

The annual closing banquet was held on the evening of July 4 with Miss Oliver presiding. The invocation was delivered by the Reverend *William Cunningham*, University Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Wash. The *Joseph L. Andrews Bibliographic Award* was presented to *Wypold Hear* and the late *Lillie M. Roberts*, and accepted by *Meira Pimsleur*, Columbia University School of Law Library. The announced speaker was Sir *Gilbert Peake*, London television producer. The audience learned, however, following his rather humorous remarks, that he was none other than *Richard Cactus Pryor*, a well-known radio personality from Austin, Tex.

Mr. *Surrency* was installed as the 1973-74 AALL President.

[*Michael C. McGoings*]

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW COLLECTIONS
IN SELECTED LAW LIBRARIES
OF THE UNITED STATES: SURVEY, 1972 — 1973¹
by *Igor I. Kavass* *

REASONS FOR THE SURVEY

From time to time during the past several years many law librarians in the United States with institutional commitments for the development of foreign and international law collections have voiced their deep concern about the intrinsic research value of their existing holdings of foreign and international law materials and, even more so, about the ability of their libraries to maintain the future growth of such collections at a sufficiently high scholarly level. Their disquietude was not without a reason. The United States could always pride itself in having several distinguished law libraries with some of the best research collections of legal materials in the world. The reputation of these collections was so great that generation after generation of legal scholars did much of their research work in them. There were also many other law libraries in the United States but they were generally small and did not specialize in foreign and international law. An unexpected development occurred, however, in the two decades after World War II. Many of the smaller law libraries as well as a number of new libraries began to expand their holdings at a phenomenal rate of growth. They began also to branch

* Igor I. Kavass, Law Librarian and Professor of Law; Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, U.S.A.

¹ The survey was conducted by the writer on behalf of the Foreign and International Law Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries. The opinions and conclusions expressed in the survey are, of course, his own.

out into areas they had not been previously familiar with, and some of them succeeded in establishing sizable collections of foreign and international law materials within the relatively short period of less than twenty years². After several decades of this unprecedented and frequently indiscriminate expansion, culminating in the emergence of a wide variety of foreign and international law collections, many of these libraries were suddenly faced in the early 1970's with a series of critical problems.

In the first place, the law libraries in question began to discover that the scope of their acquisitions in areas of foreign and international law were seriously overextended when compared to their inextricably shrinking financial resources which were being eaten away just as much by inflation as by what was idiomatically referred to in the trade as a "publication explosion" — a sudden availability of too many new or reprinted books, apparently as a result of a belated response of the publishing industry to an earlier favorable market situation. This sudden expansion in the number of published materials was not unique to the United States. More books and, specifically, more law books were being published in every corner of the world; and in some countries publishing became a striving industry as a direct consequence of the generous provisions of United States Public Law 480.

The gravity of the problem was further compounded by a simultaneous shift of interest within the American law schools and legal profession from the more esoteric study of foreign laws towards attaining a better and deeper perception of problems disturbing the very structure of American law itself which, in its turn, raised a greater demand for multiple subscriptions to local statutes, law reports, and law reviews as well as for the acquisition of a wider range of publications dealing with such nationally important topics as, for instance, constitutional law, administrative law, taxation, and other legal subjects of current interest. Faced by these mutually inconsistent problems of supply and demand, law libraries with established foreign and international law collections, which, irrespective of their coverage or quality, may have represented substantial investments of past financial resources, began to revise their priorities by making drastic reductions in their future acquisitions of foreign and international law materials. The obvious consequence of this unfortunate situation was that collections of foreign and international law materials in all but a few leading libraries with long standing policy commitments towards specialization in foreign and international law gradually began to become outdated, and their intrinsic research utility as well as their original economic value, whatever these may have been prior to the revision of former acquisition practices, diminished at an ever increasing rate of acceleration. There are many law libraries in the United States today with such truncated and, for all practical purposes, useless collections of foreign and international law materials.

² *Schwerin*, *Law Libraries and Foreign Law Collections in the U.S.A.*, 11 *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 537 (1962).

