

1969

The Law Library in a New Law School

Marian G. Gallagher

University of Washington School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/faculty-articles>



Part of the [Law Librarianship Commons](#), and the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marian G. Gallagher, *The Law Library in a New Law School*, 1 TEX. TECH. L. REV. 21 (1969), <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/faculty-articles/442>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact cnyberg@uw.edu.

THE LAW LIBRARY IN A NEW LAW SCHOOL

*Marian G. Gallagher**

Law school faculty members have a reputation for paying attention to their libraries. They achieved that collective reputation long ago through insistence on autonomous library administration by their own kind, and they have nurtured it by exhibiting greater dependence on libraries than the members of any other discipline. Expressions of their concern and involvement¹ are recorded repeatedly in annual reports, budget justifications, fund-raising brochures, and the proceedings of ceremonial cornerstone layings. Some have gone far beyond expressions of concern, demonstrating compulsion to devote more time to the functioning of their law libraries than has seemed necessary or interesting to the nonlaw academics.

Twenty-five years ago, some deans and law faculties paid a very personal kind of attention to their libraries. They prepared budgets, selected books, promulgated library rules, hired law student help, and left "housekeeping" details to the librarian. Some of them were not too concerned about cataloging, categorizing it as a housekeeping detail of interest primarily to large research libraries. They generally resisted classification on the theory that law books are self-classifying and when a man knows what is in the collection (as they all did) it is easier to find the treatises if they are arranged alphabetically by author. The more adventuresome drew up broad supermarket-type classifications and rearranged their treatises accordingly; a few applied their legal learning and great amounts of effort to construction of more detailed classification schedules which helped to bring order in the house but also may have contributed to the long delay in achieving a universal system of classification for law. That deans and teaching faculty could continue that kind of involvement as long as some of them did and that it seemed natural for them to do so can be attributed only to their knowledge of their collection, the relatively narrow focus of law school research, and the superiority of its research tools.

Paradoxically, this intimate involvement with law library management by patrons of all kinds, coupled with the long-established excellence of legal bibliographic control, contributed to the effectiveness

* Professor of Law and Law Librarian, University of Washington.

1. Some of these expressions have attained cliché status: A lawyer's books are his tools; the library is the law school laboratory; the library is the heart of the law school; the Lord is my Shepard; etc.

of law libraries in the earlier decades and now contributes to some of their difficulties. No other profession produced so many do-it-yourself librarians or had reason to feel so smugly self-satisfied about the effectiveness of the research methods which are an ingredient of their professional education and practice. Familiarity with the functioning of the law library bred a feeling among them that this is a fairly uncomplicated exercise, and the ease with which they found their way around in legal literature made them less apprehensive than others about the effects of the information explosion. They trailed in achieving that level of discontent which must precede effective changes and the calling up of more hands for the task.²

THE INFORMATION EXPLOSIONS

Now two kinds of information explosions (we can call them the *Legal Information Explosion* and the *Information Explosion in Law*) make it more difficult for law school libraries to function effectively. Either kind is sufficiently disruptive to make impossible the continuation of personal direction of the library by law school faculty; in combination they threaten chaos in libraries where order existed before.

The *Legal Information Explosion* has received less public attention than the scientific information explosion partly because lawyers had their bibliographic boots on³ when the cellar started flooding and the

2. Practicing lawyers and judges still seem to exhibit some of these symptoms.

Since they are closely connected with a branch of government whose prestige is high, it might be thought that the law libraries should have little trouble finding the resources to meet their needs. Generally speaking, this is not the case. A few law libraries have strong support from judges and state legal staffs in their search for adequate budgets and sufficient space. Nearly all law libraries are highly esteemed by their users for the services they provide. However, the cost of these services does not seem to be well understood by their users. In those state law libraries governed by a court-appointed board, or by a committee of the Supreme Court, the very closeness of the judges to the library seems to preclude their taking it seriously. The courts are conservative in their own budget requests and their conservatism is nowhere more apparent than in the requests made for their libraries. The lowest salaries for law librarians, for instance, are paid in the Supreme Court-type libraries. P. MONYPENNY, *THE LIBRARY FUNCTIONS OF THE STATES: COMMENTARY ON THE SURVEY OF LIBRARY FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE* 112 (1966).

