

are in a life and death struggle for a discard of that conformity which blights progress. You are the potential leaders in the traditionally guiding guild of citizens. If you do not live true to the paths of your great heritage, upon whom can one count? The assumption of this task is the high privilege of our chosen profession.

Lest you feel that there is an undue impediment in my silence—I'm through!

MINUTES OF DISCUSSION GROUPS MAJOR ARTICLES AND BOOK REVIEWS

1. Topics

Few reviews expressed definite ideas on the subject of selection of topics. The great majority prefer, apparently, to leave the selection to the writer. There were, however, three definite suggestions offered. One review successfully follows the practice of contacting the local bar association to determine what topics are of current interest. Another distributes questionnaires to its subscribers to determine topics of reader interest—this practice was conceded to be expensive. A few reviews depend entirely upon the recommendations of their faculty advisors.

There was a great diversity of opinion as to whether reviews should adhere to matters which are strictly legal in their leading articles, or should include works pertaining to non-legal subjects. Reviews which have experimented with non-legal material reported a high degree of acceptance by readers. Some examples of well-received non-legal material are: public opinion polls, legal history, sociological studies, tests on intoxication, statistics on criminal insanity, "Morals, Medicine and the Law," and psychological and economic studies.

An even greater diversity of opinion was indicated in the discussion of the question whether reviews should direct their leading articles at "practical" problems. It appeared that individual bias as to the basic purpose of the review was reflected in the positions taken on this question. Delegates personally committed to the philosophy that the review's primary function is to serve as a handbook for the practicing attorney emphasized problems most likely to arise in day-to-day practice. Generally speaking, representatives from reviews having close ties with local bar associations agreed with this viewpoint. On the other extreme were delegates who posited that the review's principal function was that of a tool to be used by teachers and students, and therefore, that the review should primarily concern itself with problems of theory, logic, and development of the law, treading into the "practical" realm only incidentally. Most delegates were of the opinion that the law review should strike a balance and include a respectable assortment of articles of both types.

2. Solicitations

a. Methods

The blanket letter, in one form or another, is used by nearly all reviews—and with uniformly poor results. It was thought the reason for the poor showing lay in the fact that the number of reviews published—and hence the number soliciting—has increased thirty-three per cent in the past few years. Personalized letters—letters specifying topics and/or making reference to articles previously published by the person solicited—produced better results. A few reviews depend entirely upon the law school faculty to solicit leading articles. One publication requires all candidates to write three letters soliciting leading articles as a prerequisite to staff promotion. Most reviews employ the “name writer” device in order to attract articles. This is most successfully accomplished by securing a “name writer” well in advance of a publication date and mentioning that the “name writer” will have an article appearing in the issue for which the present article is being solicited.

b. Sources

Most of the leading article sources that were mentioned are standard. They include: theses of J.S.D. candidates, seminar and research papers, faculty, reprints of lectures and speeches given as parts of a series, graduate research directors, and local bar associations. There were mentioned a number of publications from which names of persons likely to write articles could be obtained—*Journal of Legal Education*, *Journal of Political Economy*, *Index to Legal Research Problems*.

It was suggested that a “clearing house” for leading articles be organized to aid those reviews experiencing difficulty in obtaining articles. This suggestion evoked strong opposition from some of the larger reviews. The reason offered in opposition to this proposal was that hard feelings might be created when a review referred the author of a rejected article to another review. This fear was apparently grounded on experience in one case. As a counter-proposal it was suggested that reviews cross-solicit, *i.e.*, the staff of one review would personally solicit local faculty members and attorneys for articles to be published in another review. The latter would then reciprocate—necessary arrangements would be private between the two reviews. It was felt that the lure of out-state publication would overcome a certain amount of reluctance to write leading articles.

