

Law Library Lights

VOLUME 44, NUMBER 4

MARCH/APRIL 2001

A CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES

COPYRIGHT

COPYRIGHT, COMPUTERS AND THE INTERNET: 2000 REVIEW

Mike Songer
Partner at Brobeck,
Phleger & Harrison LLP

Editor's Note: Mr Songer is a recurring contributor to the Interlibrary Loan Special Interest Section. He has spoken and continues to speak on issues of electronic information and Intellectual Property.

THE YEAR 2000 SAW COPYRIGHT LAW MOVE INTO THE MAINSTREAM, as phrases previously known only to computer engineers, Internet fanatics, and copyright lawyers became a hot topic of conversation. As the courts grappled with two varying views of the Internet — allowing free access to all types of information versus protecting the rights of copyright holders — terms such as file swapping, memory cache, mp3 files, fair use, and the DMCA all entered into the public lexicon. This article examines several key developments in copyright law during 2000 involving the Internet and computers. First, 2000 saw the issue of music downloads from the Internet reach a critical point in the MP3.com and Napster cases. Second, the legal liability that may attach by the practice of linking websites was addressed by several courts, most notably in a case involving hacker code to disable the copy protection of DVD disks. Finally, in the area of computer law, the ability to reverse engineer software to create your own compatible works was clarified in a case involving Sony's Playstation video games. All of these cases moved beyond the issue of generic infringement by posting pictures on a website to more esoteric decisions involving the defense of fair use, compression technology, and hypertext links.

INTERNET MUSIC CASES (MP3.COM AND NAPSTER)

The two cases generating the most interest were the "music" cases involving downloading of audio tracks from the Internet onto computers or per-

sonal music file players. In both cases, Internet business established to help users download music — MP3.com and Napster — were sued by a recording industry anxious to stop the proliferation of copyrighted music over the Internet.

Over the past few years, numerous Internet websites have offered copies of music which users could listen to or download onto their own computers. Given the size of a music sound file, such dissemination is only viable by the use of compression algorithms that reduce the file size without impacting the sound quality. Using commonly available software and hardware, users copy music to a computer hard drive (a process made easier by the release of most new music in digital format on a compact disc), compress that music to a more manageable file size, and distribute that music via the Internet. The software predominantly used to compress music files utilizes a compression format called "mp3".

There are innumerable ways a user can download mp3 files from the Internet. The most common are those sites that simply offer the files on their own websites and allow an Internet browser to download those files. This practice is a direct infringement of the music copyrights; a result not seriously in dispute. The more complex issues involve different distribution techniques designed to skirt the copyright laws — techniques that were at issue in both the MP3.com and Napster cases.

MP3.com created a website that allowed users to download music from their site onto a user's home computer. Rather than merely offering the songs for download, MP3.com tried a different tack: the company itself bought commercially available music CD's, converted the songs on those discs to the mp3 format, and

continued on page 3

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Ann C. Green
Sonnenschein, Nath
& Rosenthal

THIS ISSUE OF LIGHTS IS ON COPYRIGHT. I want to thank our LLSDC and guest authors for their contributions: Roger Skalbeck, Mike Songer, and Laura "Lolly" Gasaway. In June, we will be setting the topics for *Lights* for the 2001-2002 year at the June 21, 2001 Leadership Lunch. Please watch *Dates to Remember* for the date and time of the meeting. We need ideas and authors and volunteers to "code" the articles.

The Leadership lunch for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 Board Members, Officers, SIS and Committee Chairs, will be held on June 21, 2001 at 12:30 pm. Details forthcoming in *Dates to Remember*. Please let me or one of the leaders know if you are interested in a committee or SIS.

I was delighted to attend the Wickersham Award Dinner on March 27, 2001 at the Supreme Court of the United States. Thanks to Leanne Battle and LEXIS-NEXIS for the invitation. I was thrilled to see many LLSDC members in attendance. The award dinner was a fundraiser for the Law Library of Congress. Talbot D'Alemberte, President of Florida State University, was awarded the 2001 Wickersham Award for his exceptional public service and dedication to the legal profession. For more information about the Friends of

the Law Library of Congress, you may contact them at 202-707-5076 or anme@loc.gov.

I hope to see many of you at the LLSDC Closing Banquet on May 10, 2001 at the Washington Monarch Hotel. The Washington Monarch has a lovely outdoor courtyard where we will meet for drinks if the weather is fine. Thanks to WDS/Choicepoint for sponsoring the dinner. Our guest and speaker will be Frank Liu, AALL Executive Board member and Director of the Law Library and Professor of Law, Duquesne University Law Library, Pittsburgh, PA. Frank will also visit several law libraries during the day on May 10th. He will be at the Franklin Square Focus Group meeting for lunch. The Focus Group will be open to anyone for Frank's visit, but please RSVP to Laurie Malone at 202-737-4582 or ljm@hpm.com if you would like to attend. Information on the time and location of the meeting will be in *Dates to Remember*.

As I write this column, 119 of you have responded to the LLSDC survey. Thank you! If you missed the Town Meeting and would like to see a copy of the PowerPoint show, please contact me at president@llsdc.org. I look forward to implementing some of the changes we discussed during my 2001-2002 term. ■

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FEATURES

| | | |
|---|-------------------|----|
| Copyright, Computers and the Internet: 2000 Review | Mike Songer | 1 |
| Legal Research Institute a Success | Ann C. Green | 9 |
| Ownership of Copyrighted Works | Laura N. Gasaway | 10 |
| An Inside Look at LLSDC, Town Meeting 2001 | Ann C. Green | 12 |
| Asking the Copyright Question: Do We Really Want Answers? | Roger V. Skalbeck | 14 |
| Volunteer Opportunity to Benefit DC Public School Libraries | Nancy McKinley | 16 |

COLUMNS

| | | |
|--|---------------------|----|
| President's Column | Ann C. Green | 2 |
| Private Law Library/SIS News | Maureen S. Stellino | 18 |
| Eye on Serials | Susan Ryan | 18 |
| Academic/SIS News | Michael J. Petit | 19 |
| Interlibrary Loan/SIS News | Pete Vay | 19 |
| Federal Law Librarians Program on Acquisitions | Rick J. McKinney | 20 |
| Foreign and International Law/SIS | Kelly Vinopal | 21 |
| Legislative Research/SIS News | David M. Mao | 21 |
| DC Code Update | David W. Lang | 22 |

ADVERTISERS

| | | | |
|--------------------|----|-------------------------|------|
| Alert Publications | 15 | Lexis | 17 |
| CAL INFO | 12 | Potomac Publishing | 6 |
| Choice Point | 11 | TLC/On Point | 22 |
| Global Securities | 5 | Washington Doc. Service | 13 |
| InfoCurrent | 20 | West | 9,16 |

Law Library Lights is published five times a year by the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, DC Inc. 20009, ISSN 0546-2483.

Subscription Rates: Nonmembers (outside Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia): \$35/volume, \$15 single issue. Send subscription requests and correspondence to: Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C., Inc. 669 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. Attn. *Lights* Subscriptions. Subscriptions are also available through F.W. Faxon Co. and EBSCO.

Membership dues include a subscription to *Law Library Lights*. For Membership information, contact the Membership Committee Chair, 669 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. The Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C., Inc. does not assume any responsibility for the statements advanced by contributors to, nor the advertisers in, *Law Library Lights*. The views expressed herein are those of the individual authors and do not constitute an endorsement by the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C., Inc.

placed those mp3 files on their website. The company sought to comply with the copyright laws by creating an internal “check”: downloading music files from the MP3 site to a user’s computer was permitted only if the user could prove prior ownership of the music compact disc.¹ Once the user showed prior ownership, that user could listen and download individual songs in MP3 format to and from any computer.

Napster’s approach to music distribution was different. Instead of purchasing compact discs and converting music files, Napster relied on “peer-to-peer” copying. Under this system, Napster itself did not offer the music files on their website. Instead, Napster provided computer software which could be downloaded and installed on a personal computer. This software allowed any user with an Internet connection to search any other Internet user’s computer files for the appropriate music. That is, if you are connected to the Internet, the Napster software actually allows other Internet users to search your computer hard drive for sound files in the mp3 format. Napster sought to avoid copyright liability by this service because Napster itself kept no music files on its site; instead, Napster merely provided the means by which users could themselves search the Internet and copy sound files.

As the two cases played out in the courts, their different distribution formats created different results. In the MP3.com case, the district court in the Southern District of New York had little trouble finding that MP3.com’s creation of compressed music files constituted infringement: “the complex marvels of cyberspatial communication may create difficult legal issues, but not in this case...defendant’s infringement of [RIAA’s] copyrights is clear.” *UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. MP3.com*, 92 F.Supp.2d 349, 350 (SDNY 2000). MP3.com was later assessed damages of \$25,000 *per copied disc* for their infringing activities, with total liability set at \$53,400,000. *UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. MP3.com*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13293 at * 18 (SDNY September 6, 2000); *UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. MP3.com*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17907 (SDNY November 14, 2000).

The Napster case appeared to be on a less certain path. The Ninth Circuit stayed a district court injunction against Napster in a much-publicized decision. Since that stay last summer, there has been a wide-ranging debate as to the merits of Napster and its effect on both music distribution and copyright law. However, as this

article was going to press, the Ninth Circuit ruled against Napster; once the district court modifies its preliminary injunction, the music service effectively will be shut-down.