It is not at all unrealistic to ponder whether these fragmented collections may not be put to a better use by being placed together in two or three conveniently located centers with adequate resources for their maintenance and updating. It is, however, unlikely that such mergers will ever be achieved. There are too many practical obstacles to be overcome, and the concept itself is repugnant to the prevailing spirit of individualism in American law librarianship.

Secondly, in more propitious times many law libraries acquired their foreign and international law materials without giving too much thought to either the subject-matter or geography. They simply followed the rudimentary principle of buying everything they could lay their hands on or, when they wished to be more selective, every publication appearing in the English language. Not that the law libraries alone were to be blamed for this unusual and, perhaps, wasteful approach of developing their collections. Supplied with more than adequate funds for the purchase of books (but almost in all cases with less than adequate resources for the development of personnel) and being directed to apply them in accordance with the fashion of the time towards at least a partial acquisition of foreign and international law materials, they followed the obvious path of the least resistance by branching out in all directions. Volume count was all that mattered, and a dash of cosmopolitan flavor made it ever so much more attractive. On many occasions they were also encouraged to use this extravagant method of developing their foreign and international law collections by the eccentric demands of their itinerant users.

When the day of reckoning arrived, and the libraries were compelled by circumstances to formulate their acquisition policies along more restrictive lines, they were faced with an imponderable question: what parts of these collections they should continue to develop and what parts should they drop? The solution to this question was not made any easier by such previously unanticipated or deliberately ignored events as the emergence of many new countries and jurisdictions, the evolution of new legal disciplines concerned, for instance, with the protection of consumers, conservation of energy, administration of economic affairs or control of ecology, the linguistic barrier which was made more acute by the gradual retirement of many polyglot librarians who had come to the United States during the World War II period, and, last but not least, by a chronic shortage of adequate bibliographic tools. These difficulties continue to prevail to this day, and they make a scholarly development of foreign and international law collections increasingly more difficult.

It is difficult to surmise at the present stage whether the affected American law libraries have managed to weather this crisis. Nevertheless, the real situation may not be as bleak as the impression it creates. Having retrenched their overextended acquisition policies relating to foreign and international law materials by introducing drastic and frequently expensive cuts in their commitments, many law libraries have also commenced to use more critical

and meaningful methods of selection. Although acquisitions of legal materials in foreign languages dropped appreciably according to random reports received from several law libraries, this trend does not indicate by any means that the quality of the respective collections is also on a decline. Some unfortunate economies were bound to occur in many law libraries, yet it is not likely that they have impaired the combined quality of foreign and international law collections in the United States. It is also expected that law libraries will retain this quality in the immediate future, if the reductions in acquisitions are not extended further or applied indiscriminately to all segments of foreign or international law materials.

The one irresistible conclusion from the preceding observations is that acquisition practices in law libraries are bound to improve. Indiscriminate acquisition will be replaced by careful selection which, in its turn, will place a greater emphasis on training of law librarians in the fundamentals of foreign legal system as well as the relevant foreign bibliographic tools. Unfortunately, in spite of excellent publications in these areas produced by the Library of Congress and others several decades ago³, foreign law manuals and bibliographies are relatively deficient in immediate relevance as well as coverage. Updating of such information and the widening of its scope of coverage is a matter of urgent priority.

The third problem of law libraries with established foreign and international law collections is of a somewhat different nature. By and large, in spite of the existence of extensive communication facilities, there is very little actual exchange of information on a regular basis among law libraries about their acquisitions of foreign and international law materials, their selection policies in these areas, the difficulties they experience in obtaining materials selected for acquisition, and their future plans pertaining to the development of special collections in foreign and international law. The willingness to cooperate is there, but the immense pressures of work and lack of time experienced by the individuals in question make the establishment of regular systems of communication among them a virtual impossibility. Efforts have been made from time to time to create schemes for the sharing of pertinent information, but the writer does not know of any such scheme which did not eventually falter and fail. This means in effect that individual law