A question was raised concerning the publication of student work as leading articles. Although some reviews took a negative position, it was generally agreed that, as a matter of policy, reviews should publish student articles. However, various qualifications were appended. Some reviews require that a faculty member co-author the

article, or, at least recommend it for publication. Other reviews make quality the only requisite. Very few reviews publish seminar papers as leading articles.

3. Processing and Disposition

a. Rejection

All reviews retain the unconditional privilege to reject submitted work. A number of reviews admitted, however, that difficulties were encountered in this respect if there had been extensive solicitation of an article. The difficulty is not entirely avoided, although it is considerably mitigated, by making clear to the person being solicited that the solicitation is not a prior commitment to print.

b. Conditions of Acceptance

Most reviews retain the privilege of making changes in a submitted article. The degree of editing which will be undertaken, however, varies considerably. A good percentage of the reviews reserve the privilege of deleting long quoted passages and making grammatical changes without notifying the author. Some reviews make substantial textual changes without prior notification to the author. A small number of reviews print submitted material without change.

Most reviews follow one of two procedures for notifying the author of changes made in leading articles. One procedure requires prior approval of the change by the author; this is usually obtained by letter. Other reviews send galley to the author with deviations from the submitted text clearly marked, but give him no prior notification concerning the changes.

Almost one-half of the reviews make no "substance check" of leading articles. Of the reviews which do make "substance checks," only one major problem was indicated: what procedure ought to be followed when a cited authority cannot be checked because it is not available in the local libraries? Some reviews send the authorities back to the author for verification. Others check the title and author in the Library of Congress Card Catalog to be sure the work exists, and also to correct any errors the writer may have made in citing the title or author's name. A few rely upon the author's accuracy and make no check.

c. Faculty Solicitation and Editing

In a very few instances, responsibility for the solicitation and editing of leading articles is placed entirely upon the law school faculty. Reviews following this practice apparently make no changes after the article is submitted.

4. The Special Issue

a. Symposium

Two values of the symposium were noted. First, it appears that attorneys find symposia particularly useful. This, in turn, means a greater sale for that issue of the review. The second value noted was the elimination of the problems involved in obtaining additional leading articles—the entire issue is devoted to a single topic.

There was unanimous agreement that the most difficult problem encountered in a symposium is planning. It was thought that at least two years should be devoted to planning the issue. Aside from planning, a second major difficulty encountered is that of the overlap between various segments of the symposium. Two partial solutions to this dilemma were offered. If local writers are involved, the best solution calls for a conference of all the writers, usually arranged by the review. If such a conference is impossible, overlapping may be eliminated by requesting outlines from all of the writers, duplicating the outlines, and distributing them well in advance of copy deadline. Overlapping areas are spotted on the outlines, and the writers are contacted by the review and asked to make adjustments directly with the other writer.

As a general rule, symposia are restricted to non-student writings. But an interesting variation of the symposium idea has been used successfully by one review. Two or three leading articles dealing with one area of the law are solicited and the student section is then devoted entirely to filling in the gaps between the points covered in the articles so that the entire area of law is contained in the symposium.

In addition to the problems of overlap and planning, symposia also present difficulties because of the varying lengths and quality of the segments. It was agreed that these difficulties are risks inherent in symposia, to which there are no satisfactory solutions.

b. Dedicatory Issue

Only a few reviews have attempted dedicatory issues. One school used such an issue to review the development of the state law over a period of years. A second review had great success in slanting a dedicatory issue toward the anticipated development of the law.

c. Review of State Law

Reviews which carry an annual survey of state law report uniform success with those issues. In a great majority of cases, the survey of the law is the product of non-student writers. It was generally felt, however, that this field was fairly restricted in that, in most cases, state universities were already devoting one issue of the review to such surveys and this precluded further entrance into the field.

5. Percentage of Review Pages Devoted to Student Work

Slightly more than one-half of the reviews present publish more non-student than student work. The consensus was that student work is the more valuable of the two varieties of law review material.