MP3.COM

Why was there a clear finding of infringement in the MP3.com case? MP3.com’s actions — taking a copyrighted music track and converting that track into a compressed computer file — clearly required the creation of a copy of the original work, thereby creating a presumptive case of infringement. MP3.com did not seriously contest this point.² Instead, MP3.com argued that its copying feature constituted protected fair use. Under the fair use standards, copying is allowed if the new use “transforms” the original work by “infusing [the original work] with new meaning, new understandings, or the like.” 92 F.Supp. 2d at 351 (citing *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569 (1994)). MP3.com argued that its computer files created a transformative “spatial shift” by allowing users to listen to music without physically having the original compact disc, thereby freeing the users to enjoy the music in any location. This argument was rejected flatly, mainly because MP3.com could not show that their actions did more than merely repackage the original content into a new medium. Under established copyright law, mere changes to an original work into a new media do not constitute a transformative fair use. “While such services may be innovative, they are not transformative.” *Id.* at 351.³

The MP3.com case is important because it conclusively establishes that the fair use defense will not excuse copying of copyrighted material on the Internet. The case also provides yet more ammunition against those who insist that copyright law does not (or should not) apply to the Internet. As Judge Rakoff noted during the damages phase of the MP3.com case: “Some of the evidence in this case strongly suggests that some companies operating in the area of the Internet may have a misconception that, because their technology is somewhat novel, they are somehow immune from the ordinary applications of laws of the United States, including copyright law...[t]hey need to understand that the law’s domain knows no such limits.” *UMG Recordings, Inc. et al. v. MP3.com*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13293 at * 18 (SDNY September 6, 2000).

NAPSTER

Like MP3.com, the district court hearing the Napster case also found that the ability of users

THE MP3.COM CASE IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT CONCLUSIVELY ESTABLISHES THAT THE FAIR USE DEFENSE WILL NOT EXCUSE COPYING OF COPYRIGHTED MATERIALS ON THE INTERNET.

IN THE LIGHT OF BOTH THE MP3.COM AND NAPSTER DECISIONS, THE COURTS HAVE STRESSED THAT NEW MEDIA — NO MATTER HOW NOVEL OR POPULAR — CANNOT DEFEAT THE RIGHTS AVAILABLE TO COPYRIGHT OWNERS.

to exchange copyrighted songs in mp3 format constituted infringement, although the strength of the decision is less certain than in the MP3.com case. *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 114 F.Supp. 2d 896 (N.D. Cal. 2000). Although the fact of infringement has not been contested, what makes the Napster case intriguing is the variety of defenses Napster has asserted to defend its file swapping service.

Napster's cornerstone for defending their activity was that their service did not directly allow users to download music from the Napster site onto a user's computer. Instead, Napster merely facilitated the use of the Internet to exchange mp3 music files by private individuals. Thus, Napster asserted that their activity fell under the "staple article of commerce" doctrine. Napster also asserted that their service was a fair use of the copyrighted work, since the presentation of files in an mp3 format transforms the nature of the work in a significant manner. Finally, the Napster case raised issues involving the Audio Home Recording Act, a law which allows users to create copies of works for their personal use and absolves equipment manufacturers (or facilitators) from copyright liability.

None of these defenses worked at the district court level (although the result is far from clear given the Ninth Circuit's ongoing review of the matter). The court rejected the "staple article of commerce" defense. This defense, most recently derived from the VCR cases of the 1980's, holds that a manufacturer is not liable for copyright infringement if its product has substantial non-infringing uses. The district court rejected this defense, finding that Napster, in fact, has no substantial non-infringing uses. Relying on expert evidence and Napster's own documentation, the court found that the "use" of Napster's service was the "unauthorized downloading and uploading of popular music, most of which is copyrighted." By this finding the concept of "space-shifting" as a defense was dismissed; the ability for users to create personal copies for use in different "spaces" other than their normal CD's was of no importance, given that the majority of Napster users did not possess legitimate copies of the music they downloaded. 114 F.Supp. 2d at 915-917.

The court also rejected Napster's fair use defense. In doing so the court affirmed the MP3.com ruling that the creation of an mp3 music file from a copyrighted audio track is not a transformative use. The court also dismissed Napster's assertion that its activities were fair use because they were non-commercial (a factor of the fair use defense examines whether the user is achieving financial gain). Even though Napster

did not charge users for its service, this fact did not absolve Napster from liability because the service encouraged the free exchange of music that normally would be paid for by a consumer. This activity conferred an indirect economic advantage on Napster's users and harmed legitimate copyright owners.⁴ 114 F.Supp. 2d at 913-914.

Finally, the court noted and rejected Napster's AHRA defense. The Audio Home Recording Act provides immunity for manufacturers of digital music devices from contributory copyright infringement claims. As a trade-off, the manufacturers of devices covered by the AHRA pay a royalty to copyright owners. Although much discussed in the Napster case, the district court did not find the statute applicable to Napster since the device, a personal computer, is not covered by the AHRA. 114 F.Supp. 2d at note 19.

The Ninth Circuit upheld all of these arguments for the recording industry. Notably, the court dismissed Napster's "space-shifting" fair use defense, distinguishing the service from those activities which allow users to copy recordings which they own in the mp3 format for playback on a mp3 device. Since the Napster users did not legitimately own the copies of songs they obtained, the concept of "space-shifting" did not apply. The Ninth Circuit also upheld the commercial benefit arguments relied on by the recording industry, continuing the trend of cases that find that even remote, indirect commercial gain by copyright infringers negates fair use. *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, ___ F.3d ___ (9th Cir. 2001).

In light of both the MP3.com and Napster decisions, the courts have stressed that new media - no matter how novel or popular - cannot defeat the rights available to copyright owners. In light of these decisions and the intersection of copyright law and music distribution technology, both Napster and MP3.com have modified their businesses — entering into relationships with established record companies, announcing fee services, and changing the manner in which users can download mp3 files. These facts may solve their corporate problems in the short term, but no long term relief appears viable unless further Napster appeals overturn the persuasive arguments against fair use and other defenses advanced by the courts so far.

INTERNET LINKS

The year 2000 also saw the maturation of the law of hypertext linking on the Internet. Hypertext links are those elements on websites that allow browsers to immediately "point-and-click" to different websites. The concern for copyright



law arises not from the placement of a link on a page — which in most instances will not contain enough original text to constitute infringement — but with the ability of a link to direct users to pages that contain infringing material. Under the concept of contributory infringement, a person may be found liable if they assist others to infringe copyrights. However, unlike the strict liability that attaches to direct infringement, contributory copyright infringement requires that the person contributing know that their actions are assisting others to violate the copyright laws.

LINK LIABILITY EXAMINED

Last year, courts began to examine the issue of link liability. In *Intellectual Reserve, Inc. v. Utah Lighthouse Ministry, Inc.*, 75 F. Supp. 2d 1290 (D. Utah 1999), the court ruled that a website operator could be held liable for contributory copyright infringement for providing links on his webpage to a site containing infringing material. In that case, the infringing material was matter belonging to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints; the court held that merely providing links to the offending pages did not relieve the website operator of liability, since the operator knew that the page to which it linked had infringing material. This trend, disturbing to some in that it negates the very essence of the Internet — providing easy methods to locate material by connecting various diverse material — continued in 2000.

In *Universal City Studios, Inc. et al. v. Reimerdes et al.*, 111 F. Supp.2d 294 (SDNY 2000), the court addressed a different aspect of copyright infringement. Instead of normal copyright infringement, the Universal City case addresses an aspect of copyright law generated by the recent Digital Millennium Copyright Act. Under this new law it is illegal to offer technology that is primarily designed for the “purpose of circumventing” copyright protection techniques. 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(2). In this case the defendants first posted, and then later linked, “hacker” software code (DeCSS) that enabled users to decrypt DVD disks. The court ordered the defendants, who operated various websites that made the DeCSS hacker code available for download, to remove the code from their site because it allowed users to bypass the encryption and copy protection features found on DVD disks. The issue in the Universal City case involves whether merely providing links on a website to other sites that make DeCSS available violates the anti-circumvention provisions of the DMCA.

GLOBAL SECURITIES AD

The court offered a sliding scale analysis of link liability, depending on the nature of the site one can visit by clicking on the link. Not all of the links on the offending website were identical. Some were merely the start of a series of links that eventually led to the DeCSS code (i.e., site A linked to site B, which linked to site C, which contained the code). Some were to websites that allowed access to the code, but required further “clicking” on that latter website to initiate the transfer of it. Lastly, some were to pages that contained the infringing code and automatically initiated the file transfer. 111 F.Supp.2d at 324-325.