³ Library of Congress Guides to the laws and legal literature of selected foreign countries; e. g., *Borchard*, Guide to the Law and Literature of Germany, 1912; *Clagett*, A Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of the Mexican States, 1947; etc. Of latter vintage and somewhat different in style was the Mid-European Law Project at the Library of Congress under the general editorship of *Vladimir Gsovski*; e. g., *Legal Sources and Bibliography of Hungary*, *Legal Sources and Bibliography of Yugoslavia*, etc. Some of the Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law at Columbia University publications are also within this category; e. g., *Szladits, Charles*. Guide to Foreign Legal Materials: French-German-Swiss, 1959; *Grisoli, Angelo*. Guide to Foreign Legal Materials: Italian, 1965; etc.

libraries are frequently in the dark about development in other law libraries, and they work very much on their own, at least in matters relating to foreign and international law materials.

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMITTEE OF THE AALL AND THE SCHWERIN SURVEY OF 1960

The foreign and International Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries, a unique professional organization in its own right with no truly comparable counterpart elsewhere in the world, has been fully aware about the existence of these problems for a long time, frequently through personal experience of its own members. On more than one occasion during the past three years it has examined the desirability of conducting a survey to elicit at least some conclusive facts about the major foreign and international law collections in the United States. The Committee has had no hesitation in concluding that the information ensuing from such an inquiry could produce many useful answers to the problems on hand.

A similar survey in 1960, conducted by Professor *Kurt Schwerin* of Northwestern University, one of the foremost experts on foreign and international law materials in the United States, had enjoyed an immense success as a guide to the growth of major foreign and international law collections in American law libraries⁴. It was the first survey of its kind specifically concerned with the analysis of foreign and international law collections, and its statistical data comprised a valuable planning basis for the subsequent development of such collections in many law libraries. More than ten years had elapsed, however, since the publication of this survey; in the meantime circumstances had changed, different trends in research uses and management practices of law libraries had emerged, and American law librarians began to encounter a variety of new situations and policy issues. The Committee was convinced, therefore, that a new survey was both timely and necessary. Eventually, in 1972 it entrusted the writer with the task of conducting such a survey among a representatively selected group of academic, government and private law libraries with large or otherwise significant collections of foreign and international law materials.

THE SURVEY OF 1972 AND ITS ANALYSIS

In a broad sense the present survey pursued the same lines of inquiry as those adopted by Professor *Schwerin* in his Survey of 1960. A questionnaire, consisting of twenty-four questions, was prepared by the writer, approved by the Committee, and sent to participating libraries. Following the methodology of the *Schwerin* survey, the questionnaire endeavored to acquire in-

⁴ *Schwerin*, *Law Libraries and Foreign Law Collections in the U.S.A.*, 11 *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 537 (1962); also, *International Association of Law Libraries, Proceedings of the Meeting at the Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass., June 24—25, 1961* (*Kurt Schwerin*, ed.), 36—50.

formation about the growth of foreign and international law collections in participating libraries, the nature of such growth, the overall size of the collections, the subject and area developments within the foreign law collections, the role performed by foreign law librarians in the development of such collections, the scope of financial provisions for such development, and the research utility of the collections. The questionnaire was circulated to the participating libraries in the early part of 1972, and replies thereto began to arrive soon thereafter. It must be admitted that the responses to some questions were not sufficiently factual for a meaningful analysis, but these omissions did not in any way detract from the general value of the information gathered by means of the questionnaire.

Forty-six law libraries were selected for participation in the survey, and eventually thirty-two of them responded to the questionnaire. A list of the libraries invited to take part in the survey appears below, and the names of libraries actually taking part are marked with asterisks.