6. Book Reviews and Book Notes

a. Book Reviews

Two methods of selecting books to be reviewed are used. Some reviews take the recommendations of faculty members. The greater number leave the selection to the reviewer.

In line with the prevalent feeling that the book review section is the most flexible part of the review, it was generally agreed that it should emphasize non-legal areas. It was suggested, therefore, that professors in the non-legal departments of the university be contacted to write book reviews. Opinions as to the most desirable length and content of the book review varied greatly. There was unanimous approval, however, that a book review should contain an analysis and criticism of the book, rather than merely a synopsis.

b. Book Notes

A book note is a short synopsis written by a student. Its value is felt to lie in the fact that it helps eliminate the possibility that some really significant work will be overlooked. Apparently, those few reviews which carry book notes require that they be written by third-year staff members.

STUDENT NOTES AND COMMENTS

1. Types of Student Work

At the outset, difficulty was encountered in communication as there was no uniformity among the schools in the classification of student work. Therefore, it was decided that for the purposes of discussion student work would be discussed under the following categories: Recent Decisions, Casenotes, Comments, Notes, Student Symposiums, and Book Notes.

a. Recent Decisions

The category of Recent Decisions embraces the shortest type of student case work. It consists of a mere recitation of the facts of a case and the holding of the court. The consensus of opinion was that this type of work was of little or no value.

b. Casenotes

Several of the reviews represented at the conference employ the Casenote. It consists of a recitation of the facts of the case, the holding, and a brief treatment of the law involved. Although the reviews

which employ this type of student work reported that it had met with favorable response from practicing attorneys, most delegates were of the opinion that it was of little value in training prospective board members.

c. Comments

The most lengthy student case work, and that used by most of the schools present, is the case comment. Although the point of departure for the comment is a recent case, it deals with a particular point of law involved in the comment case. It requires considerably more research and analyzation than the other types of student case work, and for this reason most of the reviews represented were of the opinion that the case comment was the most valuable type of student case work, both to the reader and writer.

d. Notes

The note is the longest type of student work. It endeavors to explore one point of law to the fullest possible extent and usually it deals with all the cases in that area of the law. It requires extensive research, acute analyzation, and always contains a summary or conclusion. Of all the types of student work, the note was felt to be the most valuable to the reader and the most important to the training of the writer.

e. Student Symposium

A slightly different type of student work was suggested by one school, which had successfully employed it in its review. Loosely called a Student Symposium, it is the composite efforts of a group of students taking a seminar as part of their curriculum. These students synthesize the course into an article which is published in the law review.

f. Book Notes

The book note was used by a large number of the schools present. It consists of a short review of an interesting book, which would otherwise receive no mention in the review. It should be noted that the book note is used by these schools in addition to the usual book review. The idea was well received by all the participants, who felt that this was a good place for members of the board to give vent to their writing talents, without being required to expend the large amount of time needed for completing other types of student work.

2. Topic Selection

a. Sources

All of the reviews represented at the conference make use of advance sheets in selecting cases for comment, and all appear to be

faced with the same problem, namely, the monumental task of reading through the vast accumulation of advance sheets that pile up during the summer. Some schools solve this problem by maintaining a small staff over the summer to read the advance sheets as they come in. Others, especially the smaller schools, appear to be getting away from board monopolization in case selection, and distribute the advance sheets to the staff as well. Although all of the reviews represented depended upon faculty members for aid in finding noteworthy cases and topics for the long student work, the degree of faculty participation in this field varies greatly, corresponding to the policy of the individual reviews. The more autonomous reviews, while grateful for faculty suggestions, rely less on the faculty in this area than do the faculty-dominated reviews, where at the very least, faculty approval appears to be mandatory. Regardless of policy, however, it was agreed that faculty aid is an invaluable source of topic selection.

Several schools use proposed and rejected legislation as sources for student note topics. Schools that use this type of student work, assign a staff member to scan the newspapers and keep abreast of the activities of the state legislature. This idea met with favorable response from the participants. It appeared that this was a virtually untapped source of law review material.

