

OFFICIAL RULES
FOR THE
NATIONAL
DIVISION
OF THE
1981
PHILIP C. JESSUP
INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

The Association of Student International
Law Societies
The American Society of International Law
2223 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008
(202) 387-2467
(202) 265-4313
Cable: "AMINTLAW"

OFFICIAL RULES FOR THE

1981 PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

I. ORGANIZATION

The Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition is sponsored annually by the Association of Student International Law Societies (ASILS), the American Society of International Law (ASIL) and the International Communication Agency for students enrolled in ASILS member schools and other invited law schools. The Competition, administered by the Executive Secretary of the ASILS, consists of three rounds of arguments (Regional, Semi-Final and Final). Domestic regionals shall be held in designated geographical areas of the United States, Semi-Final and Final Rounds shall be held at the site of the ASIL/ASILS Annual Meeting. A single law school will host each Regional (unless permission is granted by the Executive Secretary for two or more law schools to be hosts) and will appoint a Regional Administrator; if a student is so appointed, the host school will also appoint a faculty adviser for that Regional.

II. FACT PROBLEM

The hypothetical fact problem upon which the Competition is based will be written each year by a scholar of international law, chosen by the Executive Secretary of the ASILS, and will concern itself with a subject of timely interest.

III. ELIGIBILITY

All ASILS member societies are eligible to compete in the Jessup Competition. Other law schools may become eligible when their applications are approved by the Executive Secretary. A school shall not be eligible to participate in the Competition if it has already participated for two years without having applied for membership in the Association of Student International Law Societies. This requirement may be waived by the Executive Secretary upon a showing of cause for relief by the respective school (such as the non-existence of an international law society at the school). All participating U.S. schools shall submit an entrance fee (\$140 for ASILS member schools, \$165 for non-member schools), together with a notice of intent to participate, by October 31, 1980. An additional \$15.00 will be charged for applications mailed after midnight October 31 and before the final deadline of November 30, 1980.

IV. TEAMS

A. Number: Each eligible school may enter one team in the Competition.

B. Composition: A team shall be composed of from two to five students, who alone shall research and write the memorials. The names of all team members shall be transmitted to the Regional Administrator not later than 10 days before the beginning of the Regional Competition. All team members shall be studying for the

J.D. or its equivalent, in order to qualify for the competition. A team member must be a full or part-time student at only one school. The Executive Secretary, upon written request, may permit the participation of students studying for an advanced graduate-level law degree or a graduate level degree in political science. Team members will be chosen by any method approved by the responsible authority in the law school including intramural competition utilizing the Jessup Problem, but so as not to conflict with the provisions of Article VIII.

The international law society at a participating school has the first option to select the team and provide local administration. If the international law society chooses not to exercise their option to administer the Jessup team (or if an international law society does not exist at the school), the moot court board or other authoritative body may take on administration at the participating school.

Any team member may act as an oralist during any round. However, to be eligible for any oralist award a competitor must have argued twice during the Regional or Semi-Final Competition. Only two oralists may argue during any single round. No single oralist shall argue longer than 25 minutes of the 45 minutes given to each team for each round. Included in the 45 minutes given to each team is rebuttal or surrebuttal time if applicable. If the judges in their discretion extend total team time beyond 45 minutes (and they may not do so for more than 10 minutes), then and only then may an oralist argue for longer than 25 minutes).

During each round, one other team member may sit at the table with the two oralists as counsel. The person acting as counsel must be one of the five team members. Moreover, the person acting as counsel need not be the same person in each round. Only the judges, the two oralists, and the person designated as counsel may communicate during the argument. There shall be no communication between the counsel table and any other individual during the round.

V. REGIONAL COMPETITION

A. Time and Place of Argument: All U.S. Regionals shall be held during either the last weekend in February or the first or second weekend in March. If direct conflict with any competing school's examination period would result, a change in the dates of a Regional may be made, if approved in writing by each school participating within that region and endorsed by the Regional Administrator and the Executive Secretary.

The Executive Secretary shall notify the Regional host and the participating schools not later than the week of December 8 of the Regional groupings. The Regional Administrators shall notify each participating school of the pairings and of the exact time and place of its Regionals no later than February 9. Initial pairings shall be final, except as modified by the Regional Administrator because of the addition or deletion of a team or teams. Each team in the Regional should be assigned a number by the Regional Administrator,

which must be used on memorials and by others during the competition. The school name must not appear on the memorial, nor may it be used to identify a team or member in any way (as by the name tag) during the competition.

Any team which is not present at the time and place designated by the Regional Administrator for its assigned regional competition will be deemed to have forfeited its rounds. If the Regional Administrator has reason to believe that the team has been delayed for reasons beyond its control, however, and if he or she can do so without injury to those teams which are present, he or she may take whatever ameliorative action which may seem appropriate to the Administrator, i.e., delaying the beginning of the round for a reasonable period of time, rescheduling arguments, and the like.

B. Scope of Regions: A Regional Competition shall be composed, wherever possible, of the same number of teams in all regions.