LIBRARIES INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE 1972 SURVEY

- * American Society of International Law Library
- * Association of the Bar of the City of New York Library
- * Baker & McKenzie (Chicago)
- Case Western Reserve University Law Library
- * Columbia University Law Library
- Cook County Law Library
- * Cornell University Law Library
- * Duke University Law Library
- * Fordham University Law Library
- Georgetown University Law Center Library
- * George Washington University Law Library
- Harvard Law Library
- Indiana University Law Library (Bloomington)
- * Indiana-Purdue Universities Law Library (Indianapolis)
- * Law Library of Congress
- * Los Angeles County Law Library
- * Louisiana State University Law Library
- Loyola University Law Library (Los Angeles)
- New York University Law Library
- * Northwestern University Law Library
- * Ohio State University Law Library
- Rutgers University Law Library (Camden)
- Rutgers University Law Library (Newark)
- * Southern Methodist University Law Library
- * Stanford University Law Library
- State University of Iowa Law Library
- * State University of New York at Buffalo Law Library
- Tulane University Law Library
- * University of California Law Library (Berkeley)
- * University of California Law Library (Los Angeles)
- * University of Chicago Law Library
- University of Georgia Law Library
- * University of Illinois Law Library
- * University of Miami Law Library
- * University of Michigan Law Library

- * University of Minnesota Law Library
- * University of North Carolina Law Library
- * University of Pennsylvania Law Library
- * University of Texas Law Library
- * University of Utah Law Library
- University of Virginia Law Library
- * University of Washington Law Library
- * University of Wisconsin Law Library
- * Vanderbilt University Law Library
- Wayne State University Law Library
- * Yale Law Library

Findings of the survey appear in seven statistical tables dealing respectively with —

- (i) the size and growth of collections of foreign and international materials in the participating libraries,
- (ii) major country jurisdictions represented in the foreign law collections of all participating libraries,
- (iii) classification systems used in the arrangement of such foreign and international law collections,
- (iv) holding of foreign and international law periodicals and current subscriptions thereto in the participating libraries.
- (v) employment of specifically designated foreign law librarians in the participating law libraries,
- (vi) special topical or geographical areas of interest in some of the participating libraries, and
- (vii) their financial provisions specifically earmarked for the maintenance and development of foreign and international law collections.

The answers in the individual tables are by no means uniform or conclusive. The participating libraries did their best to supply as much of the requested information as they could in the circumstances, but several of them made a special point of explaining to the writer that their usual statistical records do not include many of the items requested in the questionnaire. Such information, as was received from the participating libraries, is scrupulously presented in the relevant tables. It is the best that can be done in the circumstances without needlessly entering into speculative and misleading extrapolations. For these reasons, most of the tables are also presented without extraneous interpretations or additional editorial comments.

GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

The survey indicates several interesting and useful conclusions. First, it supports the writer's contention that information about foreign and international law collections in American law libraries was and still is remarkably inadequate and inconclusive. The annual surveys of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools do not require law libraries to maintain separate statistical records pertaining to foreign

and international law materials, and many libraries do not keep such records for this reason. No doubt, their failure to do so is caused by a chronic manpower shortage. As a consequence of this omission many libraries have that they do not enjoy the same measure of careful planning applied to the acquisition of American legal materials and they are treated in many libraries, in spite of their possible size, as peripheral collections of secondary importance. This attitude, and the absence of adequate data in many libraries, leads one to conclude that a coordinated exchange of pertinent information among the participating libraries about their developments and acquisition activities in areas of foreign and international law continues to remain a very remote possibility.

Secondly, and contrary to the pessimistic overtones of the preceding remarks, the survey tends to demonstrate that interest in foreign and international law materials still continues to exist in the United States in spite of the reduced rate of acquisitions of such materials and a perceptible shift in current research activities from comparative and foreign law towards the more immediate issues of domestic law. A much broader range of law librarians are willing to accept at least in theory the concept that they must extend their acquisition policies beyond the strictly narrow confines of Anglo-American legal materials, and they are personally interested in learning about foreign and international law. They are seriously concerned inadequate data about their own collections which leads one to question whether their developments in areas of foreign and international law are as systematic and consistent as they appear to be at first blush. It is obvious about the quality of their existing foreign and international law collections, and they are willing to improve them within the limits of their available financial resources through acquisition of new materials, particularly if these are published in English. What they frequently lack is bibliographic guidance and background knowledge of the areas they wish to develop. Their difficulties are partially ameliorated by the information they can extract from such sources as the Szladits bibliographies⁵, the Harvard Annual Legal Bibliography⁶, and a few other equally useful publications⁷. It is obvious that these do not satisfy their demands completely, and it follows that the need for more publications of this nature is strong.