Other sources for noteworthy topics and commentworthy cases that were exploited by the schools in attendance were suggestions from alumni working in the various fields of law, the particular field of interest to the writer, and unexplored areas of casebooks or law review articles.

b. Factors Influencing Selection

Several factors were mentioned which are used in the selection of a case for comment. It was pointed out that the number of dissents in a case is very often a "tip-off" as to its commentworthiness. Many reviews favor cases dealing with statutory interpretation. There was a sharp divergence of opinion concerning the desirability and propriety of commenting on cases that are pending in the appellate courts. Some delegates believed that it was bad policy to comment on such cases, indicating that it is very often disturbing to the lawyers litigating the case. Other reviews seem to make a game out of trying to get the comment out before the case is finally decided. One school proudly asserted that several of its comments have been cited by some courts.

There was also some divergence of opinion as to whether cases widely deviating from accepted norms are good ones on which to comment. The majority of delegates seemed to think that it was best

to shy away from these "bastard" cases, as they are really of little value to the reader, and are very difficult to write.

The selection of note topics depends a great deal upon the policy of the particular review. Those that are faculty-dominated are greatly influenced in their selections by the wishes of the faculty. Those reviews, however, that enjoy greater autonomy allow the writer a wide range of discretion in selecting a topic that is of considerable interest to him. It was agreed that it is best to select a note topic dealing with an area that is relatively unexplored. This, it was believed, not only adds to the general interest with which the note will be received, but also gives the writer, perhaps, a chance to formulate the law in that area.

3. The Editorial Process

a. Assignment of Topic

The amount of work done by the various reviews prior to topic assignment varies widely. Some schools make assignments with very little or no preliminary investigation into the area. Others will first submit the topic to a faculty member for approval or advice as to its desirability as a topic. Still others undertake preliminary research in the area to see if the selection will yield a good note or comment. One review requires its board members to brief promising cases appearing in the advance sheets. These are then discussed in a "case club." After a great deal of discussion it is there decided which cases would be best for comment.

b. The Editing Process

The editing processes employed by the various reviews differed greatly depending upon such factors as the number of members on the review, degree of faculty control, and the amount of material published. Prior to the first draft, the writer, on almost all reviews, may seek advice from the faculty. Some schools assign a third-year man to work with and supervise the candidate. Still other schools, and it appeared that these were a definite minority, give no assistance to the candidate struggling through his first draft. Once the first draft is completed, most schools hold a consultation with the writer in which the work is discussed, criticized, and evaluated.

After this initial critique, some schools return the work to the writer for a rewrite. Other reviews, after the original consultation, give the draft to a board member who then proceeds to edit the work. Still other reviews, combining these two procedures, return the original draft to the writer, who then rewrites it with the assistance and supervision of a board member.

After the work has been rewritten, it is then returned to the editor.

At this point, if the work is still unsatisfactory, some reviews simply abandon it. Reviews which are not as wealthy in student work, however, and cannot afford to let this much time and effort go to waste, return it to the writer, who then attempts to put it in acceptable form. Other schools assign the work to another candidate, who starts anew. If the work is in fairly "good shape," a rewrite man will usually "polish it up." When the polishing process is completed, it goes either to the note editor, or the editor-in-chief who makes final corrections, holds final consultations, and "polishes it to its ultimate luster." Finally, most schools send the completed work to a faculty member, often the faculty advisor, for final approval. The weight attached to this approval as a condition precedent to publication, again depends upon the policy of the individual review.

c. Style of Citation

The majority of the reviews at the conference use the blue-book system of citation. Some schools have departed from the blue book in part, following it in form, but developing their own style of printing in order to save printing costs. One school has devised an entirely new system of citation and has discarded the blue book. The consensus was, however, that uniformity of citation among the reviews is not only desirable, but indeed, essential.