Working backwards from the issues presented above, the court had little trouble finding infringement for links to those sites that began the automatic file transfer of DeCSS, since the defendants, by offering the link, were “engaged in the functional equivalent” of transferring the code themselves. 111 F. Supp.2d at 325. Similarly, the court had little trouble with liability for links that connect websites that contain the code but require further action to initiate the download. Interestingly, the court did not address the issue of “indirect” linking, whereby the owner of site A could be liable for links that eventually connected to the infringing code; a close reading of

the case suggests that if the owner actually knew that the indirect website was offering the code and offered the link that started the chain towards infringement, that site owner would be found liable under the anti-circumvention provisions of the copyright law. *Id.*

The court’s wide-ranging findings were tempered by the realities of linking on the Internet. The court found “potentially more troublesome” the issue of links to sites that may contain the infringing code (or links to the infringing code), but that also contain a “good deal of [other] content.” *Id.* The court presented a hypothetical whereby the *Los Angeles Times* website may somewhere contain, in addition to its news stories, advertisements, and services, the offending DeCSS code. Many website owners may link to the *Los Angeles Times* website for different reasons, the majority of which are legitimate efforts to connect users to the *Times*’ website. In this case, the court noted that “it would be wrong to say that anyone who linked to the *Los Angeles Times* website, regardless of purpose or the manner in which the link was described” violated the DMCA. *Id.* at 325. However, this analysis did not excuse the defendants’ liability, since the purpose of their links was not to go to a site that merely “happened to” have the DeCSS code — the purpose was to actively get people to go to the sites to locate the code.

This decision and others have started to clarify the issues involved with link liability. Contrary to many reports, the linking cases percolating from the courts do not prohibit or even present the danger of prohibiting generic links on your website. Instead, the decisions are logical extensions of existing copyright law into the digital world. The DeCSS case acknowledges that not all links will generate infringement; instead, it depends on the nature, knowledge, and extent of your linking activity. If you knowingly assist someone to infringe another’s copyright, you are guilty of contributory copyright infringement. Likewise, if you knowingly offer technology that circumvents copy protection devices, you are guilty of infringement under the DMCA. The link context of these decisions does nothing to change the basic concepts: If you link to a site with the knowledge that the site contains infringing material, you will violate the copyright laws; if the purpose of your link is to encourage others to locate or download infringing material, you will violate the copyright laws; and, if you describe your link in a manner that leaves no doubt that clicking through that link will lead the user to infringing material, you will violate the copyright laws.

POTOMAC
PUBLISHING AD



SONY V. CONNECTIX

Finally, in the area of computers and copyright law, the year 2000 saw the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirming the ability to reverse engineer software code to obtain access to certain features in that code. *Sony Computer Enter., Inc. v. Connectix Corp.*, 203 F.3d 596 (9th Cir. 2000), cert. denied 121 S.Ct. 172 (2000). The facts of this case involve popular video games. Connectix created emulation software which allowed users to play Sony Playstation video game software on a personal computer instead of Sony's proprietary game console. Under the Connectix system, users were required to have a legitimate copy of the actual video game software; however, that software could be played on an Apple Macintosh computer instead of the Sony hardware. Connectix created the "Virtual Game Station" program by reverse engineering Sony's copyrighted BIOS, or system command, software. Connectix then emulated BIOS through the creation of a separate computer program that ran on the Macintosh computer operating system. Connectix's final product — their computer program — did not infringe Sony's BIOS code. Despite the lack of copyright infringement in the final copy, Sony argued that the method used by Connectix — creation of "intermediate" copies for the purpose of creating a non-infringing work — constituted copyright infringement. Sony argued that this reverse engineering process infringed their copyright on BIOS because Connectix created unauthorized copies of BIOS to study and design their program. The district court ruled in favor of Sony and granted an injunction against the distribution of the game product; Connectix appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Computer software inherently contains two elements — original elements that reflect the authors expression and original elements that are functional in nature in that they direct the computer to perform certain tasks. Copyright protection exists over the non-functional elements, but not over the functional elements. Given this dichotomy, courts have struggled over how to address the issue of those who reverse engineer software to obtain access to functional, non-protected features. This reverse engineering process is likely to violate the copyright laws, since during the process the entire software code — including the protected expressive elements — usually is copied onto computers for analysis.⁵

Prior to 2000, courts held that it was protected fair use to reverse engineer software to obtain access to non-protected (i.e., functional) elements. *Sega Enters. Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc.*, 977

F.2d 1510 (9th Cir. 1993). Under the *Sega* doctrine, disassembly of computer software code to "gain access to ideas and functional elements" is fair use of the copyrighted work "where there is a legitimate reason for seeking such access." 977 F.2d at 1527-28. The district court, in granting an injunction against the distribution of the Connectix program, found that Connectix exceeded the scope of allowable fair use copying dictated by *Sega v. Accolade*. The court found that Connectix's "use" of the BIOS to create the emulation program violated *Sega* in that the fair use permitted by *Sega* was limited to "studying" computer code to determine its functional elements. 203 F.3d at 604. The lower court also indicated that there was no "legitimate reason" for Connectix to access and copy Sony's BIOS, since Connectix's repeated copying of the Sony code for examination purposes went beyond the "necessary" copying allowed under *Sega v. Accolade*. *Id.*

The appellate court rejected these arguments and removed the injunction. The Ninth Circuit held that, with respect to the creation of intermediate copies for proper reverse engineering purposes, there is no distinction between "using" and "studying" the code in the fair use analysis. Reverse engineering, a complicated process, necessarily involves creating intermediate copies; and an artificial semantic difference between "use" and "study" was not supported by the existing case law. 203 F.3d at 604. Moreover, the court rejected Sony's argument that the repeated copying of the Sony code onto Connectix computers was not "necessary," finding that such an argument would "erect an artificial hurdle in the way of the public's access to the ideas contained within copyrighted software programs." *Id.* at 605. Analyzing the statutory fair use factors, the Ninth Circuit found that three of the factors (nature of the created work, purpose of the use, and effect of use) favored Connectix. Sony effectively argued that the fourth factor — the amount of the portion copied — weighed in their favor due to the pervasive nature of the copying to conduct the reverse engineering. However, the Ninth Circuit gave this factor "little weight" since it involved "a case of intermediate infringement when the final product [did] not itself contain infringing material." *Id.* at 607-08. Thus, the Ninth Circuit overturned the injunction: the intermediate copying of Sony's BIOS code constituted allowable fair use.

The *Sony v. Connectix* decision is important in that it clarifies the scope of reverse engineering that may be used to create competitive software products. Software designers may manipulate a copyrighted work in a variety of ways to discover

**PRIOR TO 2000,
COURTS HELD THAT
IT WAS PROTECTED
FAIR USE TO
REVERSE ENGINEER
SOFTWARE TO
OBTAIN ACCESS TO
NON-PROTECTED
ELEMENTS.**

the functional aspects of that work. The copyright owner — despite the pervasive copying of the work necessary for reverse engineering — cannot claim infringement so long as the end product does not itself infringe on the work from which it was derived.

CONCLUSION — 2001 AND BEYOND

If 2000 saw the rise in consumer awareness of copyright law and the Internet, the coming year offers more of the same, as the evolving nature of the Internet and digital media will continue to receive attention from both the courts and the media. Upcoming in 2001 will be more appeals related to the Napster decision, which will clarify the future of mp3 file music distribution over the Internet. In addition, the Supreme Court will decide the case *New York Times Co. v. Tasini*, 206 F.3d 161 (2d Cir. 1999), relating to the rights of freelance writers when their articles are republished in electronic format. The lower court ruled that electronic database owners had a right to create a derivative work of articles previously written in a non-digital format; the appellate court reversed and found that the writers were individual contributors to collective works, and thus entitled to control their works under 17 U.S.C. § 201(c). Finally, recent regulations related to “streaming” audio and video technologies that allow Internet users to listen to radio and television broadcasts will likely be challenged in 2001; the new regulations require broadcasters that simultaneously transmit over the Internet to pay

additional royalties on the Internet transmission. (65 Fed. Reg. 77292, 12/11/00).

¹ Prior ownership was shown by requiring the user to load the music compact disc into their computer hard drive — MP3.com would recognize this ownership and allow copying of files from their website. Prior ownership also could be shown by having the user purchase the music compact disc through an affiliated online retailer.

² Although MP3.com argued that the compressed file copies it created were different than the original music track, the court found such differences to be insignificant, especially since the computer file was meant to be “sonically as identical to the original CD as possible.” UMG Recordings, 92 F.Supp. 2d at note 1.

³ MP3.com also attempted to use the *Sony v. Connectix* decision to support its fair use argument in that those cases allowed the copying of an original work for reverse engineering purposes. This argument was rejected; the *Sony v. Connectix* decision was distinguished in that the transformative use actually created a new form of expression, whereas MP3.com’s use merely converted the original expression into a new format. UMG Recordings, 92 F.Supp 2d at note 2.

⁴ The court thus expanded the holding in *American Geophysical Union v. Texaco, Inc.*, 60 F.3d 913 (2d Cir. 1994), which held that the copying of scholarly articles for the purpose of facilitating research generated an indirect economic benefit for the copier and was therefore a commercial activity. See also *Los Angeles Times v. Free Republic*, 54 USPQ 2d (BNA) 143 (C.D. Cal. 2000)(finding copyright liability against a non-profit bulletin board service that allowed the verbatim posting of news articles because the copying had an adverse impact on the newspapers by allowing users to avoid paying the customary price).