3. The legal community must give credit to the law publishers, who early undertook and still are largely responsible for retrieval systems for legal literature. Scientific literature, on the other hand, has been indexed, if at all, by the scientists themselves; commercial services for science are, by our standards, a new development.

The much-cited "Weinberg Report" emphasized the advanced quality of legal bibliography by including in its introductory statement these words: "The Panel wishes to call the attention

scientists did not, and partly because the volume of scientific literature apparently has increased more rapidly than the volume of legal literature.⁴ Those who are responsible for collecting, organizing, and retrieving legal literature have been shaken by this explosion, nevertheless. The proliferation of administrative agencies, the growing importance of the understanding of local governments, the acceptance of foreign and international law as necessary ingredients in the law school curriculum: all of these developments mean more sources to search for more papers in more languages. The demand for coverage in depth as well as in breadth has followed legal education's movement toward required seminars and individual research activity by students. Keeping ahead of developing legal fields is a traditional concern for law librarians, of course, and today's problem is not different in kind; it is massively different in volume—accelerative and cumulative volume requiring more housing room, more man-hours, and more efficient methods to control the literature and make it available.

With all its volume, the *Legal Information Explosion* is not as threatening to order in existing law libraries as is the *Information Explosion in Law*. The growing importance of interdisciplinary studies to legal education has brought great pressures on law librarians to provide materials in nonlegal subjects, notably in the social sciences.⁵

of the technical community to a promising new method of access to the literature called the citation index: a cumulative list of articles that, subsequent to the appearance of an original article, refer to that article." A REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SCIENCE, GOVERNMENT, AND INFORMATION: THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TECHNICAL COMMUNITY AND THE GOVERNMENT IN THE TRANSFER OF INFORMATION 4 (1963). (The long and successful existence of the Shepard system received recognition at another less prominent part of the report.)

4. The total annual volume of significant technical documents appearing in world literature in 1965 was estimated at 900,500; the 1970 estimate is 1,143,000. It is estimated that only one-fourth of the country's available scientific literature is catalogued. A. Busch, *Equating Information with Currency* 2-3 (1966).

We are not aware of a published estimate of the world's annual output of legal literature; the current annual production of United States court decisions and statutes has been estimated at 40,000. M. COHEN, *LEGAL BIBLIOGRAPHY IN A NUTSHELL* 1-2 (1968). How many more legal units are produced annually by federal, state, and local administrative agencies and various kinds of study commissions would be difficult to pin down; federal documents excepted, lack of method in indexing and distribution effectively prevents even a state-by-state inventory.

5. Book selectors have expanded the term "legally related" to encompass these materials, but the fact is that sociology, economics, and anthropology books still are nonlegal and are "legally related" only because lawyers are interested in them.

The discovery that legal educators should be paying attention to the world around them, that they should be engaging in empirical research, is a seemingly recent discovery in spite of the fact that the ability to familiarize himself with nonlegal background to legal problems always has been considered one of the lawyer's distinctive skills. A reading of the seminar papers in *THE LAW*

These pressures are ill-defined in many law schools and ill-directed in most, but even in these stages have effected notable and sometimes panicky changes in the boundaries of book selection in some law school libraries. The development of more legal scholars trained in the social sciences and its methodology and the addition of scholars of the other disciplines to law school faculties can provide welcome definition and direction. Even so, there are serious implications for law libraries in the changing direction of legal education; discussion of the solutions has only begun. The pressure to expand law school collections to encompass nonlegal subjects presents one problem for which new law schools will not find a model solution among the established schools.

That is not necessarily bad news for the administrators of the new law schools. New schools, unfettered by tradition, always have had the opportunity to adopt operational plans which could become models for established schools and to demonstrate the value of programs which the faculties of established schools had only talked about. The timing of the *Information Explosion in Law* merely gives the librarians of tomorrow's new schools greater opportunity for that kind of leadership. The best among them will find ways to deal successfully with the problem.