4. Citation Check, Proofreading, Press Work

At the majority of schools, all menial tasks connected with law review work, such as typing, shelf-checking, proofreading, "substance checking," blue-booking, etc., is done by the members of the review. Some reviews hire secretaries or needy students to do these chores. Most of the reviews were of the opinion, however, that the members of the review must at least undertake the "substance check" for the sake of accuracy.

5. Author Credit on Student Work

While most schools give author credit for the note (lengthy student work), almost none use by-lines for the short notes or case comments. The consensus was that author credit is to some degree desirable on the longer notes. It serves as a stimulus to aspiring board members and aids in the development of pride of authorship, and hence improves the quality of the work. But it would be manifestly unjust and misleading to use a by-line in the shorter work because these are usually the composite efforts of several review members. A small minority of the reviews present did not by-line any of their work, or at most only ascribed their initials to the article.

SELECTION AND ORGANIZATION OF STAFF

1. Selection of Second-Year Staff

a. Time of Selection

It appeared that most of the law reviews represented at the conference made their selection of prospective staff members in the early part of the candidates' third semester. Schools that deviated from this general policy were those choosing their members either at the start or close of the candidates' second semester. Since library facilities might not be available to some students who vacationed during the summer months, those schools that selected their staff personnel at the end of the second semester imposed no obligatory writing requirements until the commencement of the third semester, but candidates were at liberty to complete at their convenience one or more of their writing requirements during the summer. Under this latter plan, however, it was difficult for board members to give any supervision or assistance to prospective staff members except through general instructions that were printed and distributed to the candidates before they left school for the summer.

b. Methods of Selection

All the schools attending the convention in selecting their candidates considered some type of academic standard. In most instances the academic standard consisted of a grade requirement, but a few reviews used relative position or standing in the class as their criterion for selection. Many schools made their selection exclusively on the basis of grades or class standing. Others considered in addition to the academic standards, such factors as proficiency in moot court, results of freshman writing requirements, achievement in competitive writing contests, or combinations thereof. One school used a system of correlating writing requirements with grades, providing that the quantity of written work demanded from a prospective member was inversely proportional to the quality of that student's grades.

2. Responsibilities of Second-Year Staff

The responsibilities assumed by the staff consisted of writing requirements and clerical or administrative duties. The quantity of writing required of staff members varied considerably among the reviews, ranging from a minimum of one comment, or in lieu thereof two casenotes, to a maximum of two comments, an extended note, and the editing of a fellow staff-member's comment. The average writing requirement appeared to approximate one casenote and one comment. Schools that employed second-semester students on their staff imposed no writing requirements on these men until the third

semester. These students were given such duties as shelf-checking, page-proofing, and other chores of a mechanical nature. At some schools the staff was either partially or completely relieved of the strictly clerical duties by hired shelf-checkers, or by part or full-time secretaries, or both.

3. Selection of Board of Editors

Factors mentioned at the convention which were influential in selecting persons for the board of editors included: whether any written work of the student had received publication in the law review; the demonstrated academic ability of the student; personality of the individual; and loyalty and responsibility to the law review.

Methods of selection differed according to the policy of the particular school and according to the particular position for which the person was being considered.

a. Editor-in-Chief

The represented schools listed eight different methods that were used to choose the man for this position: at some schools the editor was chosen by the faculty exclusively; at others the editor was selected by the faculty acting on the recommendations of the retiring board; a third view allowed the board of editors to select the editor, some schools providing for a veto power residing in the faculty; closely allied was the policy of having the third-year men select the editor, but acting on the recommendations of the second-year men; a slight modification from this latter view consisted of having both the board and the staff make the selection; one school allowed the selection to be made by the retiring editor; and a final method was to choose as editor the man who academically ranked first in the class.