C. Regionals

1. Oral Arguments and Judging. The Regional Competition shall consist of four rounds of oral arguments. At the Regional Competition, each team shall argue two rounds as the applicant and two rounds as the respondent.

Each round of oral argument shall be judged by a panel of three judges. Permission of the Executive Secretary may be given in extraordinary circumstances to allow a panel of two judges to hear a round. In such cases special scoring will be used (see VII A).

No team shall appear before the same judge twice. No team shall meet any other team more than once.

2. Scouting. No team member or person affiliated with that team may attend a round in which a prospective opponent team is participating. Any team member or affiliated person who wishes to attend any other round must obtain advance permission from the two arguing teams. No taping of arguments will be allowed.

3. Memorial Judging. Each memorial shall receive three separate scores. Each of the three memorial judges shall score the memorial independently of his colleagues, assigning a numerical score in accordance with the Memorial Scoring Instructions (see Annex E). Each memorial judge shall submit his or her scores to the Regional Administrator prior to the first oral argument of the Regional competition.

4. Interpretation of Rules. If there is any question about the interpretation of Rules during oral arguments, such questions must go to the Regional Administrator. The timekeepers have no power to interpret the Rules. Any detrimental reliance by a team on an interpretation by a timekeeper will not prevent a penalty from being imposed later if a Regional Administrator's interpretation differs from that of a timekeeper in a situation which raises the possibility

of an imposition of a penalty. Such penalties may ultimately be appealed to the Executive Secretary as provided for in VI (C).

D. Memorials:

1. Identification. No school name or addresses of any kind shall appear anywhere on the memorials. The memorial shall be identified only by a number designated by the Regional Administrator. The names of individual team members shall appear on the cover. Team members may sign the memorial at the conclusion.

2. Required Memorials. Each team in the competition shall prepare an applicant's memorial and a respondent's memorial.

3. Length. The body of the memorial shall be no more than 25 pages in length. The 25-page limitation shall include the conclusion, annexes, appendices, footnotes. The Table of Contents, Index of Authorities, Jurisdiction, Statement of Facts, Questions Presented, Summary of Argument, title page and back cover (if any) are excluded from the 25-page restriction. Footnotes may be placed either at the bottom of the page, within the body of the argument, or at the end of the memorial. No issue or argument not discussed within the body of the memorial shall be included in any other section of the memorial. Footnotes may not be argumentative. (Footnotes are not to be used to bypass the length limitation by placing substantive arguments there.)

The Arguments Section of the memorial must be double spaced. Footnotes and titles more than one line in length may be single spaced. Quotes of 50 words or more may be single spaced as called for by Harvard's Uniform System of Citation. All portions of the memorial other than the argument section may be single spaced. 8½" x 11" paper is to be used in the memorial.

4. Prohibition on submission of additional written memorials. No written materials, other than the memorials, may be submitted by a team to oral judges, prior to, during, or after an argument.

5. Form. Memorials must be typewritten and reproduced by mimeograph, Xerox or offset. No part of the memorial, including the cover shall be otherwise printed or press-typed.

Any type style is permissible. Standard pica is the preferred type size and no type smaller than standard elite (12 spaces to the inch) shall be used.

Memorials must be fastened by staples; no other type of fastening (such as ring binding or tape) is permitted. There should be two staples across the top or two to three staples along the left side of the memorial.

Applicant and respondent memorials must be differentiated by different colored covers.

6. Citations and Footnotes. (See Annex B.) The form of citations used shall be in accordance with the rules in the most recent edition of a Uniform System of Citation. Footnotes may be placed either at the bottom of the page, within the body of the argument, or at the end of the memorial.

7. Mailing of Memorials. Mailing of memorials must be done by postage stamps. If the post office refuses to give postage stamps and will only issue a meter stamp, a team must obtain proof thereof and submit a copy to the Regional Administrator and the Executive Secretary. Failure to obtain and submit proof will result in a penalty assessment as per VI(A) 1.

8. Submission of Memorials. Each team shall mail 18 copies of its applicant memorial and 18 copies of its respondent memorial to the Regional Administrator for use by the judges. Each team must also mail one copy of both memorials to the Executive Secretary and one copy of the appropriate memorial to each opponent team against whom they are paired in the Regional. Non-metered stamps must be used, and mailing must be by priority or first class and registered or certified. Deadline for these mailings: Midnight, February 10.

9. Revision of Memorials. No team may revise, substitute, add, delete, or in any other manner alter its memorials after the deadline for their submission. However, if a revision is made on a non-substantive part of the memorial (substantive part of the memorial is the argument section) or if pages are inadvertently left out in the collating process either in the substantive or non-substantive section of the memorial, for example, then a discretionary penalty may be imposed by the Regional Administrator in assessing the facts. Retyping the argument section to correct footnote numbers, typographical errors, or change footnote format (e.g. -- put them at the end rather than in the body) is subject to the revision penalty. Revising a memorial and taking the subsequent penalty may not be used as a method of avoiding a greater penalty assessment for another infraction. The greater penalty in such a case will be the one assessed. (e.g., a team with a 10 point length penalty may not revise the memorial to conform to the length requirements and take the lesser 5 point revision penalty).

