewis and
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Clark Law School, who mentioned that the position of U.W. law librarian was still available, and he encouraged Penny to apply. She took his advice and was eventually offered the position.\(^\text{190}\)

**D. The Hazelton Era**

A number of changes in the law librarianship curriculum have occurred under Hazelton’s leadership. During his time at U.W., Bob Berring had noticed that many library students outside of the law librarianship program, some of whom were interested in law firm library positions, were asking to take the law courses.\(^\text{191}\) A new course in Basic Legal Bibliography was added to give non-law-trained students the background to participate in the rest of the law librarianship courses, and also to provide a review for the lawyer-students.\(^\text{192}\)

During Penny Hazelton’s first year at U.W., law librarianship students were not required to take the Basic Legal Bibliography course. However, she found that the students had widely varying experience with LEXIS and WESTLAW, and some students required intense catching-up during the Advanced Legal Bibliography course in the winter quarter. The basic course, a requirement of the program since the fall of 1986, has been offered to students at the law school since the fall quarter of 1989.\(^\text{193}\)

Students in the Advanced Legal Bibliography course no longer spend the winter quarter revising the Legal Research Guide. Topics now covered include review of computer-assisted and manual legal research; legislative history; research in English law, comparative law and international law; looseleaf services; and a “pathfinder” project, in which students produce a critical guide to the bibliographic and non-bibliographic resources of a particular subject.\(^\text{194}\) Selection and Processing of Law Materials, offered in the spring quarter, provides students with an opportunity to make collection development recommendations for the Gallagher Law Library and puts heavy emphasis on automation of law library systems.\(^\text{195}\) Law Library Administration is taught in the late summer quarter, when students return from their three-week fieldwork assignments. Since 1988, the course has been taught by visiting professors: Virginia Wise of the University of Michigan in the summer of 1988 and Virginia Kelsh of the University of
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San Francisco in 1989; Donald J. Dunn, law librarian at Western New England School of Law, is scheduled for 1990.

Aside from reducing the law librarian’s teaching load, the visiting professors benefit the program by giving students exposure to how things are done in other law libraries and by making the program more immediately visible to others in the profession. Alumni recently surveyed generally agree that bringing in outsiders, including guest lecturers in regular classes, is a good idea. Several former students emphasized the importance of the program’s setting within a well-run working law library and the daily contact which such a setting provides; however, they also noted that visitors supply a fresh perspective to the students’ education.

Many former students commented that practical experience is a vital part of the law librarian’s education. Some suggested that longer fieldwork assignments or a requirement that students work part-time in a law library during the school year would enhance the program. One graduate suggested that arrangements might be made so that students would be paid or provided with room and board during fieldwork, thus allowing more flexibility in choosing fieldwork sites.

To give students a more organized practical experience with the law library, a formal internship program was initiated in 1988, under which participating students rotate through the various departments of the library, including reference, circulation, and technical services.

One former student suggested that the program could operate a law review type of publication to expose the students to some of the more seasoned members of the profession and allow students an opportunity to write for publication. Several graduates said that students should be encouraged to write for publication while in school; a few thought that a thesis or publishable paper should be a requirement. Others said that there is not enough time in the one-year program to do any substantial writing. At present, students are not required to write for publication, although they are encouraged to do so, and have the opportunity to produce publishable articles in connection with course work and independent studies. The Hazelton era is now five years old, and the curriculum is continually evolving. The first class of “Hazeltonians,” the class of ’86, had five members. Chris O’Rourke of that class remembers that “we were loose and informal, and we were Penny’s first class. As a result, I think
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things were just a little out of kilter on the fun side all year."  

The vigor and relevance of the program are evident in the “fiftieth anniversary” class. The class of 1990, with eight students, is one of the largest classes ever. It includes two University of Washington Law School graduates who began to take classes in the library school before law school ended. Other law schools represented in the class include Brigham Young University, the University of Oregon, the University of Puget Sound, the University of Virginia, and Washburn University.

VII. The Nineties and Beyond

What of the next fifty years? Will the law librarianship program exist in 2040? In what sort of settings will the twenty-first-century class of ’40 be working? What new directions will law librarianship itself take?

About the profession, Marian Gallagher said, “I certainly don’t expect it to sit still!” She noted that methods of information delivery will undoubtedly change and added, “I don’t have any sense that the need to use your head on the approach to problems will be any less, regardless of the tools you’re using.”

Earl Borgeson predicts that librarians of the future, including law librarians, will rely less on “information in packages in books” and will no longer be buyers and holders of information, but rather will function as “information switching stations.” Now retired but looking toward the future, he is characteristically enthusiastic about the possibilities for law librarians: “What a future! I wish I were 28!”