THE SHAPE OF THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

The information explosions seem to deserve the emphasis here placed on them. They already are disruptive of the efficiency of established law libraries, and awareness of that fact ought to have decisive effect on the plans for new law schools. Certainly the explosions have ended the possibility of planning a law library entirely on terms which were successful in the do-it-yourself era. This does not mean that new dean and faculty will find the going much easier. Even though the notion be discarded that it can be faculty-administered, the law library remains a most taxing exercise for those with prime responsibility for building a quality school. It usually costs more than

SCHOOL OF TOMORROW: THE PROJECTION OF AN IDEAL (D. Haber & J. Cohen eds. 1968) or of some of the committee reports in AALS PROCEEDINGS, pt. 1, § 2 (1968) could leave a literal reader with a vague feeling that research in legal materials, in a law library, is something for which any self-respecting law professor ought to apologize. No one really supposes that such change will occur, of course. Yale Law School, forerunner in the integration of social sciences into the curriculum, reported a 60 percent increase in student use of the library at the time of their divisional program. Freilich, *The Divisional Program at Yale: An Experiment for Legal Education in Depth*, 21 J. LEGAL ED. 443, 450 (1969). There is a suspicion that legal materials, as well as social science materials, still are in use.

advance calculations and very seldom works smoothly as quickly as the calculators had hoped. It bites off increasingly large amounts of money as it grows, becomes increasingly complex in its operations, and can become increasingly inefficient unless it has the proper kind of attention from knowledgeable dean and faculty as well as from the librarian and supporting staff.

The proper kind of attention implies faculty concern for objectives, at a level above the old do-it-yourself involvement. Successful library operations depend on forward-looking yet realistic faculty-formulated objectives, communicated to a librarian who is completely competent to establish policies which will best carry them out and to implement them through an adequate and completely competent supporting staff. In good circumstances, the faculty and decanal administration are free to enjoy the achievement of their objectives without having to bother with a lot of details. Uncounted things can go wrong, unfortunately, and often the ideal is not much related to what actually happens at the law school. Most often, in the past, budgetary failure has contributed to the going-wrong; wise objectives and reasonable policies fare poorly when there is not enough money to implement them. At times it has been the librarian's fault; not everyone is inherently suited to or sufficiently interested in this task. Occasionally an otherwise competent person has been done in by a failure of communication, either in explaining to faculty and staff what he was doing or in gathering information which would have supported persuasive justification of needs. That kind of failure leads in turn to a failure of faculty support, without which no law school library yet has prospered. Preventing that kind of failure has to be the chief justification for today's faculty library committee, which no longer has any business approving individual book purchases or debating administrative details. If the librarian has talent for anticipating school needs and for keeping the whole faculty informed without a deluge of memoranda the faculty library committee might never be missed.

There is a preliminary accounting of objectives by those who make the decision to establish a new school which leads to an appraisal of present and future budgetary needs and prospective support, and has decisive effect on faculty recruitment. The selection of the head law librarian, always a carefully planned attempt to employ the best available person,⁶ now takes on new dimensions. His educational

6. The shortage of able candidates with librarianship and legal educations, long a concern to law school administrators, may have been, in the past, more apparent than real. Many of the

background is advised by Association of American Law Schools Executive Committee Regulation. His planning and management ability, his knowledge of the principles of personnel relations, his talent for good public relations within and without the law school, his imagination, flexibility, and unflappability may be more important than his previous experience on law library circulation desks, whether he can catalog or already has worn out a set of *Law Books in Print*.

New schools have the advantage of offering exciting challenges to able and energetic and imaginative people. The planning of the library's system, the shaping of its collection, the opportunity to participate in launching a new educational venture, these make the professional experience most attractive. Truly qualified library administrators still are harder to locate than truly qualified law teachers, but new schools, given provable prospects for supporting quality, have the best chance to attract quality. The importance of a quality beginning for the new school is obvious, and no early decision is more important than this selection. An incompetent teacher can damage the school program and may have some effect on alumni loyalty for years to come; an incompetent librarian or library staff can do it faster, spread it more evenly over the total program, and leave behind debris which takes much longer to clean up.