Conversely, the survey also demonstrates that no new significant centers of foreign and international law materials have emerged in the United States in the last twelve years. All of the responses to the questionnaire indicate that by far the largest number of acquisitions of foreign and inter-

⁵ Szladits, Charles. *A Bibliography on Foreign and Comparative Law*. Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law, Columbia University, 1955—.

⁶ Harvard Law School Library. *Annual Legal Bibliography*, v. 1 (1961)—, supplemented by a monthly *Current Legal Bibliography*.

⁷ E. g., Northwestern University School of Law, Elbert H. Gary Library, *Selection of Foreign Legal Publications*, which is issued on a quarterly basis.

national law materials continues to be shared by ten or twelve libraries (depending on the method of calculation) with existing major collections in these areas. Other law libraries acquire their foreign and international law materials at a much smaller rate and more or less at random. Also they do not have any real demand for them, except during short and intermittent periods when the law schools or other institutions they serve exhibit a temporary interest in comparative or international law. This is not to say that the efforts of such law libraries to establish small but viable collections of foreign and international law materials are completely wasted. Their collections can serve many good purposes, and one may never know whether a book gathering dust on the shelves today may not be in heavy demand tomorrow.

Invariably, however, the survey and the writer's personal observations about foreign and international law collections in many law libraries tend to point towards the possibility that most of such collections are developed on a random basis and frequently without any proper guidance. In spite of the increasing number of rapidly growing law libraries in the United States, the really meaningful and scholarly development of foreign and international law collections remains to this day the sole responsibility of a few major libraries. The hard question is whether in a country such as the United States with a large and active legal profession and a broad variety of legal interests this unequal distribution of resources is really sound?

Table 1

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW COLLECTIONS LISTED BY SIZE
(1972 Figures Estimated in Thousands)

Library	Schwerin Survey *	International Law 1972	Comparative and foreign Law 1972	Totals 1972	Rate of Growth 1960-1972
1. Law Library of Congress (including materials both in the Law Library and in the general collections of the Library of Congress)	475,000 (1)	100,000	750,000	850,000	375,000
2. Harvard University **	420,000 (2)	—	—	—	—
3. Columbia University	135,000 (4)	50,000	180,000	230,000	95,000
4. University of Minnesota	30,500 (11)	9,000	220,000	229,000	198,500
5. Los Angeles County Law Library	105,000 (6)	13,000	180,000	213,000	108,000
6. University of Michigan	150,000 (3)	35,000	170,000	205,000	45,000
7. Yale University	100,000 (5)	40,000	140,000	180,000	80,000
8. Association of the Bar of the City of New York Library	75,000 (7)	8,000	122,000	130,000	55,000
9. University of California (Berkeley)	15,000 (16) bound volumes, 30,000 monographs and dissertations	20,000	90,000	110,000	95,000

10. Northwestern University	75,000 (8)	17,000	75,000	86,000	11,000
11. University of Washington.	—	13,000	68,000	81,000	—
12. University of Pennsylvania	"Substantial Collection" (12)	14,000	60,000	74,000	—
13. University of Chicago	40,000 (10) (14,000 of this amount in other collections)	21,000	44,000	65,000	25,000
14. Cornell University	—	11,000	52,000	63,000	—
15. Southern Methodist University	20,000 (15)	35,000	20,000	55,000	25,000
16. University of Illinois	10,000 (21)	9,000	43,000	52,000	42,000
17. Stanford University	15,000 (17)	10,000	40,000	50,000	35,000
18. University of Miami	12,000 (20)	6,000	40,000	46,000	34,000
19. Ohio State University	13,000 (19)	—	45,000	45,000	32,000
Tulane University ***	41,000 (9)	—	—	—	—
20. Louisiana State University	28,000 (13)	4,000	30,000	34,000	6,000

* Includes conflicts, comparative and international law published in a foreign language, as well as Roman and Canon law. Numbers in parenthesis indicate 1960 rank of libraries by size of their foreign law collections.

