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Before law school, he had worked for Shepard's. He aced the 1L Bluebook exercise by remembering the space between Fed. and Supp. (P. Supp.) and the commas before and after affirmed (, aff'd,). As technical editor of the law review, he underlined the period in id., and gained the "King of Cites" award at the farewell banquet. Four years and a federal clerkship later, I ran into him on the Sixteenth Street Mall. "You know what?" he said. "Citation's not such a big deal after all. Even some of the best attorneys don't get it perfect." He's right, and he's wrong.

The Impact of Incorrect Citations

True, a judge probably won't rule against you if your cites are wrong, but faulty cites do reflect poorly on you. First, like good manners, proper citations illustrate both your knowledge of the rules of etiquette for legal writing and your precision in following those rules. If your citations are sloppy, some readers may presume that your research and reasoning were done in a similarly uninformed and careless fashion.

Second, incomplete citations can be a burden for your readers. The jurisdiction and date are important factors in weighing the precedential value of a case. If you don't provide this information, your readers may need to interrupt the process of digesting your argument and spend valuable time looking things up. Furthermore, the flow of your argument may never recover from such an interruption.

Finally, the most serious citation errors are those that mislead your readers. For example, it is important to know that all Colorado cases are reported in the Pacific Reporter. Consequently, the only way readers can know whether a case is one decided by the Colorado Supreme Court instead of the Colorado Court of Appeals is the notation in parenthesis at the end of the case.


Lack of Uniformity in the Bluebook

Although there are some exceptions, the majority of legal periodicals, lawyers, and courts in this country follow the citation system set out in the Bluebook. Furthermore, the Bluebook has retained its status as the Bible of citation, despite challenges from rival citation systems.

The word "uniform" in the Bluebook's complete title—A Uniform System of Citation—might explain its persistence: legal writers crave consistency and a universal understanding of what citations mean. Nevertheless, the Bluebook is compiled by student editors who turn over on an annual basis. Consequently, the Bluebook has undergone a number of changes over the course of its sixteen revisions, and the frequency of these changes has undermined the very uniformity sought by the system.

Often the changes from edition to edition of the Bluebook are relatively minor. However, at least one change in the latest edition (the 16th) creates the potential for the most serious kind of citation problem—one that could mislead readers. In the 16th edition, the introductory signal "see" is defined as follows:

Cited authority directly states or clearly supports the proposition.

This definition is a radical departure from the previous edition of the Bluebook (the 15th), which defines "see" as follows:

Cited authority clearly supports the proposition. "See" is used . . . when the proposition is not directly stated by the cited authority but obviously follows from it; there is an inferential step between the authority cited and the proposition it supports.
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If you used “see” in the 15th-edition sense (indirect support) and the readers expected it in the 16th-edition sense (direct support), your citation might be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to mislead a court. However, if you are still using “see” to mean indirect support, you are probably with the majority of attorneys who graduated from law school before 1996. In fact, the Association of American Law Schools adopted a plenary resolution against the 16th-edition change of the meaning of “see.” Such resolutions have eroded the Bluebook’s status as a universal standard, and they highlighted the need for a more consistent and practical alternative to the Bluebook.

The ALWD Citation Manual

The Association of Legal Writing Directors (“ALWD”) is an organization of more than 200 members representing approximately 150 law schools. This group of professional law school teachers decided to publish an alternative to the Bluebook. Unlike previous “alternatives” to the Bluebook, the ALWD Manual did not attempt to reinvent the wheel by creating an entirely new system of citation. Because Bluebook form has been widely recognized as the universal currency in legal writing, the ALWD Manual deals in that same currency. However, the following are some features that set the ALWD Manual apart from the Bluebook:

- The Bluebook is written by student editors and is geared to law review format; this is why only ten of the 367 pages of the Bluebook are aimed at practitioners’ needs. In contrast, the ALWD Manual is aimed specifically to the everyday needs of lawyers and judges.
- The ALWD Manual simplified the typefaces for citations to two: standard or italic. This eliminates the confusion created by law review typefaces such as large and small caps.
- The ALWD Manual takes the guesswork out of spacing concerns in citations by using a symbol between the parts of a cite. E.g., (Colo. ▲ App. ▲ 1999).
- The ALWD Manual uses the same format regardless of where a citation appears, so there is no distinction between legal memoranda, law review articles, or footnotes.
- The “Quick Reference: Court Documents and Legal Memoranda” on the back cover of the Bluebook is one of the most useful guides to practitioners in that book. The ALWD Manual has expanded such guidance by having “Fast Format” pages of examples for users at the beginning of the description of each of the various citation sources.
- The Bluebook often was unavailable because of publishing problems. To avoid such problems, the ALWD Manual is professionally published and available by calling a toll-free number.

- The Bluebook often raises more questions than it answers: Why does the Bluebook suggest that cert. denied be added only to cases that are less than two years old? When is it appropriate to cite unreported decisions? The ALWD Manual provides “sidebars” to explain some of these mysteries of citation to give readers methods of deducing how to proceed in a situation not addressed in the manual.

- When you have a question or comment about a Bluebook rule, there is no one to turn to other than a former teacher or someone like my student above, the King of Cites. The ALWD has a website it will use to post updates and necessary clarifications to the ALWD Manual.

Conclusion

The ALWD Manual represents the solution to many a practitioner’s citation woes. Starting next fall, some ALWD members will choose to teach from the ALWD Manual, instead of teaching Bluebook skills that become obsolete before their students even graduate from law school. Once this practice becomes prevalent, the ALWD Manual will supplant the Bluebook to become the legal citation system for the twenty-first century. Then, the next time you see the King of Cites, you can tell him to relinquish his crown and hand the scepter over to the ALWD Citation Manual.
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