Marian Gallagher predicted also that there may be more specialization in law libraries, an idea affirmed by her student Albert Brecht, who wrote the following when he was president of AALL: “Today [academic] law libraries are selecting areas of specialization. Law libraries in major cities are dividing the world so as to limit duplication of foreign material. Less often will researchers be able to go to one library and find exhaustive collections.”

The profession, and the program, have felt the impact of more active involvement in recent years by law firm librarians. Marian Gallagher saw a gradual trend, during her tenure as head of the program, toward law firms hiring librarians to clean up their libraries and provide real information service. She said that law firms used to call her and ask her to send over a
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law student for library work, never thinking to ask for a library student. That attitude is changing. In Seattle, for instance, Jane Stewart, who took all of the Gallagher classes, became the first law firm librarian sixteen years ago; today, there are dozens of librarians working in Seattle law firms.

Not having to deal with the issue of faculty status, law firms are less likely than are academic law libraries to employ librarians with law degrees. Penny Hazelton feels that law firms represent a growth area in law librarianship and that the program’s future graduates may increasingly find themselves in law firm positions.\(^{205}\) Bob Berring agrees, adding that the private sector will eventually be the driving force in the law librarianship profession, with academics having dwindling influence.\(^{206}\)

The program may find itself reaching out to attract more general library students, without law degrees. Penny Hazelton says that such students add balance and perspective to the classes. Encouraging such students, however, creates scheduling problems and adds additional teaching duties to the law librarian’s already overburdened schedule. Teaching non-law-degreed library students is not what the program was devised to do. “I feel a clash,” says Hazelton, “between my desire to help lawyers become law librarians and my desire to attract good librarians into law librarianship.”\(^{207}\) A possibility for the future is to reinstate the Master of Law Librarianship degree for those students coming into the program with law degrees, and offer the special certificate to the nonlawyers who complete all four courses in the program.\(^{208}\)

Students in the course today are entering a different professional world than that faced by Penny Hazelton’s class of 1976. In 1976 and before, most of the students expected to go right into directorships or assistant directorships in academic law libraries, as the field was wide open. Today, most academic law library directors are relatively young, and new positions are just not there. The current crop of graduates, therefore, will typically begin in reference positions and will have to spend a number of years working their way through the ranks.\(^{209}\)

The program is changing to meet these evolving circumstances. There is no longer an easy assumption that nearly all of the graduates will
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eventually become law library directors. The Hazelton course puts more emphasis on reference and computer skills than did the Gallagher course, and it will, in the future, feature more heavily the interplay of computers and CD-ROM products with book research.\textsuperscript{210}

Because of the growth in nonacademic opportunities in law librarianship, Hazelton would like to see more general librarianship courses added to the curriculum, as nonlegal research may become a more important part of the law librarian’s job. This would create a problem, however, as the nonlegal courses cannot be added to the curriculum at the expense of the law classes and, as has always been the case, it is unrealistic to expect to attract law-trained students to a program of more than one year’s duration.\textsuperscript{211}

Hazelton foresees more law librarians in the twenty-first century, and more need for them. She predicts that more of her students will end up not only in law firms, but also in state and county law libraries, which are increasingly beginning to grasp the benefits of having librarians, even law-trained librarians, to handle the ever-increasing volume of legal materials. Statewide and even regional coordination of county law libraries, perhaps funded in part by contributions from state and local bar associations, would allow for more efficient library service to outlying areas, and would create more need for well-trained law librarians.\textsuperscript{212}

The law librarianship program at the University of Washington has profoundly influenced the lives of those who have graduated from it. It has also had a far-reaching effect on the profession of law librarianship. One-third of those graduated over the past fifty years have become directors of academic law libraries, and other graduates have contributed to the profession in the areas of teaching, reference work, research, and publication, both in the United States and abroad. Marian Gallagher’s influence and role modeling have encouraged many of her graduates to take an active part in AALL, and the program has been an inspiration and encouragement for other library schools to add legal bibliography and law librarianship courses to their programs of instruction.\textsuperscript{213}

Arthur Beardsley could not have foreseen the transformation in library work and legal research caused by the computer and other recent developments. But he had a common-sense idea about how to train law librarians, and the program he founded, which flourished under Marian Gallagher, has been flexible enough to change with the changing times.
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Its existence fifty years later is testimony to Arthur Beardsley’s vision and Marian Gallagher’s unique ability to teach and inspire. Arthur Beardsley may have been hard to please, but it is likely that he would be proud of his legacy.