** In response to a special inquiry, Harvard University advised that its collections of foreign and international laws have continued to expand at the previous rate of growth.

*** Did not participate in the 1972 survey.

Table 1
(continued)

Library	Schwerin Survey* 1960	International Law 1972	Comparative and foreign Law 1972	Totals 1972	Rate of Growth 1960-1972
21. University of Texas	—	8,000	25,000	33,000	—
22. George Washington University	—	25,000	5,000	30,000	—
23. State University of New York at Buffalo	—	6,000	24,000	30,000	—
New York University ***	25,000 (14)	—	—	—	—
24. American Society of International Law Library	—	22,000	400	22,400	—
25. University of California (Los Angeles)	15,000 (18)	—	—	—	—
26. University of North Carolina	—	4,000	10,000	14,000	—
27. Duke University	—	2,000	11,000	13,000	—
28. University of Wisconsin	—	1,000	12,000	13,000	—
29. Fordham University	—	5,000	7,000	12,000	—
30. University of Utah	—	3,000	6,000	9,000	—
31. Baker & McKenzie (Chicago)	—	100	7,000	7,100	—
32. Vanderbilt University	—	—	—	5,000	—
33. Indiana-Purdue Universities ****	—	—	—	—	—

*** Did not participate in the 1972 survey.

**** Did not supply information about the size of its collection.

Table 2

MAJOR COUNTRY JURISDICTIONS IN
FOREIGN LAW COLLECTIONS OF ALL PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES

- (i) Great Britain and the "British Commonwealth"
- (ii) Germany
- (iii) France

Note. (a) — The three jurisdictional groups listed above comprise about 90 per cent of the total aggregate holdings of foreign law materials in the participating libraries. The largest proportions of such materials are, of course, represented by Great Britain and the "British Commonwealth", i.e., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa. Nevertheless, even the holdings of French and German legal materials in all participating libraries substantially exceed their cumulative holdings of materials from all other jurisdictions. A more balanced and comprehensive representation of materials of other jurisdictions is evident in the libraries with the largest foreign law collections. Once again it should be stated the holdings of European legal materials, e.g., Italy, Netherlands, Spain, exceed the combined holdings of materials from other continents.

Note. (b) — Out of the total number of 32 participating libraries, 28 responded that they acquire materials in English as well as in foreign languages whilst four libraries (George Washington University, Indiana-Purdue Universities, University of North Carolina and the University of Utah) indicated that their acquisitions of foreign law materials are by and large restricted to publications in the English language.

Table 3

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS
USED IN THE ARRANGEMENT OF
FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW COLLECTIONS

(a) Foreign Law	
Own system, alphabetical arrangement or unclassified	16
Hicks or modified Hicks	5
Los Angeles County	3
Schiller	3
Stanford	2
Elizabeth Benyon Class K	2
Dewey (to be reclassified to the Library of Congress classification, when available)	1
(b) International Law	
Library of Congress Class JX	14
Own system, alphabetical arrangement or unclassified	9
Schwerin	3
Los Angeles County	2
Stanford	2
Modified Hicks	2

Table 4

COMPLETE AND PARTIAL HOLDINGS OF
FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW
PERIODICALS AND CURRENT SUBSCRIPTION TO SUCH PERIODICALS

Library	Number of Serials	Number of Subscriptions
American Society of International Law Library	300	300
Association of the Bar of the City of New York Library	95	85
Baker & McKenzie (Chicago)	33	30
Columbia University	2,630	380
Cornell University	460	400
Duke University	159	144
Fordham University	155	125
George Washington University	119	90
Indiana-Purdue Universities	55	55
Law Library of Congress	"too numerous"	"too numerous"
Los Angeles County Law Library	2,300	2,167
Louisiana State University	233	206
Northwestern University	800	650
Ohio State University	information not available	1,135
Southern Methodist University	150	126
Stanford University	377	?
State University of New York at Buffalo	431	431
University of California (Berkeley)	570	500
University of California (Los Angeles)	information not available	information not available
University of Chicago	557	289
University of Illinois	1,360	1,040
University of Miami	280	no information
University of Michigan	no information	no information
University of Minnesota	798	472
University of North Carolina	60	45
University of Pennsylvania	570	380
University of Texas	517	386
University of Utah	52	41
University of Washington	1,020	890
University of Wisconsin (excluding international law periodicals)	182	167
Vanderbilt University	80	80
Yale University	1,700	1,300

