

INTERNATIONAL LAW : CASES AND MATERIALS. By William W. Bishop, Jr.
Second Edition. [Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1962. xlvi + 964 pp.
U.S.\$13.]

Professor Bishop has provided an interesting collection of materials in a work the point of view of which 'is frankly American — that of the American lawyer and the Department of State of the United States — although there is an effort to present a rounded picture of international law rather than merely the views expressed by the United States.' Despite this proviso, there is little in the work to make it of general appeal to the non-American scholar and most of the 'non-case' materials come from American official sources.

The book is not a casebook in the sense that this term is normally used in English legal circles and only some 90 cases are actually reported, often in a very shortened form. Of these, about 40 are decisions of American courts; some 25 of bilateral commissions, in most of which the United States figured as a party; 2 come from the Philippines, 1 from Panama and 1 from Belgium; 11 judgments and advisory opinions represent the work of the World Court; and 10 the contribution of English courts to the development of international law.

It is easy to criticise any casebook for what the editor has omitted. It is strange, however, to find a 1962 collection of cases and materials on international law which reduces the *Corfu Channel Case* to one sentence in a footnote, and deals with the two advisory opinions on the U.N. and I.L.O. Administrative Tribunals by merely naming them in explanation of the statement: 'There has been considerable interest in the legal status of international organization employees vis-a-vis the organization and

the state of which they are nationals.' The three decisions of the World Court on *Asylum* are represented by two footnotes and a single paragraph on the nature of 'American' international law; while it is of little help to an understanding of mandates today, or of questions relating to the 'succession' of the League of Nations by the United Nations, to find only the advisory opinion on 'Status' mentioned, and then merely by reproducing *verbatim* the actual finding of the Court.

Whatever the criticisms of this work, and however parochial its approach, some of Professor Bishop's comments on the significance of international law and its study may be brought to the attention of students everywhere. Thus, it is obviously important to stress the interplay between international law and international relations. Too frequently, however, students and practitioners alike overlook the fact that 'at times an international law solution to a problem may appear obvious, when in fact it would prove entirely impracticable when viewed against the entire background, particularly when that political, economic, or social background is unfamiliar.'

What Professor Bishop says of the American lawyer's professional responsibility where international law is concerned is equally important to the lawyer in an emergent country: 'Characteristic of our American civilization, at least, is the extent to which lawyers are among the chief leaders of our communities and the important part which they play in shaping public opinion and national policy. With the increasing importance of the United States in world affairs, and the importance of international relations to everyone in the United States, it becomes highly necessary that we have many persons sufficiently conversant with international law to understand the legal side of the problems arising with other countries. International law, as the legal aspect of international relations, calls for the lawyer's skills, the lawyer's attitudes, the lawyer's approach. By reason of the lawyer's training and familiarity with law in his daily work, it is the lawyer who is in the best position effectively to guide the public opinion of a democracy when legal questions arise in international relations. Although international law forms only a part, at times a small part, of international relations, yet it is that part of the field which falls particularly in the lawyer's sphere and in which he is the most competent to guide opinion and to understand the wisdom or unwisdom of governmental action and policy.'