PLANNING THE LIBRARY QUARTERS

The law librarian or some other person familiar with the working details of a law library, and frequently both, need to be consulted and listened to when the law school building is being planned. Omission of that precaution is likely to erect obstacles to library efficiency which cannot be removed by faculty resolution, seldom can be overcome by remodeling, and usually endure for the life of that building. *Ellsworth* and *Metcalfe*⁷ carry essential advice about libraries for law school building planners, but they assume the predetermination of certain basic decisions about the future of the library. If those decisions are made by university administrators before dean and faculty have been

older schools, the kind characterized by the "one-man library," had frequent and recurrent openings because they recruited by painting pictures of grand objectives and expanded budgets, which perhaps were honest pictures but later proved to have been unrealistic. Some of them simply expected too much of the "one man" and as a result his time had to be spent on grubby details better handled by clerks. Even if he stuck it out the situation allowed no possible opportunity to prove professional competence.

7. R. ELLSWORTH, *PLANNING THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY BUILDING* (rev. ed. 1968); K. METCALFE, *PLANNING ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH LIBRARY BUILDINGS* (1965).

selected, there is danger of miscalculation of the rate and probable limits of collection expansion; deans working without library consultants are more apt to misjudge the number and size of quarters needed for library staff. *Metcalfe* and *Ellsworth* advise on putting the pieces together. They do not attempt to estimate the number of pieces needed to carry out particular programs.

The drafters of the *Guideline Statement on the Establishment of New Law Schools*⁸ took a whirl at estimating numbers, but with a certain degree of absentmindedness. They specified a minimum collection, book budget, and staff size⁹ and disclaimed the intention to deal further with detail. The drafters referred nevertheless frequently throughout the draft to the library, usually in the context of a "facility," a faceless collection of books that is *there*. They acknowledged the existence of library facilities and faculty time in several linkings as major resources; they said that the book collection must grow with expansion of enrollment and faculty; they listed an adequate library as one of the necessary "other kinds of service to

8. AALS COMMITTEE ON GUIDELINES FOR NEW LAW SCHOOLS, GUIDELINE STATEMENT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW LAW SCHOOLS (corrected ed. 1967) [hereinafter cited as GUIDELINE STATEMENT].

9. An initial library of at least 40,000 volumes; an initial collection cost, by 1966-67 price calculations, of \$300,000; an annual book budget of at least \$50,000; a full-time librarian and not less than two full-time staff members of undefined qualification. GUIDELINE STATEMENT 18.

By 1968 amendment of AALS Executive Committee Regulations 8.1d, 8.4c, and 8.3b, member schools with libraries of less than 60,000 volumes are advised to adopt a plan of expansion to 60,000 by January 1, 1975; annual expenditures for library materials should be budgeted at \$40,000 during 1968-71; "where practicable," libraries of 60,000 volumes should be staffed by three professional assistants in addition to the librarian, and by other necessary professional and clerical assistants. AALS PROCEEDINGS, pt. 2, at 234-36 (1968).

More generous criteria have been suggested by the June 21, 1969, Report of the Association of Research Libraries-Association of College and Research Libraries Joint Committee on University Library Standards [hereinafter cited as ARL-ACRL Jt. Comm. Rep.]. That committee collected data from 50 leading university libraries and has proposed "Criteria for Excellence" based on the identified current practices of these best libraries. Thirty of the fifty respondents included information about their campus law libraries, and minimum levels proposed by the committee for university law libraries, based on that sample, are these:

Volumes in collection	200,000
Volumes per student	350
Current journal titles	2,000
Number professional staff	7
Number total staff	20
Annual book expenditure	\$75,000
Annual book expenditure per student	\$125
Annual salary expenditure	\$105,000
Annual salary expenditure per student	\$ 200
Hours open per week	100

faculty," along with secretaries, leave of absence, and individual offices.¹⁰ The facelessness of the library, to the Guideline Statement Committee, is emphasized further in the nine-point checklist of building essentials,¹¹ in which references to library needs were confined to listings of stack and study space and of "special provision for faculty access to library materials," while no provision for library worker space was advised although over a dozen categories of working space for other law school personnel were listed.