Remark. — The above figures for serials do not appear to be completely accurate. This observation is certainly true for subscription figures because Professor *Kurt Schwerin* of Northwestern University and the writer circulated questionnaires for a new Union List of Foreign Legal Periodicals at about the same time as the writer conducted this survey, and the data for the Union List showed in many instances totally different number of subscriptions to foreign legal periodicals than the numbers given by the same libraries in this survey.

Table 5

LIBRARIES WITH COLLECTIONS SUPERVISED BY
FOREIGN LAW LIBRARIANS OR OTHER SPECIALLY DESIGNATED
PERSONS WITH FOREIGN OR INTERNATIONAL LAW EXPERIENCE

American Society of International Law Library	University of Chicago
Columbia University	University of Illinois
Harvard University	University of Miami
Law Library of Congress	University of Michigan
Los Angeles County Law Library	University of Minnesota
Louisiana State University	University of Pennsylvania
Northwestern University	University of Texas
Southern Methodist University	University of Washington
University of California (Berkeley)	University of Wisconsin
	Yale University

Note. — All other participating libraries treat their foreign and international law materials as integral parts of their general collections. They do not have specially designated persons for the supervision of such materials. It should be pointed out, however, that the librarians of many of these libraries are recognized experts in foreign and international law materials.

Table 6

SPECIAL TOPICAL OR
GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS OF INTEREST

Library	Area of Interest
Association of the Bar of the City of New York Library	British Commonwealth and Western Europe
Cornell University	Great Britain and British Commonwealth, European Communities, France, Germany and Switzerland
George Washington University	Industrial property, trade and finance, taxation, protection of human rights, arms control, atomic energy, European Communities
Los Angeles County Law Library	Mexican State gazettes
Southern Methodist University	Taxation, gas and oil, air and space law, sea law
University of California (Berkeley)	Laws concerning religion, church-state relations, religious organizations, ancient law, medieval law, protection of human rights

Table 6
(continued)

Library	Area of Interest
University of Illinois	Family law, private international law, European Communities, Soviet Union
University of Miami	Caribbean and Latin America
University of Pennsylvania	Criminal law
University of Washington	Japanese law and other Asian countries
Yale University	African law, Brazil, and Chile

Table 7

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS FOR
FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW
COLLECTIONS IN PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES
(Indicated as approximate percentages of annual budgetary appropriations)

Library	Percentage of Funds
American Society of International Law Library	100 %
Association of the Bar of the City of New York Library	10 % on foreign materials (not including periodical subscriptions, and excluding all acquisitions in international and comparative Law)
Baker & McKenzie (Chicago)	50 % (30 % of that on upkeep of foreign loose-leaf services)
Columbia University	no response
Cornell University	15—20 %
Duke University	5 %
Fordham University	12 %
George Washington University	20 %
Indiana-Purdue Universities	no response
Law Library of Congress	49 % of funds appropriated for books for the law library; also National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, Public Law 480 Program, copyright deposits, gifts, foreign and domestic exchanges, and transfers from other government agencies
Los Angeles County Law Library	24—26 %
Northwestern University	20—25 %
Ohio State University	15 %

Table 7
(continued)

Library	Percentage of Funds
Southern Methodist University	20—25 %
Stanford University	17 %
State University of New York at Buffalo	no response
University of California (Berkeley)	75 %
University of California (Los Angeles)	"Estimate impossible"
University of Chicago	20—25 %
University of Illinois	20—30 %
University of Miami	no response
University of Michigan	35 %
University of Minnesota	24 %
University of North Carolina	"Variable"
University of Pennsylvania	8 %
University of Texas	10 %
University of Utah	10 %
University of Washington	20 %
University of Wisconsin	"Impossible to tell"
Vanderbilt University	"No designated"
Yale University	13 %