⁵ The mere act of copying software onto a computer’s memory, including RAM and memory caches, constitutes infringement. *MAI Systems Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc.*, 991 F.2d 511 (9th Cir. 1993). ■

LLSDC INTERNET LISTSERV



TO SUBSCRIBE SEND A MESSAGE TO:

listproc@gmu.edu
In the message field type:
sub llscd Your Name

Messages can be sent to the listserv by
addressing them to: llscd@gmu.edu

If you have any problems or
questions, please call Rae Best at
703/993-8101 or contact her via e-mail
to RBEST@GMUVAX.GMU.EDU

LLSDC SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANTS COMMITTEE



The LLSDC Scholarships and Grants Committee provides awards for registration fees to professional meetings, seminars, workshops, classes, coursework, and other forms of continuing education. Deadlines are August 1 (for Fall semester), December 1 (for Spring semester) and May 1 (for summer). For more information please contact, Gordon Van Pielt at 202/662-9191. Application forms are available on the LLSDC website at www.llscd.org/llscd/grants.html.



THE LEGAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES WERE HELD ON MARCH 13 AND MARCH 15, 2001

at the George Washington University, Jacob Burns Law Library. The Legal Research Institutes are hands-on all day programs aimed at those working in law libraries who want to sharpen their research skills and non-law library personnel and paralegals with limited experience using basic American legal sources. This year for the first time, there was also a class on International Law Sources. Thanks to Ruth Bridges, Jane Walsh and Carol Grant for planning, coordinating and staffing the event. For Institute I, there were 98 participants and for Institute II, there were 87 participants this year.

On behalf of LLSDC, I express our gratitude to the instructors who taught the classes for both Institutes. Institute I instructors included Charles M. Knuth, Foley & Lardner, who talked about Cases; Tracey Bridgman, Georgetown Law Center, whose topic was statutes; Annette Erbrecht, Crowell & Moring, who spoke on Secondary Sources; and Lisa Harrington, Holland & Knight, whose topic was Looseleaf Services. For Institute II, thanks to J.O. Wallace, Latham & Watkins, who spoke on Legislative History Sources; Mindy

Klasky, Arent Fox whose topic was Administrative Law; Herbert A. Somers, George Washington University, Jacob Burns Law Library who lectured on International Law; and Patricia A. Keller, Kirkpatrick & Lockart who spoke on Finding law On the Internet.

For the first time, LLSDC had sponsors for the Legal Research Institute. Our sponsors for the morning continental breakfast and afternoon snacks were LEXIS-NEXIS and West Group/WESTLAW. Thanks to Ellen Feldman, Williams & Connolly, for coordinating the sponsorship. LEXIS-NEXIS and West Group/WESTLAW also contributed handouts and promotional materials. We were delighted to have representatives from our sponsor groups - Gary Berberian from West Group/WESTLAW and Linda Hutchinson and Leanne Battle from LEXIS-NEXIS - attend the Institute.

We will be conducting a Focus Group soon on the future of the Legal Research Institute. If you are interested in teaching, working on handouts, or talking about what classes to include in the future, please contact Ann Green at president@llsdc.org or 202-408-6452. ■

LEGAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE A SUCCESS

*Ann C. Green
Sonnenschein Nath
& Rosenthal*

WEST AD

OWNERSHIP OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS

Laura N Gasaway

Editor's Note: This article by Laura "Lolly" Gasaway, Director of Law Library and Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Law Library, originally appeared in the October 2000 issue of SLA's Copyright Corner. Lolly is a frequent author and speaker on copyright issues.

WHO OWNS A COPYRIGHT WORK? The easy answer is found in the statute itself - the author owns the copyright. But who is the author? Who else has a claim of ownership in a copyright? Ownership may be held by the original author, jointly held by two or more co-authors, claimed by the author's employer or by a publisher.

The copyright clause of the U.S. Constitution enables Congress to enact legislation that promotes learning by ensuring to authors the exclusive rights to their writings. So, copyright law is grounded in the idea that the author should reap the benefits from exploiting the work she developed. This is a very attractive outcome—rewarding the author who produces the copyrighted work.

Public acceptance of the work dictates how much monetary reward the author will receive. Thus, romance writers may earn considerably more income from their novels than a serious Keats scholar earns from his scholarly writings. Romance novels often are sold in both hardback and then paperback editions; further, they may be marketed as a book on tape. Very lucrative movie contracts are also often available for romance novels that are then converted into television movies of the week, i.e., derivative works. The author earns additional income by transferring the movie rights to the motion picture studio and may receive residuals each time the movie plays on broadcast or cable television. Viewers who see the made-for-television movie may then want to purchase a copy of the novel to read. Contrast this with the serious Keats scholar who may produce either a scholarly journal article or a monograph which likely will have many fewer readers than the romance novel. There are no paperback versions, books on tape or motion picture scripts developed from this work. But whatever monetary or reputational rewards the scholarly writing generates ought to belong to the author.

If there are multiple authors and the copyright is jointly owned, each author owns the entire work. The difficulties caused by joint ownership are especially acute for users who seek permission to use a jointly held copyright work. Although each owner may alienate the work but must share any income that the transfer of the work generates, often joint authors will require a user to obtain permission from each of them.

For both individual and joint authors, ownership of the copyright may be illusory at best. In order to get most scholarly articles published, one is forced to transfer the copyright to the publisher. In fact, often publishers require transfer of the entire copyright when, in reality, all the publisher needs is the right to reproduce and distribute the article by publishing it in a journal issue, and to be able to include it in future publications efforts such as electronic publishing. To be effective, transfers must be in writing.

But what happens when the author is an employee of a company, a university or a federal government agency? Each of these types of authors is treated differently. A "work for hire" under the Copyright Act is defined as one prepared by an employee within the scope of his employment. The copyright in a "work for hire" then belongs to the employer and not to the individual author. This provision governs corporate employees, and often this is directly stated in employment contracts or corporate employment policies.

Federal government employees may not own the copyright in works produced within the scope of their employment, but for different reasons. Under Section 105 of the Copyright Act, works produced by the federal government are not eligible for copyright protection. Thus, a work developed by a federal employee either on the job or within the scope of employment is copyright free. On the other hand, if a federal employee writes a novel in the evening on her own time, these works may be copyrighted and the copyright would be owned by the author.

Articles written by federal government employees within the scope of their employment are also copyright free. It appears that many federal employees are unaware that they do not hold the copyright, and they frequently sign forms purporting to transfer the copyright to a publisher. When the article is published in a journal issue, often at the bottom of the first page of the article there is a statement that the article is copyright free because of the employment status of the federal employee. However, when the publisher places copyright notice on the journal issue, it seldom states that the notice does not apply to the included articles written by federal employees.

Faculty authors, on the other hand, almost always own the copyrights in works they produce. While there is a strong argument that faculty-generated scholarly works are works for hire, by tradition, however, universities have not claimed rights in faculty produced copyrighted works. There are several possible explanations for this tradition. First, except for a few best selling textbooks,

**OWNERSHIP MAY
BE HELD BY THE
ORIGINAL AUTHOR,
JOINTLY HELD BY
TWO OR MORE
CO-AUTHORS,
CLAIMED BY THE
AUTHOR'S
EMPLOYER OR BY
A PUBLISHER.**

novels and software, most faculty-produced works generate no income. In fact, in some disciplines, the author may have to pay page charges in order to get the work published. Second, permitting the author to hold the copyright is often reward for faculty in lieu of higher salaries. Third, these works often are not very marketable and appeal only to a very small group of scholars.

Of course, this may be changing in the digital environment. Especially with the advent of online courses, the institution now has two interests: the right to continue to use the online course even if the faculty member leaves the university and the right to share in any royalties that commercializing the course generates. Usually the key is the amount of resources that the university has invested to develop the course. All over the world the issue of faculty ownership of nontraditional works is being discussed. Many institutions of higher learning are revising their copyright policies to encompass institutional rights to use these works, own the rights or share any income that the work generates.

The digital environment creates some additional concerns about authorship. In the analog world it was easy to determine when a work was finished. Whenever the work is completed, each artist who added paint to the canvas is an author. In other works, there is a point at which it is clear that the work is completed, and then it is relatively easy to determine who were the authors. Digital works complicate this determination since the online mystery novel may continue to be edited, expanded and changed by a variety of authors. At what point is authorship fixed? This is a matter of some concern since determining when the work passes into the public domain is triggered by the death date of the author. Works are protected for life of the author plus 70 years. In the case of multiple authors, it is the life of the last living author that starts the running of the 70 year term. Huge groups of authors who contribute to sequential works such as an on-going mystery novel on the web or a painting to which various artists contribute over time will complicate the determination of the running of the copyright term.

Authorship is a critical issue in copyright now complicated by technology and the digital age. And yet, the constitutional clause itself focuses on authors. ■

ERROR

The January-February 2001 issue of Lights was incorrectly numbered as vol. 45 #3. It should have been vol. 44 #3.

CHOICEPOINT AD

AN INSIDE LOOK AT LLSDC, TOWN MEETING 2001

Ann C. Green
Sonnenschein Nath &
Rosenthal

FIFTY PEOPLE ATTENDED THE LAW LIBRARIANS SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, DC TOWN MEETING on March 22, 2001 at the law firm of Kirpatrick & Lockart. President Ann Green led a discussion of "Hot Topics" based on questions from the March 12, 2001 membership survey. These topics, which have also been discussed by the LLSDC Board, include Changes to current Committees; Member and non-member rates and benefits; LLSDC Society-wide Meetings; Jobline Facts, and Volunteerism. As of the date of this meeting, 119 of 800 LLSDC members had responded to this zoomerang.com based electronic LLSDC membership survey.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Discussion of the 23 LLSDC committees centered on the ideas that they are not operating effectively, are not all active, and that even getting Chairs for each of the committees is difficult. Some committees can be merged and some can be deleted. Ten percent of the survey respondents think that the following committees are not necessary: Consulting, Contemporary Social Issues, Mentoring, Placement, Public Outreach, Public Relations, and Volunteer. Some of these functions could be

merged, e.g. Membership and Mentoring. The committees that will be merged or cut cannot be vital to LLSDC's operation such as the Nominations Committee.