It is not to be supposed that any new law school has been or will be built in the exact shape of the *Guideline Statement* with consequent absence of planned space for librarians to sit down.¹² But the truth is that in the process of "paying attention" to library needs, some of the apparently most enthusiastic library users among law school administrators have assumed too much can be done by too few. New buildings have been opened recently which do not provide sufficiently for library staff, with consequent unfortunate effect on operation of their libraries.

Less frequently, law school buildings have shortchanged the stack space. This is an oversight easier to remedy, provided the architectural design has not made the library the heart of the law school to an extent which wraps it up inside faculty offices or places it on the wrong end of a lot with no place to go. It always is easier to find money to house collection expansion than to find it for staff expansion. All levels to which the justification for expansion must go—faculty, deans, university administration, alumni, or legislators—understand the need for book space, just as they find it easier to provide increased appropriations for books than for staff salaries. Books are easily defined units, and their growth rate can be charted.¹³ Work units, on the other hand, are more difficult to describe, and particularly so when performance does not produce a tangible product.

10. GUIDELINE STATEMENT 17.

11. *Id.* 16.

12. At my own school, where it is our recent custom to tear out stacks and move books to storage to provide offices for faculty or library staff, these people, during the remodeling process and while homeless, are known as "canaries," a term inspired by the owner of a one-ton panel truck who moved two tons of canaries by stopping to whack the side of the truck at 2-block intervals, thus managing to keep half of his birds in the air all the time.

13. Accuracy of growth-rate prediction frequently is undone by fluctuation in budgetary support; there is, in addition, a suspicion that volume count, the universal measurement of library growth rates, is not suitable for measuring law libraries. Much of our book budget is devoted to supplemental accumulation which occupies shelf space but fails to impress the volume count. Once the minimum volume requirements of ABA and AALS have been satisfied, linear foot measurement is a better tool for discovering growth rate and expansion needs.

LIBRARIES ARE EXPENSIVE

Libraries are expensive, and law libraries are comparatively more expensive, per patron served, than general libraries. The cost of all libraries will continue to rise,¹⁴ and law libraries, because so many of their acquisitions carry continuing obligation for supplementation (much of it cumulative), sustain the clear expectation that their operating costs will continue to rise ahead of the price indexes. Estimating the initial investment in the book collection will be further complicated as more new libraries compete for standard sets in limited supply. For those reasons price estimates need to be revised every few years, just as the AALS minimum expenditure advice will be redefined, and new school planners need to get fresh advice about the safe size of their initial stakes and foreseeable future support.

The most accurate advice about initial collection cost comes from comparison with the cost figures of the most recently established schools of comparable ambition. Those figures are seldom published, but sometimes are embalmed in annual reports and in any event are available for the asking. To those figures an appropriate upward adjustment must be made. Ten percent per year might be adequate now, but that figure too is subject to upward revision.

The prospects for continued support for the library, after the period of crash collection-building, often can be measured by charting the budgetary history of the general library of the college or university to which the new school will attach. The university's library ought to claim a minimum of 5 percent of the university operating budget,¹⁵ and

14. Mathematica, *On the Economics of Library Operation*, June 30, 1967, at 21 (final report submitted to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and to be reprinted, at least in part, in 1969 in *LIBRARIES AT LARGE: TRADITION, INNOVATION, AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST: THE RESOURCE BOOK BASED ON THE MATERIALS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES* (D. Knight & E. Norse eds.)):

[E]ven if we were to be satisfied to offer no improvements in the services offered by the libraries, no increase in number of persons served and no growth in the number of volumes carried, the costs of library operation could be expected to rise. Moreover, it will be shown these rises alone are, by their nature, progressive and cumulative. This suggests that those who supply the funds which support our libraries have not recognized the full extent of their obligation. They must learn that even with no improvement in library service, the amount which suffices to support our libraries today will prove inadequate tomorrow, and the amount which is enough for their maintenance tomorrow will be insufficient the day after that. This is no fortuitous manifestation of the current state of the economy but is rather a result inherent in the technology of library operation.

15. The average university library is getting 4.5 percent of the university budget. Ellsworth, *The Contribution of the Library to Improving Instruction*, 94 *LIBRARY J.* 1955, 1957 (1969).