b. Editorial Board

Included in the methods outlined above for selecting the editor-in-chief are those that would be applicable for selecting the board of editors. It appeared, however, that selection by the retiring board of editors was the most prevalent method used by the various schools.

c. Problems Related to Selection of Board

One problem that was discussed briefly in connection with placement on the board of editors was that of maintaining the interest of third-year men who were not selected for the board, but whose services were valuable and necessary for the smooth functioning of the law review. Numerous suggestions were offered to alleviate this situation: one school suggested social pressure through an *esprit de corps* movement; a more forceful alternative was a reinstatement of academic requirements (moot court, required papers or courses, etc.)

that had previously been waived for men on the law review; another proposal was to promote activity by giving more editing assignments to people not placed on the board; a fourth view suggested summary discharge from the law review; and a final plan was to give awards on a competitive basis to outstanding members of the third-year class that were not chosen for board positions. An obvious means of motivation that was mentioned but not developed is the possible withdrawal of various privileges generally granted to law review members as a matter of school policy.

4. Organization of Board

a. Partition

The larger reviews are able to divide their personnel into specialized departments or sections, and agreed generally that such division is successful and desirable. In this way all the administrative work done at the staff level in the various departments comes under the direct supervision of department editors, who are in turn responsible to members of a correlating board, and ultimately to the editor-in-chief. The smaller reviews, of course, are unable to effect this partition due to limitations on manpower.

b. Composition of Board

As suggested previously, the smaller reviews are faced with the basic consideration of manpower and hence adopt the policy of placing all third-year members on the board of editors. Some of the larger reviews, however, do not place all their third-year students on the editorial board, but retain some of them in staff positions in order to prevent the board from becoming unmanageable through sheer force of numbers. In this respect the problem of the larger schools is just the inverse of that of the smaller ones.

c. Responsibility for Last Issue of Academic Year

The majority of schools represented at the convention place the responsibility for the final issue upon the third-year men. Other schools place the responsibility for this issue on the second-year men, and the third-year men are relegated to positions purely supervisory. One school has its second-year men assume responsibility for notes and comments in the May issue, and then places total responsibility on the second-year men for the June issue.

5. Privileges and Immunities of Review Staff

This topic of conversation, which proved to be very dear to the hearts of all students attending the convention, was the most informative if not the most prolific of all topics discussed. Highlights of the

various privileges extended to law review members throughout the country are outlined below; it should be stated, however, that no one school offered *all* the privileges that are mentioned, although combinations of two or more of such privileges existing at one school were not infrequent.

The first concession mentioned, and one that received favorable endorsement without exception, was exemption from papers and other writing requirements imposed by the school. It was the policy of some schools to award academic credit for law review work, ranging from one to six hours, but not all schools granting such hours assessed an academic or grade value to them; *i.e.*, students received academic credit for the hours, but the hours did not affect the academic average of the student. Of those schools that assessed a numerical value to the hours granted, it was the policy of some to have a faculty advisor assign the grade, while the others had the students (editor-in-chief or editorial board) determine the grade. Several schools have pre-empted the field of honorary organizations in favor of their law review students by making law review work a prerequisite for selection to Coif. This policy has the additional advantage of attracting the best qualified and most ambitious students to apprenticeship on the review. One school granted a J.D. rather than an LL.B. degree to its law review graduates, provided that the student possessed an undergraduate degree and had maintained a "B" average through law school. Many schools provided placement service for graduates of its law review, channelling the higher paying and more advantageous positions to these students. Late library privileges to men on the review was one of the concessions made by a number of schools. Furthermore, many law schools as a matter of policy grant scholarships to men on the law review who request financial aid. A privilege sometimes extended to second-year men allows them to take varying numbers of elective courses their third and fourth semesters in lieu of adherence to a required curriculum. And finally, close relations between faculty advisors and law review students is supplemented at some schools by means of occasional coffee hours, luncheon dates, or cocktail parties.

