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MOOT COURT

At the beginning of the Winter quarter there were twenty cases listed on the Moot Court docket. Of this number twelve have been carried to completion. Of the cases dropped or continued seven were junior cases and one freshman case. In the argument of the twelve cases forty-eight students took part in the presentation, and thirty-six acted in the capacity of judges. The participants were divided into two groups, one headed by Harry Angel and the other by Edwin Teple. At the close of the quarter Angel's team is leading by the score of four hundred five to four hundred four. The competitive angle did not seem to play a very large part in the program, and it is doubtful if some of the students knew what side they were on.

It would be interesting as well as helpful if it were possible to get the reaction of each person who took part in the Moot Court activity. It is only possible to give here a personal reaction to the work of the court. Considering that we were entering upon a new field of activity, the results were, on the whole, quite satisfactory. On the other hand a backward glance reveals weaknesses which should be remedied by readjustment. The work of the court seems to provide a desirable and needed experience for the first-year student. The greater number of cases dropped by the junior class would seem to indicate either a lack of interest or lack of time. A more probable explanation might be that the junior class was taking part in other Bar Association work. This is as it should be. The work on the Legal Aid and Publications Committees is necessarily somewhat limited to advanced students, but there is no reason why a student should not be able to argue regarding elementary principles of Tort or Contracts during the early part of his first quarter in law school. The work will induce the student to acclimate himself to an entirely new environment.

We feel that there will be a continued need in the Law School for the experience which the Moot Court gives to those participating. The problem will continue to be to adjust the program of the work so as to fit into the program of the other committees as well as the regular class work of the school. It would seem that the information which would lead to this adjustment could best be obtained by contacting every student who took a part in Moot Court during this year and obtaining his suggestions as to how the court may be of most benefit to the student body.
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