ARL-ACRL Jt. Comm. detailed a 1967-68 average of 3.5 percent among the 50 leading university libraries, with a range from 1.6 percent to 8.6 percent.

the law library needs not less than 10 percent of the amount budgeted to the adequately supported university library.¹⁶

WHY SO MANY PEOPLE?

The most prominent hangover from the do-it-yourself era is the lawyers' frequent failure to provide their law libraries with adequate staffing. No other discipline can match our examples of "crash" appropriations for library materials without accompanying money for staff increases. It is true that in the collection's early days one experienced law librarian of good memory, or even one dean, can get rid of \$100,000 by means of a few phone calls to dealers and publishers of standard in-print sets. Continuation of that kind of presto-acquisition is not possible. Even a librarian with a relatively small collection and exceptional knowledge of its gaps hardly can be expected to remember which editions of standard but out-of-print treatises have been acquired or are on order or which volumes and numbers of serial runs still are needed. As a collection grows, more staff time inevitably will be consumed in book selection decisions, in bibliographic checking, in the search for wanted titles, and in cataloging and classification.

No study has been made among law libraries to give us a standard by which to measure technical services staff needs against size of collection, book budget, and rate of acquisition, and system variables certainly make a single standard impractical.¹⁷ A high percentage of

16. Statistical information about law school libraries has been confined in the past to that provided by the "Hervey Reports," (confidential memoranda distributed annually to law school deans by the Adviser to the Council of the American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar) and has not covered this kind of detail. Neither can it be identified in the ARL-ACRL Jt. Comm. Rep., because the Report's expenditure averages are based on disparate samples.

There is a statistic-gathering custom among budget-making law librarians which leads to the collection of ad hoc figures from the libraries of comparable schools or of those with which comparison is a goal. This is a custom which the American Association of Law Libraries' current statistical project, if successful, may undermine but not eliminate. Statistics compiled from the totality of the law school library population are essential to discovery of national needs, but comparison by selection will retain its advantages to budget makers. Who wants to aspire to the average?

A comparison by selection, made in 1969 by Professor Roy Mersky for the use of the Committee on Library Formulas of the Texas Coordinating Board for Higher Education and selectively distributed, investigated percentages of budgets devoted to university library and law library support at 10 established law school libraries ranging in size from the largest down to a collection of 90,000 volumes. During the period from 1965-66 to 1967-68 those law library budgets averaged 8 percent of corresponding university budgets.

17. Internal formulae developed by some general research libraries may serve as procedural examples for law libraries, but because law libraries will not reach the size of those general

Documents and pamphlets in the acquisitions process can increase the workload without making commensurate impression on the book budget; the extent to which that kind of material is given standard cataloging produces another variable which is difficult to pin down. Still other variables depend on curricular requirements for foreign language materials or the devotion of book selectors and order staff to the pursuit of monographic studies made by state and local commissions, independent planning agencies, bar association committees, or others who publish freely and distribute reluctantly. In the absence of a neat standard, it is imperative for new school administrators to realize that, in any kind of library with a growing collection, the growth of the technical services staff is inevitable.

Compared to that inevitability, the expansion of the law library's public services staff is easy to control. It would be quite possible to hold down this expansion by holding down public service in the beginning, because library patrons who do not receive professional attention learn to expect none. Conversely, concentration on public service at any stage of development will result in an increasing workload because in any library, law or general, there is an expectation that the more the staff does for patrons the more of them will use the library and the more demanding they will become. A school which aims for quality will expect of its library staff excellent reference assistance to students, faculty, and faculty's research assistants, to the university community, and to some controllable portion of the legal community. It is not enough to provide only for service to the faculty, and to repeat the observation that faculty time is more valuable than the time of reference librarians. It needs to be noted that there is a limit to what law students can learn usefully about legal research by thrashing about on their own in law libraries, and once that limit has been reached their time, as well as the time of every other serious patron, is worth saving by professional assistance. Where this is acknowledged, the public services staff will expand too, although with more restraint than the technical processes staff.