CIRCULATION, ADVERTISING, FINANCES AND PUBLISHING

1. Circulation and Subscriptions

a. Students

Many schools include student subscriptions within tuition or a required activity fee. Other schools solicit subscriptions on a voluntary basis, obtaining them from such sources as voluntary student bar dues, or from the students during registration or following subscription campaigns. Most schools provide reduced rates for their students.

One school issued its review to its students free of charge. Some schools sell three-year subscriptions to the law students. It was also suggested that it might be feasible to solicit subscriptions from pre-law students.

b. Alumni

The alumni are solicited individually for subscriptions by most schools, and one school included the subscription price in alumni dues. Few schools offer reduced rates to the alumni.

c. Profession

A few schools have been successful in securing the cooperation and aid of the county or state bar association in increasing circulation within the legal profession. In a number of instances where the review is published by a state university, the subscription fee is included in bar association dues. Several other means of increasing circulation among the profession are employed: mailing tables of contents to lawyers prior to publication, including subscription cards when mailing requested issues, soliciting the judges and attorneys involved in cases commented upon in the review, mailing letters and outlines concerning symposiums which will appear soon (this has been very successful), mailing flyers to lawyers on all special issues, mailing promotional letters to all judges in the United States, soliciting state attorney generals, and encouraging the authors of leading articles to secure subscriptions among their friends.

d. Agencies

Although some agencies will handle subscriptions without the benefit of a discount being extended to them, there is the further problem in this situation of losing subscriptions as a result of the agency charging subscribers more than the standard subscription price. One school discontinued granting discounts to agencies and thus far has lost no subscriptions.

It was also reported that circulation is often increased by publishing symposiums. Some reviews have utilized this method to increase circulation by publishing a periodic symposium on one topic. Others have found that symposiums suggested by their local bar associations not only stimulate interest in the review among the profession, but also aid circulation.

2. Advertising

Although most reviews carry some form of advertising, there was a marked difference among the attending schools as to the amount of advertising a review should contain. The price per page varied from \$125.00 to \$250.00, the higher charge being explained in some

cases because of the larger number of issues published per year by the particular review as compared to the number published by the smaller schools. Some reviews give commissions to those students who secure new advertising.

There was some disagreement as to the kind of advertising which law reviews should accept. Most of the delegates agreed that the advertisements should be of institutions or occupations which are closely related to the legal profession, or those with which lawyers will often come into contact, such as insurance companies, certified public accountants, publishers and printers of materials pertaining to the legal profession, banks, and title companies. A few schools did not so restrict themselves and followed no particular policy in regard to the kind of advertising which they solicited.

It was also pointed out that any review which wishes to increase its advertising, must consider the possibility of losing its second-class mailing privilege which is restricted to printed material containing less than five per cent advertising. It was suggested that if a review has difficulty in securing this privilege from a local post office, it might be possible to obtain it from a post office close to their printer.

3. Financing and Publication Policy

In addition to the income received from subscriptions, every review attending the conference received a subsidy from its law school. One review supplements its subsidy by running a used-law-book store and found that many other used-book stores were unable to compete with it.

Most of the reviews which were present did not have a separate business staff. Approximately one-half of these schools paid the business manager a salary, and others granted scholarships to their business managers. About one-half of the reviews also employed clerical help.

In regard to printing expenses, some reviews have found that any time lost in mailing materials to and from distant printers, is more than compensated for by the cheaper rates which they have been able to secure in other localities. A few schools utilize their university printing facilities, but most schools employ commercial printers. Many of the latter schools reported that commercial printers offered them cheaper rates than did the university printer. One school has reduced its printing costs by using paste-ups and making up its own review. Other schools reported that printing costs are less if regular roman type is used throughout the footnotes instead of the many types of print used in the blue book, such as italics and large and small capitals. There was strong support for the suggestion that a committee be organized to collect and transmit information

concerning printing costs and circulate this information among all the law reviews. It was also suggested that the reviews belonging to the National Law Review Conference exchange such information with one another.