MEMBER AND NON-MEMBER RATES AND BENEFITS

What are the benefits of being a LLSDC member? Member benefits include the publications (*Membership Directory*, *Dates to Remember*, *Law Library Lights*), invitations to educational programs, meetings and banquets, as well as the added social and networking benefits. Special Interest Section (SIS) membership is available for an added nominal fee.

The member/non-member rate question is critical to this year's Board discussions on paying for publications or seminars using a credit card. The use of a credit card is increasingly important to a growing number of members, especially those in government or academic institutions. A solid 18% of survey respondents does not favor one uniform rate for members and nonmembers, as this reduces our overall membership benefits. Survey statistics show that members might be willing to concede to "one rate" using a charge card for publications rather than seminars, but there is still opposition to this. We do have to remember that those requesting a credit card option are also members. We have to do what is best for the entire LLSDC Society with regards to member benefits and credit card transactions.

LLSDC SOCIETY-WIDE MEETINGS

LLSDC has three Society-wide meetings each year: Opening Banquet, Town Meeting, and Closing Banquet. Of the survey respondents, 13% always attend the Opening Banquet and 37% never attend; 2% always attend the Town Meeting and 58% never attend; and 10% attend the Closing Banquet and 38% never attend. A show of hands in the room indicated that some would prefer a lunch or breakfast format for at least one evening function. A recent vendor-sponsored breakfast was very well attended, for example. Having a large gathering over lunch or breakfast would also be less expensive than an evening banquet in a hotel setting. LLSDC has to subsidize evening events heavily even with vendor sponsorship and a fee per person charged to the member. Almost 30% of survey respondents said they pay their own way, while 70% of employers pay. Everyone at the meeting seemed to think that the Town Meeting as a business meeting was a useful event, especially for newer members. Sev-

CAL INFO
AD



eral LLSDC members who had been members of other AALL chapters stated that business had always been conducted at their quarterly meetings before or after the speaker or event. That is hard to do with a group as large as LLSDC in certain settings, but the idea of sharing business information with members is a good one.

JOBLINE FACTS

The LLSDC Jobline on the webpage is not current and revenue has not been collected from employers. Of the survey respondents, 54% use the jobline but only 80% of employers use it. Retyping job postings from the listserv and the Washington Post is too time consuming. Meeting attendees seemed in favor of trying to load PDF versions of the postings on the listserv onto the LLSDC WebPage, if this could be done quickly and efficiently without a lot of rekeying by the Website Committee. Whether to just have links to other sites like The Washington Post, Metropolitan Council of Governments and other Library WebPages or whether to keep Jobline and update it on the LLSDC WebPage was discussed.

VOLUNTEERISM

Volunteerism is another hot button on the Board this year. Of the survey respondents, 51% stated that they do not have enough time to volunteer. Many LLSDC members, especially new members, check the volunteer box on the Membership form,

but have not been contacted. The form is too vague and the list of over 200 names is too long to call every name on it. Ways to modify the Volunteer form were discussed. An email list of those who want to volunteer was also discussed, possibly using Yahoo email groups. LLSDC members were also urged to contact the SIS or Committee Chair or Board members directly. Some other chapters such as SLA, offer an incentive to volunteers such as a free registration for working the seminar or writing an article or a free meal for working a meeting or banquet. This option appealed to several people at the Town Meeting and will be discussed further by the Board.

MAKE YOUR OPINIONS KNOWN

If you have not responded to the LLSDC Survey and are a member of the chapter, we would like to have your input. To fill out the survey, please go to the following URL and follow the instructions on the screen: <http://www.llsdc.org/survey.htm>. Only one response per member, please. Members are welcome at Board meetings, especially when they have an item on the Board Agenda. You can also make their opinions known by talking to the Board liaison for all SIS and Committee Chairs, or by contacting the LLSDC Leaders listed on the webpage and on the back of *Law Library Lights*. Members were encouraged to call the leaders directly or to email Ann Green at president@llsdc.org. ■

WASHINGTON
DOCUMENT
SERVICE AD

ASKING THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION: DO WE REALLY WANT ANSWERS?

A LOOK AT
TECHNOLOGY
TOOLS AND LEGAL
DEVELOPMENTS THAT
HELP POSTPONE
ANSWERS TO COPY-
RIGHT QUESTIONS - IS
THIS WHAT WE WANT?

By Roger V. Skalbeck
Technology Services
Librarian, George Mason
University School of Law.

NOWADAYS, UBIQUITOUS COMPUTERS AND INTERNET AVAILABILITY of any number of digital formats and materials are causing us to consider critical copyright questions including those involving rights, payments, royalties, and the ever-elusive “fair use” beast. I’m not a lawyer now, so I won’t even try to answer some of these. In fact, in considering the current questions, I think that we might not want answers all too quickly. I tend to think that with widespread questions of copyright, it might be advisable to follow the age-old advice: “Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it.”

In this brief article, I’ll look at some recent developments in linking technology as well as some high-profile copyright cases and legislation that seem to postpone or somehow avoid direct answers to very profound questions of copyright. I think that in many respects we do want to hold off on pushing for answers too quickly. My one goal with this article is to propose some scenarios in which the questions are being avoided or diverted to varying degrees of success, so that we can consider how the alternatives might impact us.

RECENT CASES OF NOTE

As I am writing this article, two very important and attention-grabbing copyright cases are being considered and will have probably been decided by the time this appears in print. One involves freelance author rights in database availability their works and the other involves Napster and their music file-sharing imbroglio.

Tasini v. The New York Times: during the October 2000 term, the Supreme Court of the United States is considering the Tasini case. At the heart of the case is a copyright question regarding a violation involving electronic reuse of work produced and sold on a freelance basis. On February 1, 2001, the Special Library Association published comments on this case¹, calling for “publishers and authors to seek consensus through negotiations, rather than wait for the Supreme Court to reach a decision in the matter”.

A & M Records et al v. Napster: At the time that this article goes to press, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit just released their ruling, in a move that will very likely end much of what Napster had been. Napster was able to negotiate an agreement with plaintiffs such as Bertelsmann (termed a strategic alliance on the Napster web site) to charge user fees to be put more or less towards copyright royalties. As Napster was not able to negotiate arrangement with all plaintiffs, this is one copyright question has certainly gotten an answer, though we’ll have to

wait to discover the long-term effects.

In both cases, there were different moves to postpone getting answers involving novel issues of copyright, as the alternative seemed preferable to many people involved. With the well-known Napster case, the company in effect tried to keep a very successful business model alive by substituting potentially huge fines with ongoing license contracts. In the Tasini case, I think that it is very telling that the Special Library Association made a public statement asking for a settlement to the case, irrespective of the outcome of this plea, let alone the case.

UCITA: CONTRACTS TRUMP COPYRIGHTS?

UCITA: This is the Uniform Computer Information Transactions Act, which is a uniform law approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Versions of it have already been adopted in Virginia and Maryland, and it is foreseeable that other states will adopt versions of UCITA during 2001. At its heart, UCITA governs the sale of software, and it has strong supporters as well as critics.

It’s beyond the scope of this brief piece to draw extensive comparisons between UCITA and copyright law, but it’s important to note that terms of use and access rights governed by UCITA will be dealt with in the realm of state contracts and licensing agreements, mostly avoiding any issues of federal copyright use, ownership or similar privilege provisions. In this instance, those who enter into agreements under UCITA provisions are in a sense not even allowed to ask questions of copyright.

NEW LINKING TECHNOLOGY

In the world of legal information technology, there are now some pretty exciting tools that make it possible to provide links to large classes of documents in full-text without having to worry about licensing the content or paying royalties. Well, that probably paints the situation much rosier and one-dimensional than it really is. It’s probably more accurate to simply say that this new sophisticated technology can function without any negotiation of copyright concerns per se.

A good majority of documents used in legal writing, whether for a brief, a law review article, a will or whatever, tend to have uniform citation standards, which can be recognized with increasing accuracy by computer programs. When combined with Internet-availability of document databases, links can be built to point the user directly to cited sources. You might have heard of LEXIS’ Intranet Solutions the corollary West

Group product West Intranet Toolkit as two examples. These particular tools can be very powerful, but they tend to force users to build links manually when linking to individual documents.

At the next level of sophistication, both WESTLAW and more recently LEXIS have come out with software that will integrate with your word processor to convert uniform document citations into Internet links for each respective document in a database. These tools can be invoked for immediate or links can be imbedded into documents for later use. Once a link is converted using either tool, you are then able to access the cited document after supplying the necessary login ID and client information. In an academic setting, this tool is employed by West Group in their legal curriculum product, The West Education Network, which allows professors and students to post citations online, which can be immediately available if covered in a WESTLAW database.