Total personnel costs in law libraries gradually are approaching the configuration of the typical American university library, which spends 40 percent of its income on its collection and 60 percent on its staff.¹⁸ Professor Mersky's 1969 survey¹⁹ showed that the 10 libraries

libraries or match their high percentage in monographic acquisitions, the actual figures are too rich for us. They are, indeed, unbelievable to remnants of the do-it-yourself clan. For example, the Columbia University Libraries' internal formula, described to law school librarians at the N.Y.U. Law School Summer Institute in 1967 by Professor Maurice Tauber, called for the addition of one professional and two clericals in technical services for every \$25,000 new-project addition to the Libraries' book budget.

18. "Why so much on the staff? Well, the task of selecting, collecting, organizing for use

spent 60 percent for salaries and 40 percent for books during 1968-69. Half of the 10 had personnel expenditures exceeding 60 percent. The smallest of these had a collection of 180,000 volumes.

THE STAFF PROFILE

Something needs to be said about the kinds of people who should staff the law library. Early law school library administrators had a tendency to overload on legally-educated librarians. An inventory of law library tasks in a modern law library turns up a preponderance of need for workers in technical services, and these must understand the methodology of librarianship rather than the subject background of the law. Legal training in addition to librarianship training certainly does not hinder performance in technical services, if the incumbent is otherwise interested, but under usual circumstances it is too expensive to sustain. Able holders of both degrees are needed as head librarians and in middle management positions, and lawyers without librarianship educations can be used to best advantage in reference positions.

The integration of interdisciplinary studies into legal education is changing the work of law school reference staffs and may soon force changes even in schools where reference assistance has been of the minimal directional type. Compared to traditional saturation in law study, the interdisciplinary programs encourage dabbling in the social sciences, the applied sciences, even the pure sciences, without any possibility that students will be able to become familiar with the supporting materials as they traditionally have become familiar with legal materials. Some of the independent study projects lead them to areas in which teaching faculty can be of no help. Even supposing the presence of extraordinarily friendly university reference librarians, the law schools must look forward to adding subject specialists to their library staffs or to finding ways to train their librarians in the bibliography of the social and applied sciences. Such specialists will be needed to identify pertinent materials in other available collections and to select what should be added to the law school collection.

In the new school, there is a special need for experienced professional personnel, recruited at the beginning of the enterprise. The

all the carriers [of knowledge] as well as helping readers know what relevant information is available is a task that grows in complexity as the collection grows in size." Ellsworth, *The Contribution of the Library to Improving Instruction*, 94 LIBRARY J. 1955 (1969).

19. Note 16 *supra*.

new school's professionals need to be able to proceed with a minimum indoctrination period, because the collection must be built in a hurry and there are no observable library precedents to follow or predecessor staff for overlap in-service training. They must be able to make decisions about purchases and about the setting up of systems which will not have to be undone when the crash period has ended. This is of more importance than immediate recruitment of staff members who fully understand computer application to library problems. The state of the art does not yet encourage more than tentative experiments with minor computer projects by a few law libraries, and it will be some time before law libraries can be converted to automation even as parts of university library systems. In the meantime, the efficiency of the manual system will affect the ease with which the library can take advantage, at the right time, of technological advances.

Finally it ought to become universal knowledge among law school administrators, as it long has been known to general library administrators, that every competent professional librarian can keep two full-time clericals busy and that a more than competent professional, or one with responsibility for heavily routine assignments, can produce the most for the library's dollar if he can depend on three or more clericals. It must be emphasized too that law student helpers with truncated schedules, divided attention, and periodic pre-exam neuroses cannot be spliced together to produce the equivalent of full-time library clericals, no matter what the number available for splicing. The waste of time in starting and stopping, the lack of continuity for task carry-through, the unavoidable irregularities in scheduling, the toll on professional time in training, scheduling, and supervising each new class of students all work to promote inefficiency. Some form of student library work is commendable as a form of financial aid to the recently decreasing few who are interested. Dependable students still are the best bet for desk duty and shelving at hours when nobody but law students and faculty still are awake, and when full-time personnel willing to work such hours are unavailable. Student help should not be counted, however, toward satisfaction of the AALS recommendation that the law school librarians have "supporting staff."