There was much variation in the policy of the reviews concerning reprints. Some schools send a certain number of reprints and copies of the review to the authors of their leading articles. One review sent as many as ten copies and fifty reprints. Many schools sought to reduce costs by sending tear sheets or overruns to the authors. While most schools provided the reprints to the authors free, others charged the authors, either the full price or a reduced rate. One review did not handle reprints at all but required those who desired them to make their own arrangements with the printer. A few reviews provided reprints at a reduced rate for those students who had material appearing in the review. To provide for subsequent reprint orders, plates were retained by the reviews for periods ranging between one to six months. In order to avoid the possibility that the review might run out of back issues, some reviews retain their mats and utilize offset printing to provide additional back issues. One review sends a certain number of issues to a private book company which then handles any orders for back issues. Some schools also reported profits earned by binding old reviews for subscribers.

It was also discovered that a wide variety of indexing systems were in use. One review contains an index within each volume. It was suggested, however, that reviews published in states which are not heavily populated may need a cumulative index, since many of the lawyers in small towns do not have access to an *Index to Legal Periodicals*. A few reviews are fortunate enough to have the aid of the law school library staff in preparing their indexes.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

FRANK W. MILLER—Professor of Law, Washington University School of Law. B.A. 1946, University of Wisconsin; LL.B. 1948, University of Wisconsin; S.J.D. 1954, University of Wisconsin. Assistant to draftsman, Bulk Sales article of the Uniform Commercial Code. Author of various leading articles. Member of Wisconsin Bar.

ROBERT J. YALEM—Instructor of Political Science, University of Florida. A.B. 1950, Washington University; M.A. 1953, American University; Ph.D. 1956, American University.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW QUARTERLY

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews

Volume 1957

April 1957

Number 2

Edited by the Undergraduates of Washington University School of Law, St. Louis.
Published in February, April, June, and December at
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIAL BOARD

DOMINIC TROLANI, *Editor-in-Chief*

RONALD M. BELT
Associate Editor

W. LAYTON STEWART
Associate Editor

JAMES L. VIANI
Associate Editor

S. SHELDON WEINHAUS
Associate Editor

JEROLD B. KATZ, *Business Manager*

STAFF

JULES B. GERARD

GERHARD J. PETZALL

MARTIN SCHIFF, JR.

Assistant Business Managers

ALBERT J. HALLER

EARL TEDROW

FACULTY ADVISOR

WILLIAM E. WALLACE

ADVISORY BOARD

CHARLES C. ALLEN III
ROBERT L. ARONSON
FRANK P. ASCHEMEYER
EDWARD BEIMFOHR
G. A. BUDER, JR.
RICHARD S. BULL
REXFORD H. CARUTHERS
DAVE L. CORNFELD
SAM ELSON
ARTHUR J. FREUND
WARNER FULLER
JOSEPH J. GRAVELY

JOHN RAEBURN GREEN
FORREST M. HEMKER
GEORGE A. JENSEN
LLOYD R. KOENIG
ALAN C. KOHN
HARRY W. KROEGER
FRED L. KUHLMANN
WARREN R. MAICHEL
DAVID L. MILLAR
ROSS E. MORRIS
RALPH R. NEUHOFF
NORMAN C. PARKER

CHRISTIAN B. PEPPER
ORVILLE RICHARDSON
W. MUNRO ROBERTS
STANLEY M. ROSENBLUM
A. E. S. SCHMID
EDWIN M. SCHAEFER, JR.
GEORGE W. SIMPKINS
KARL P. SPENCER
MAURICE L. STEWART
JOHN R. STOCKHAM
WAYNE B. WRIGHT

Subscription Price \$4.00; Per Current Copy \$1.25. A subscriber desiring to discontinue his subscription should send notice to that effect. In the absence of such notice, the subscription will be continued.