The legal profession is uniquely positioned to take advantage of this kind of linking tool, due to the fact that the vast majority of primary law materials are available in online databases. Historical collections and many documents more than 10 years old could still be unavailable though for sources such as law reviews. There is also still a problem with automating the linking process for items with less uniform citation formats, even including newspapers and most general interest periodicals, but even that ought to be possible to attempt fairly soon.

The chief disadvantage of this kind of technology is that it will tend to bias and restrict users to certain data providers, making them increasingly reliant on access contracts and costs. The other problem is that access costs may even be assessed each time a cited reference is checked, and they could fluctuate greatly. In addition to this, links built in this fashion are obviously proprietary in nature, so they won't be portable from one provider to the next.

In spite of these limitations, if you can convert all citations in a 40-page legal brief in a few seconds, and then have around 80-90% of the cited references available at the click of a button, you ought to be pretty satisfied. If all of this can be done easily and efficiently, you probably won't have to ask too many questions of copyright to get the job done. The more important questions will be where to find that other 10-20% if you need them right away.

CONCLUSION

Nowadays it's a real mixed bag in getting answers to questions of copyright. Some of the issues appear to be fundamental and worth fighting for.

Technology is getting to the point that a core of materials can be directly available online, often more so if we are willing to trade usage rights under copyright for usage agreements under licenses and contracts.

Ease of access, ownership and rights such as "fair use" conveyed under federal copyright laws are some of the most important long-term concerns for the library community. I think that in fighting to protect these rights, we need to consider the areas in which we truly want to get a resolution to answers. Before pushing quickly for the answers, I think that it's important for us to weigh any alternatives, considering the balances of new access, new restrictions or new interpretations of copyright and its doctrines.

Copyright © 2001 Roger V. Skalbeck. All Rights Reserved.

¹ This is published on the SLA website at: <http://www.sla.org/content/memberservice/communication/pr/pressrelease/2102.cfm> ■

ALERT AD

VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITY TO BENEFIT DC PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Nancy McKinley

Editor's Note: Nancy McKinley has approached LLSDC seeking volunteers to help automate DC Public School Libraries. If you or your organization can contribute time or a monetary contribution to this cause please read the following information.

VOLUNTEER YOUR TIME AND EXPERTISE TO ASSIST A LOCAL DC SCHOOL LIBRARIAN AUTOMATE. DC Public School System has purchased library automation software, Follett, and the hardware to run it for every school in the system. However, many of the "teaching-everyday" librarians need help in getting the bibliographic data converted and entered and the barcodes applied.

L.O.R.E., *Librarians' OutReach Effort*, a nascent non-profit of school librarians, is working to help as many DC school librarians as possible achieve the reality of functioning automation before the end of this academic year. By organizing work teams and or partnerships on a school-by-school basis, LORE founders, Nancy McKinley & Julie Allen, are planning to begin work the week of April 23, 2001. Other days will be scheduled in the future Schedules will be flexible and customized and will probably include Saturdays.

Perhaps your firm already has established a partnership with a neighborhood DC public school. If so, your professional support of that

school's librarian in this automation endeavor would be an added tangible and immediate benefit. However, firm-school partnership is not at all necessary, even though a great idea. Individual, professional support and volunteerism is what LORE is requesting.

Presently LORE is operating as consultants, charging a nominal fee for facilitation and hands-on work while waiting to either affiliate with another non-profit or incorporate solely. Fiscal sponsors, donors, and/ or grantors are actively being solicited.

The goal of automation in a school library is to improve student learning, specifically information literacy skills. Please join your fellow-librarians in helping District students learn the skills they need to excel in today's information society. For more information, please contact: Nancy McKinley 202-537-6141 or email her at loreconsulting@hotmail.com. ■

**WE APPRECIATE OUR ADVERTISERS ...
SO WHEN YOU USE THEIR SERVICES,
TELL THEM YOU SAW IT IN
LAW LIBRARY LIGHTS!**

WEST AD

LEXIS AD

PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES SIS

Maureen Stellino
Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard,
McPherson & Hand

THE PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES SIS CONTINUES TO HAVE A BUSY CALENDAR.

During March, the Education Committee sponsored a brown bag discussion where fourteen librarians exchanged tips and ideas for National Library Week events. The Social Committee sponsored an evening reading by our own Mindy Klasky. Mindy read excerpts from her forthcoming book and shared her experiences in

the publishing world.

In April, the Education Committee is holding a breakfast program on Time Management. Julie Nutty from LEXIS-NEXIS will speak on "Prioritizing and Procrastinating". The Social Committee is planning a series of Library Open Houses for late spring.

We hope to see all our PLL members at these events. ■

EYE ON SERIALS

Susan Ryan
Georgetown Law Library

PRINT PUBLICATIONS

Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law and Ethics, 2001-

Published semi-annually by the Yale Law School, P.O. Box 208215, New Haven, CT 06520-8215; 203/436-0774; Website: www.yale.edu/yjhple. E-mail: yjhple@yale.edu
Price: \$39.00 per year.

This peer-reviewed journal will cover such topics as: health policy, health law and biomedical ethics in an attempt to attract both academicians and professionals from the fields of medicine, law and public health. Each issue will survey the legislation on a specific topic from all fifty states and a section called "Case Studies" will feature the views of professionals from various backgrounds on recent court cases and their likely impact on specific policy questions.

Journal of End User Computer Support, 2001-

Published quarterly (only one issue to be published in 2001) by Haworth Information Press, 10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904; 607/722-5857; Fax 607/722-1424; Website: www.Haworth-Press.com.

Price: \$125.00 per year.

The Journal of End User Computer Support will provide a forum for practitioners and academicians to publish materials related to supporting end user computing. User training and

answering technical questions are just part of the resources to be offered in this publication.

ON-LINE SUBSCRIPTION

Biotechnology Law Report, 2000-

Published bimonthly by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., Two Madison Avenue, Larchmont, NY 10538-1962; 914/834-3100 or 800/M-LIEBERT; Fax: 914/834-1388; Website: www.liebertpub.com/blr
Price: \$891.00 per year.

Biotechnology Law Report, long available in print, is now available online as well. This publication covers legal, patent, technology transfer and regulatory decisions pertaining to biotechnology.

TITLE CHANGE

International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies, 2000-

Published quarterly by Kluwer Academic/Human Sciences Press, 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013-1578; 212/620-8000 or 800/221-9369; Fax: 212/807-1047; Website: www.wkap.nl/kaphtml.htm/HOMEPAGE

Price: \$205.00 per year.

Formerly Journal of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Identity, this new publication began with volume 5, number 1, dated January 2000. The last issue of the previous title was volume 4, number 4, dated October 1999. ■

LIGHTS DEADLINE



The deadline for the May/June 2001 *Law Library Lights* is May 25, 2001. For submissions, call Andrew Martin at 202/861-1582 or e-mail amartin@bakerlaw.com.

MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY

■ ■ ■ If you have changes in your listing for the 2000-2001 *LLSDC Membership & Law Library Directory*, please contact Steve Mellin, Jenner & Block, at 202/639-6012 (phone) 202/637-6366 (FAX) or at smellin@jenner.com.

THE SIS SPONSORED A BROWN BAG LUNCH ON BASIC BOOK REPAIR ON JANUARY 26, 2001.

Hilary Seo, Preservation Librarian at Georgetown University Law Library, gave an informative presentation for those of us who knew next to nothing on this topic. She even provided the supplies so that all 10 attendees could make their own mini-book! I would like to personally thank Hilary for a wonderful program, and also thank the Georgetown Law Library for hosting the event.

Please remember the upcoming brown bag lunch jointly sponsored with the PLL-SIS. This event is an outgrowth of last year's highly successful program on summer associates and the research skills they require. It will be held at Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinky, 2101 L Street NW, 8th Floor, Kaufmann Conference Center on April 24, 2001, from 12 noon until 1:30 p.m. The firm is located on the northwest corner of 21st and L Streets. Beverages and cookies will be provided. RSVP to Nancy Crossed at (202) 274-4344, E-mail:ncrossed@wcl.american.edu; or Lisa Harrington (202) 457-5911, E-Mail:lharrington@hkllaw.com.

It is getting to be that time again! I need several volunteers to run for office in the Academic SIS. Nancy Crossed is moving up to President for the 2001-2002 academic year. I need interested people to run for her vacancy as Vice-President/President-Elect. Also, Gordon Van Piel will be leaving the post of Treasurer after two years

of excellent service. Thanks, Gordon. I need people to run for Treasurer as well. If you are interested, please contact me at (202) 274-4345, E-Mail:mpetit@wcl.american.edu.