BIBLIOGRAPHY
GERMAN LEGAL FESTSCHRIFTEN
1969—1971

VERFASSER- UND SACHREGISTER
AUTHOR AND SUBJECT INDEX
by *Klaus Menzinger**

Preliminary note:

It was not the primary purpose to index the German Legal Festschriften. In this case it would have been better, to present the Festschriften in a systematical order right from the beginning, like for instance the well-known *Bibliographie Juristischer Festschriften und Festschriftenbeiträge* by *Helmuth Dau* (1945—1961: Karlsruhe 1962; 1962—1966: Bielefeld: 1967). As mentioned in Bulletin no. 28, page 37, my object was rather to give the foreign law librarian practical help for deciding which German Festschriften (in the technical sense as collections of essays contributed by several persons and issued in honor of a person, institution or society)

* Klaus Menzinger, Akademischer Oberrat, Juristisches Seminar der Universität Freiburg, Germany.

he should acquire according to the special field of research done in his library and which ones he could buy, considering his limited financial means. For this reason the titles of the Festschriften and their contents were listed as a whole.

If the Festschriften are nevertheless indexed by an author and subject index, this is because of "the importance of Legal Festschriften for work in international and comparative law" (CF. *L. M. Roberts*, 11 *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 403—411, 1962) and "the real trouble is that the public is usually unaware of these publications and their contents due to lack of bibliographical information". Since the late *L. M. Roberts* wrote this in 1963 (CF. 56 *Law Library Journal*, 47, 54) the situation has slightly changed (last not least through the *Bibliography of Legal Festschriften* (1868—1968) compiled by herself and edited posthumously, The Hague, Nijhoff 1972, although she was not able to carry out the planned subject index). With special reference to the current legal Festschriften in the German language, these are almost completely indexed with all contributions in *Karlsruher Juristische Bibliographie* since 1965.

However, as this invaluable bibliographical aid to German Legal Science is probably at one's disposal only in a few foreign libraries and as the *Current* (resp. *Annual*) *Legal Bibliography* of the Harvard Law School Library as well as the *Index to Legal Periodicals* and the *Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals* only evaluate Festschriften in a rather limited way, there might be some interest to index the listed Festschriften. The somewhat complicated method results from the above mentioned purpose of publication and the distribution over several issues.

The *author index* lists first the authors of contributions to all the listed Festschriften in alphabetical order, secondly the year of publication of the Festschrift, thirdly the continuous number given here within a year of publication and finally the name of the honoured person or institution.

The *subject index* is arranged not in alphabetical order but in classified order, which is usually preferred by "Civil Lawyers". It follows the classification of the *Karlsruher Juristische Bibliographie*, relating to German law probably the best known at the moment. For the — always problematic — translation of the German headings into English equivalents I mainly used the bi-lingual *Bibliography of German Law — Bibliographie des Deutschen Rechts* — as well as the *Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals and Szladits' Guide to Foreign Legal Materials, French, German, Swiss*. The necessary additions were made with the help of Mr. *A. Sprudz*, Foreign Law Librarian, The University of Chicago, Law School, to whom I should like to express my gratitude at this point.

Following the headings are listed first the year of publication of the Festschrift, secondly the continuous number mentioned here, thirdly the name of the honoured person or institution, fourthly the page within the Festschrift and fifthly the author of the contribution. Biographical contributions are only mentioned, if they are specially signed. The bibliographies are in alphabetical order for the covered period of 3 years. The honoured persons are named, not the compilers.

The legal Festschriften 1969, no. 1—14 are published in *IALL Bulletin* no. 28, pp. 36—46, those of 1969, no. 15—31 in *Bulletin* no. 29/30, pp. 44—51, those of 1970 in *International Journal of Law Libraries*, Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 33—42 and those of 1971 in Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 89—95.