THE LIBRARY OF THE FUTURE

The library of the future will make use of network connection among research libraries. Some of the technology on which the network will depend already is operational: microform storage, digital computer storage and retrieval, facsimile transmission, and cathode-ray-tube

display of printed material. The potential for research is enormous, but present costs also are enormous and are likely to remain out of the reach of law libraries for some time. Neither immediate nor long-term prospects allow today's planners of new law schools to anticipate reliance on other collections for satisfaction of their patrons' needs. Much-used materials will continue to be acquired and stored at lower cost and used with far greater convenience in book form on the new schools' premises. For the foreseeable future, new schools must plan the basic collections as though computers never had been invented.

The information explosions have increased the scope of patron demand, however, far beyond the traditional recurring needs, and new schools must find ways to solve the problem which now is the greatest worry of the librarians of established schools. It may be that the library staff of a new law school will be insulated to some degree from pressures to buy everything in which every important patron is interested, simply because there will be a period of concentration on building up the legal collection which all will be reluctant to disturb. The new school, too, may be an instrument for breaking long-established habits, even to an extent which would find faculty members willing to rely on the patently superior collections in other disciplines in their university library, at least for titles which will not be used with reasonable frequency. To do otherwise, and to attempt to build an interdisciplinary collection which would fill occasional requests at the same level of incidence as that of the legal collection would require financial support far beyond the expectations of every law school.²⁰

There is implied in this suggestion a closer affiliation and greater effort toward cooperation with university libraries than many schools have achieved, or even have tried to achieve, in the past. The effort will become necessary for other reasons. All of the plans for prospective electronic networks assume a base of interconnected local networks, and general librarians (notably those in state library agencies), not law librarians, are in position to coordinate the planning. The plans assume too that cooperation does not mean, as it did in the past, that weak libraries could rely on strong collections to cover their inadequacies. Today, the research library world predicts that weak libraries will have

20. Yale Law School Library's collection incorporated social science materials long before the current information explosions and before social sciences made an impression on most of the law schools' curricula; no claims have been made that the Yale Law School collection is self-sufficient. The University of California Law Library at Berkeley houses a "bibliography room" containing indexes and other search tools which lead to nonlegal materials in other collections; the example is of particular importance to schools with more limited book funds.

to pay for that kind of "cooperation."²¹ There is also an assumption that network member libraries will have built collections adequate to their local needs and capable of contribution to the other members. Law libraries are in a fortunate position in that regard. Regardless of their newness, they can contribute materials the general library world does not collect.

The new school's ability to contribute something to other law libraries in the network is less certain. It will not be possible to acquire much of the classic legal material which is and will remain out of print,²² and local legal publications or subject specialization related to the curriculum seems to offer the best prospects for qualification. While the new school builds its collection in anticipation of electronic network participation, there is no reason to suppose that informal cooperation among law libraries will not continue to function. Reasonable and intermittent needs for legal materials not in the new school's collection will be supplied for some years to come through old-fashioned interlibrary loan.

In anticipation of the library of the future, we must not dream of instant and electronic fulfillment of our every need. We must not expect to install telefacsimile equipment to drain off the whole interdisciplinary resources of a great research library to satisfy the special research project of one professor. As Dan Lacy reminded us,²³ it would be cheaper to send the professor to the great collection.

21. "It should be kept in mind that most research libraries are now hard pressed to maintain the collections and services required by their own particular constituencies; they cannot be expected to provide greatly increased regional or national services unless means can be found to reimburse them for the additional costs of these services." *On Research Libraries: Statement and Recommendations of the Committee on Research Libraries of the American Council of Learned Societies*, November, 1967, at 42 (submitted to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and reprinted by M.I.T. Press in *ON RESEARCH LIBRARIES* (1969)).

The possibility of placing a dollar value on interlibrary loans has not yet had serious discussion among law librarians, although it is overdue. In the absence of a legal union catalog, we overwork the Harvard Law Library.

22. Some of the out-of-print materials listed in the looseleaf *AALS, LAW BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR LIBRARIES* (1967) are being reprinted. The size of the market, however, makes it unlikely that more than a small percentage of the titles will be affected.

23. Lacy, *The Traditional Library*, 39 *LIBRARY Q.* 13, 19 (1969).