Finally, the Academic SIS is sponsoring Law Librarians' Night at the BaySox. The Academic SIS has reserved the owner's suite at Prince George's County Stadium for the Friday, June 1st game between the Bowie BaySox and the Harrisburg Senators. The event includes exclusive use of the indoor and outdoor seating in the suite located on the stadium upper level between home plate and 3rd base. The game will start at 7:05 pm, and an all-you-eat dinner buffet will begin at 6:30 and will be served until 8:00 pm. Also, drinks (soda, iced tea, and lemonade) and popcorn will be served until the end of the game. Beer and wine will be available for you to purchase. There is a sumptuous dinner buffet as well as ballpark hamburgers and hot dogs. The cost for all this is just \$25.00 per person. Parking at Prince George's County Stadium is FREE! The capacity for the suite is 40 persons. So, tickets will be on a first come-first served basis. Send checks, payable to Michael Petit; American University Law Library; 4801 Massachusetts Avenue, NW; Washington, DC 20016-8182. Checks must be received before a reservation can be accepted. This event is sponsored by the SIS, but all LLSDC members and guests are welcome. If you have any further questions, contact me at (202) 274-4345 or mpetit@wcl.american.edu. ■

ACADEMIC SIS

Michael J. Petit
American University Law
Library

"LIBRARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS NEAR AND FAR"

was the title for the February meeting of the Interlibrary Loan Special Interest Section. About twenty people gathered at Howrey, Simon, Arnold & White to discuss library school programs. Several recent graduates and current students attended this meeting and shared their experiences with the group. The distance programs at the University of Illinois and Syracuse University were represented along with the University of Maryland and Catholic University. Some of the topics discussed included costs, admission requirements and procedures, class size and composition, coursework, and other aspects of everyday life as a student in library school. The Section would like to thank Kineret Abramson, Brent Burton, Kristi McLane, Julia Mychalus, Trina Warden and Larry Ross for sharing their experiences.

ILL SIS members met in March at Pepper, Hamilton LLP to discuss the use of the LLSDC Listserv for ILL requests, and conduct a survey on the members use of court document retrieval ser-

vices. The first half of the meeting was a focused look at the practices of listserv subscribers regarding ILL postings. All persons in attendance showed true interest in this discussion. Concerns over the cluttering of the list with ILL messages were debated. Those present also talked about etiquette and the use of the "list" in relation to the more traditional means of conducting interlibrary loan searches. Section members generally thought the "list" works well for ILL's and loan requests were not overly bothersome. The discussion progressed with the common consensus reached that a new and separate list for borrowing was deemed unnecessary at this time.

The last time the ILL SIS held a meeting on the topic of court document retrieval, few participants had first hand experiences to share. This time, almost all present had court material retrieval as part of their regular duties. The second half of March meeting was used for the surveying the members' use of online docket databases and preferred court services. ■

**INTERLIBRARY
LOAN/SIS NEWS**

Peter Vay
Williams & Connolly

FEDERAL LAW LIBRARIANS PROGRAM ON ACQUISITIONS

*Rick J. McKinney
Federal Reserve Board*

ON MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2001, the Federal Law Librarians Section of the Law Librarian's Society of Washington, D.C. held a brown bag discussion on ways to streamline acquisitions in Federal law libraries. The meeting was held in the conference room of the Dolly Madison House, 1520 H Street, N.W., which is part of the complex of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Attending the meeting were our hosts Patricia McDermott and John Moore of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit Library, as well as Beth Arnold and Rick McKinney of the Federal Reserve Board Library; Roberta Babbitt, Noreen Lewis and Erika Teal of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Library; Linda Thompson, Betty Bourg and Wendy Melis of the World Bank Law Library; Shelly Dowling and Diane Simpson of the U.S. Supreme Court Library; Dorothy Hamid and Paula Lipman of the Department of Energy Legislative Library; Roger Karr of the Federal Judicial Center Library; Anita Illustre of the Federal Labor Relations Authority Library, Suzanne Campbell of the Gov-

ernment Printing Office General Counsel Library; Mary Ann Keeling of the Securities and Exchange Commission Library; and finally Kathy Eighmey, FLICC/FEDLINK Program Specialist at the Library of Congress.

The meeting was led by FLL Section President Rick McKinney who asked a number of questions to stimulate discussion. One question concerned how many used jobbers for periodical acquisitions and with what satisfaction. Many did, but with some mixed satisfaction in getting the jobber to make prompt corrections or to obtain missing issues.

Questions and discussion also focused on government credit cards and making payments electronically. It was noted by some that electronic transfers of money tell the vendor very little about what the money is for and for which invoices or for corrected invoices. It was suggested by Kathy Eighmey that acquisition librarians send a payment advice fax to the vendor as to when a payment is to be expected and telling the vendor how much it is and exactly what it is for. Others suggested scanning invoices and sending them as electronic attachments with specific payments.

Government credit card purchases were popular with most everyone except for the fact that they are usually only made available with item amount limits and monthly amount limits which can be easily exceeded by orders from large publishers.

It was noted by many that agency administration offices rarely pay invoices in advance of the legal thirty days after they (the administration office) accepts a valid invoice which is mandated by the Prompt Payment Act. It was noted by some that arranging to pay vendors up front for one year may save a lot of headaches. Kathy Eighmey noted that the Federal Library and Information Center Committee (FLICC) in the Library of Congress now has authorization to retain obligated money on behalf of agencies which have a bonafide need for information services and that this revolving fund is retained for the agency even after the end of a fiscal year.

As part of the program Kathy Eighmey gave handouts about FLICC and talked about consortia purchasing of electronic resources. In consortia purchasing she stressed the need to ask and answer certain who, what, why, and when questions.

Who questions in consortia purchasing include who the players are - how many organizations, how many persons will have access, how much money, etc. Other who questions concern who will represent the group during negotiations, who will do the contracting, who has authority to sign the license agreement, and who will admin-

INFOCURRENT AD

ister the consortium - handle the money, parse out invoices, and reapportion costs based upon cumulative usage statistics.

What questions in consortia purchasing include what vendors are you interested in and are they willing to negotiate with you and is an RFP required. Other what questions concern what pricing models to employ - enterprise wide or relevant professionals.

Why questions concern the consortia objectives - more access and/or better pricing. The larger the consortia - in dollars and/or users - the more negotiating clout you have. Plus the vendor and participating agencies only have to deal with one administrative point of contact.

When questions in consortia buying concern time frames - when does the consortia start (calendar year, fiscal year, immediately), when can new participants sign up or drop out as in an open enrollment period, and when is your money required - monthly, annually up front, etc.

Consortia buying is hard work and takes a very long time to get going with all the parties signed on, but it should save on expenses and administrative hassles for all but the consortium

administrator, and vendors see it as a way to expand to new customers.

At the conclusion of the meeting participants were given a tour of the Dolly Madison House and Library at the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit. Many thanks were expressed to Pat McDermott and John Moore for hosting the event which included beverages, fruit and other finger foods. Appreciation was also expressed to Kathy Eighmey from FLICC, our principal speaker.

The next FLL Section meeting will be on Friday, May 11, 2001, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. in the conference of the Law Library of Congress at the James Madison Memorial Building, Room 240, 101 Independence Avenue, S.E. Staff at the Law Library of Congress will make presentations about the kind of services that they can make available to Federal agencies, which is the third service priority of the Law Library after Congress and the U.S. Courts.

Following the program from 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. will be an FLL Section business lunch in the Montpelier Room of the Madison Building in order to elect new officers and to discuss possible future programs. ■

ON MARCH 7TH, THE SIS HOSTED ITS FIRST FUNDAMENTALS OF FOREIGN LEGAL RESEARCH PROGRAM on Canadian Research at the National Digital Library at The Law Library of Congress. Stephen Clarke, Senior Legal Specialist, Law Library of Congress, gave an excellent overview of print and web-based Canadian research sources. The program was very informative and well-attended. Special thanks to Dr. Rubens Medina, Law Librarian of Congress, who introduced the program, to Malo Bernal for hosting the event, and to Marcie Hoffman for moderating the program.

The World Bank is the location for our April

10th program on Russian legal research with speaker Peter Roudick. The May program will be on legal resources on Greece and it will include some discussion of European Union resources. Please check *Dates to Remember* and the LLSDC website for complete details and registration forms.

The SIS is interested in hearing from members to support these continuing programs. Please contact Pat Gudas at pat.gudasmitchell@piper-rudnick.com or at 202/689-7010 or Kelly Vinopal at VinopalK@dsmo.com or at 202/775-4774 for your ideas, questions and suggestions. We hope to see you at the April 10th program! ■

ON JANUARY 31, 2001, THE SIS OFFICIALLY MARKED THE BEGINNING OF THE 107TH CONGRESS (and a new administration) with its "Welcome Back Congress" party. As always, we had a great time "talking shop" and eating. Following up on the Virginia and Federal legislative history presentations last fall, the Legislative SIS invited Mike Miller from the Maryland State Law Library to give a presentation on Maryland legislative history research at its March 20th brown bag lunch. Miller's detailed and informative presentation helped shed light on an often confusing area of research. Thank you Mike for making the trip from

Annapolis to attend our meeting.

At our next meeting-schedule for April 26, 2001-long-time SIS member and legislative librarian Mike Welsh from Shaw Pittman will give a presentation on using portable document format (.pdf) to compile and maintain legislative histories. As more libraries lose space, electronic legislative histories offers a promising way to maintain these collections. Moreover, .pdf compilations allow researchers not only to work with "official-looking" documents, but also to index and highlight documents for easy searching. Please check upcoming *Dates to Remember* for further details about this program. ■

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW SIS NEWS

*Kelly Vinopal
Dickstein Shapiro Morin &
Oshinsky*

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SIS

*David M. Mao
Covington & Burling*

DC CODE UPDATE

David W. Lang
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering

WOULDN'T YOU KNOW, AS SOON AS YOU GET SOMETHING PUBLISHED IN LIGHTS, THE FACTS CHANGE. West announced its winning of the D.C. Code contract, January 22, 2001, just as my previous article was distributed. They will publish and ship an entirely new edition of the code by May 2001. In their press release, they state "under the contract, West Group will completely recodify the existing edition of the Code." This is further explained as "a complete renumbering" and removal of obsolete language." They also claim to have exclusively "advance access to the recodification scheme," for whatever that is worth. Whether that appears initially or later in the contract remains to be seen.

Other features will include the usual bevy of editorial enhancements associated with this publisher. Other formats will be CD-ROM and WESTLAW.

In a letter dated February 2001, LEXIS stated it will continue to publish the D.C. Code. LEXIS further states it will publish "the exact same provisions as the 'official version.'" They say

recodification is "an action that's far from certain at this time." Since, the Council has only recodified one title (Title 47 Tax) in recent memory, they may have a point. If recodification occurs, does this mean they will replace the volumes they just published for free? They suggest there will be "conversion tables" in either publisher's set. How rude!

So where does this all leave us - the law librarians. One could argue, still employed because of circumstances like these. Or one, could quote Jake Blues response the nun's rejection of their help in the Blues Brothers movie. While the latter response is enticing, in the end, we will have to use our training, experience, skill, and education, as well as patience, to decide for our organization what is best for them in terms of cost, space, features, etc. In the meantime, whatever we offer in terms of D.C. code research should have "caveat emptor" written all over it, until all published versions are out and recodification is a fact. Researching D.C. law does not seem to ever get any easier, just more expensive. ■

TLC AD

A REMINDER FOR ALL PLANNERS OF SOCIETY EVENTS



ALL MEETINGS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

and other LLSDC events must be coordinated on the Society's calendar. Each person who is planning a meeting must check with the Corresponding Secretary, currently Nancy Crossed, 202/274-4344, crossed@wcl.american.edu, to ensure that the date is available, and that the planned function does not conflict with any other gathering. Additionally, this will enable your meeting to be included in the Current Events listing on LLSDC's Events/Job Hotline, 202/310-4570. The Corresponding Secretary will also help you with information regarding vendor support, if requested, and will record any vendor support that you have secured, so that particular vendors are not burdened with repeated requests for donations.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LAW LIBRARIANS' SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., INC.

■ **COUNSEL: CONSOLIDATED UNION SERIALS LIST, 15TH EDITION, 2000-2001**

Published annually, *COUNSEL* contains the legal and non-legal serials holdings of over 175 area law libraries. A single copy is provided to each member library who participates and submits its holdings for inclusion in *COUNSEL*. **Price:** \$360.00 for non-participating Society members, plus \$10.00 shipping/handling and \$20.70 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$390.70); \$425.00 for non-members, plus \$10.56 shipping/handling and \$24.44 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$460.00). Additional copies for participants are \$125.00 each, plus \$10.00 shipping/handling and \$7.19 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$142.19).

■ **GENERAL LEGAL PUBLICATIONS UNION LIST, 5TH EDITION**

The *GLP Union List* contains D.C. area law library holdings of federal administrative decisions, federal and state reporters, state and local codes, and legal looseleaves. A single copy is provided to each member library who participates and submits its holdings for inclusion in the *GLP Union List*. **Price:** \$375.00 for non-participating Society members, plus \$10.00 shipping/handling and \$21.56 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$406.56); \$425.00 for non-members, plus \$10.56 shipping/handling and \$24.44 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$460.00). Additional copies for participants are \$125.00 each, plus \$10.00 shipping/handling and \$7.19 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$142.19).

■ **LAW LIBRARY LIGHTS**

The Society's newsletter, published 5 times per year, is provided to members as part of the Society's membership fee. It is available for separate purchase. **Price:** \$35.00 to non-members; add \$10.00 for foreign subscribers; single issues are \$15.00 each.

■ **LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SIS MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY AND SOURCE BOOK, 1999-2000**

Available at www.llsdc.org/sourcebook/index.html.

■ **MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY**

The *Membership Directory*, arranged alphabetically by member name and by organization name, is provided to members as part of the Society's membership fee. It may be purchased separately. **Price:** \$10.00 to Society members, plus \$1.42 shipping/handling and \$.58 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$12.00); \$40.00 for non-members, plus \$1.70 shipping/handling and \$2.30 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$44.00).

■ **UNION LIST OF LEGISLATIVE DOCUMENTS, 3RD EDITION, 1994**

Contains information on area holdings of various Congressional publications, such as bills, reports, hearings, directories, indexes, past editions of the U.S. Code and the Congressional Record. Also available at <http://www.llsdc.org/sourcebook/unionlistdocs.htm>. **Price:** \$68.00, plus \$6.10 shipping/handling and \$3.90 DC sales tax (total cost: \$75.00).

■ **UNION LIST OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORIES, 7TH EDITION, 2000**

This notable looseleaf publication contains a listing by public law number of legislative history collections on thousands of U.S. laws in over 140 law libraries in the Washington, D.C. area. Public law enactment dates range from 1790 to 1998. Each listing contains the public law, statute, and bill numbers, as well as the subject matter, history formats, and abbreviations for the libraries holding the histories. The publication is updated on an irregular basis. There is also a listing of participating libraries with contact and loan policy information. **Price:** \$75.00 to Society members, plus \$10.69 shipping/handling and \$4.31 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$90.00); \$100.00 for non-members, plus \$11.25 shipping/handling and \$5.75 D.C. sales tax (total cost: \$117.00).

Orders must be prepaid except for Purchase Orders from Federal Government offices only. Orders subject to availability and filled on a first-come, first-served basis. Please allow 2 - 3 weeks for delivery.

NAME _____ ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

Subtotal _____ D.C. Sales Tax (5.75%) _____

Shipping/Handling _____ TOTAL _____

SEND THIS FORM AND PREPAYMENT TO:

LAW LIBRARIAN'S SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., INC. Attn.: Publication Sales 8727A Cooper Road,
Alexandria, Va. 22309 Telephone: 703/619-5033 E-mail: management@llsdc.org

**LAW
LIBRARIANS'
SOCIETY OF
WASHINGTON,
D.C., INC.**

703/619-5033
8727-A Cooper Rd.
Alexandria, Virginia 22309

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President: Ann C. Green408-6452
Vice President: Michelle Wu994-7338
Immediate Past President: Brian L. Baker974-7354
Recording Secretary: Emily Carr707-3790
Corresponding Secretary: Nancy Crossed . . .274-4344
Treasurer: Leslie A. Lee994-2385
Assistant Treasurer: Mary Alice Durphy . . .861-1512
Board Members: William H. Grady508-9858
Rachel W. Jones775-4777
Michael J. Petit274-4345

SPECIAL INTEREST SECTIONS

Academic: Mike J. Petit274-4345
Contemporary Social Issues: VACANT
Federal: Richard J. McKinney . .452-3283
Foreign & International: Pat S. Gudas-Mitchell 689-7010
Kelly A. Vinopal775-4774
Interlibrary Loan: Pete Vay434-5303
Legislative Research: David S. Mao662-6178
Private Law Libraries: Maureen C. Stellino . .371-6153

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

Arrangements: Marvin L. Lewis624-2837
Audit: VACANT
Bylaws REVISION: Mary K. Grady260-5919
Consulting: Gabrielle C. Zsebi835-7578
Dates to Remember: Jeannine L. Coscia . . .719-7387
Directory: Stephen S. Mellin639-6012
Education: John H. Harbison342-8468
Elections: Frances Brillantine . . .319-4331
GLP: Keith Gabel585-6954
History and Archives: Laura Anne Bedard . .662-9172
Joint Spring Workshop: Charlotte C. White .662-6177
Mary Longchamp . .783-8400 x 47079

LIGHTS: Andrew Martin861-1582
Eve I. Valdivia879-4054
Membership: Barbara J. Fisher263-3314
Mentoring: Carol A. Grant994-2687
Nominations: Katheryne H. West . . .263-3040
Gina Clair887-1588
Placement: Donald D. Coney, Jr. .502-1589
Publications: Susan Lewis-Somers . .274-4330
COUNSEL: Laurie Green457-7136
Public Relations: James H. Walther . . .508-6055
Scholarships & Grants: William T. Ryan . . .274-4331
Vendor Support: Ellen Feldman434-5301
Volunteer Committee: Carla Evans416-6823
Website Committee: Christopher C. Reed . .994-1383

LAW LIBRARY LIGHTS

Editor: Andrew Martin861-1582
Assistant Editor: Eve I. Valdivia879-4054
Advertising Manager: Rachel W. Jones775-4777
Calendar of Events: Nancy Crossed274-4344
Eye on Serials: Susan Ryan662-9142
News of Members: Barbara J. Fisher263-3314

LLSDC INFORMATION

Webpage.....<http://www.llsdc.org>
Listserv.....listproc@gmu.edu (to subscribe)
llsdc@gmu.edu (to post messages)

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

LLSDC, 8727-A Cooper Rd., Alexandria, VA 22309
703/619-5033

All numbers are in area code 202 unless otherwise indicated.

LAW LIBRARY LIGHTS

Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C., Inc.
8727-A Cooper Rd.
Alexandria, Virginia 22309

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
ALEXANDRIA, VA.
PERMIT NO. 5269