10. Statement of Facts. The Statement of Facts, if included in the memorial, shall be limited to the stipulated facts and necessary inferences. The facts should not include unsupported facts, distortions of stated facts or legal conclusions.

E. Exhibits. The use of exhibits, other than documents or hand-outs, is permitted. Teams requiring special equipment in connection with an exhibit to be used during an oral argument (such as blackboard, holders for charts, pointers, lights, etc.) shall so inform the Regional Administrator and their opponents no later than 10 days prior to the beginning of the Regional Round. Failure to comply may eliminate the possibility of having materials available. However, no written material shall be passed to the judge's before, during or after the argument.

F. Oral Communication. No oral or written communication may take place between counsel table and an oralist while the oralist is presenting his or her argument (this does not, however, preclude an oralist from taking a treaty or similar document from the counsel table when the oralist has been questioned about such document).

No oral or written communication may take place between counsel table and any spectator or team member not at the counsel table during a Round.

G. Awards. One award for the best memorial shall be given by the Regional Administrator to the team receiving the highest combined score from the memorial judging panel for its two memorials (after the imposition of any penalties). An award shall be given by the Regional Administrator to the best individual oralist. Awards will also be given by the Regional Administrator to the first place and runner up teams.

VI. PENALTIES

The following is an inclusive list of penalties which may be imposed on a team. It is extremely important that each team have a thorough understanding of the contents of this section. The issue of penalties arises when the Regional Administrator as a result of his or her own motion or as a result of a complaint must ascertain the facts of a situation in order to determine if an infraction has occurred. All complaints must be addressed to the Administrator and the team accused of a violation. The accused team shall be allowed to reply to the accusation. Upon receipt of complaint and reply, the Administrator shall make a prompt decision as to whether a penalty is warranted. Each team shall be notified of penalties assessed by the Regional Administrator as a result of his or her own motion so as to allow the penalized team a chance to reply.

Complaints pertaining to memorials must be submitted in writing to both the Regional Administrator and the allegedly violating team (see timetable for exact dates for complaints) prior to the commencement of the competitor orientation session. Complaints pertaining to oral arguments must be submitted prior to completion of the Regional Competition or Semi-Final Competition, whichever is appropriate. Penalty points will be assessed against the score given by each (as appropriate) oral judge in a Round or each of the memorial judges.

The power of the Administrator to assess penalties is divided into two categories: nondiscretionary and discretionary.

A. Nondiscretionary Penalties. For the following, the Administrator acting on his or her own motion or as a result of complaint, will determine the facts of the situation as they apply to the alleged infraction. If he or she determines that the facts constitute a violation then the penalty will be assessed mechanically with the Administrator having no discretion in the matter. This means that there can be no ameliorative attempts, equitable remedies, or waiver of the rules by the Administrator nor by the competitors except as per (VI) C.

1. MEMORIAL RULES.
Violation

PENALTY

a. Tardiness in submitting any memorial either to the Executive Secretary, Regional Administrator, or the opposing teams (for memorials postmarked between February 12 and February 13 inclusive)

5 points

b. Extreme tardiness in submitting any memorial (for memorials postmarked between February 14, February 15 and February 16 inclusive)

an additional
one point per day

c. Unacceptable tardiness in submitting any memorial (for memorials postmarked after February 16)

Elimination from
Competition or a score
of 60 if remaining in
competition would not be
prejudicial to the
Competition.

d. Use of metered stamps

1 point

e. Failure to send memorials registered or certified (penalty suspended if memorials arrive within 5 working days of proper mailing date)

1 point

f. Excessive memorial length

2 points per page
over 25 pages.

g. Form violations (see section V(D) (5))

2 points per
category of viola-
tion.

h. Revision after submission date
(See section V(D) (9))

5 points

2. ORAL ARGUMENT RULES
Violation

PENALTY

a. Communication between counsel table and any person (other than judges) during the argument

3 points

b. Submission of any additional written materials to oral judges, whether prior to, during, or after argument

3 points

c. Scouting

Loss of the indi-
vidual round. (Scouted
team to receive all 6
oral points for the
round but only those
memorial points it would
have received had the
round been counted).

B. Discretionary Penalties. The Administrator may assess up to 5 points (oral or memorial, depending upon time of infraction) for each action by a team which substantially prejudices the conduct of the Competition. Penalties of up to 5 points may also be assessed by the Administrator for:

1. Persistent violations of citation form which result in the inability to find the material cited.
2. De-minimus violation as to revision of memorials.
3. Argumentative footnotes used to bypass length restrictions.
4. A statement of facts which materially distorts the applicable fact pattern (as described in V(D)(10)).

C. De-Minimus Rule. When the impact of an alleged violation is so insignificant as to be de-minimus the Executive Secretary may waive any assessed penalty.

When circumstances arise which are not the fault of the participants and which preclude any reasonable means of avoiding a violation of the rules, the Executive Secretary shall evaluate the facts and may determine that a penalty shall not be assessed. (This is to account for things like blizzards which close down a school just prior to the due date of memorials, etc.) However, this power is not to be used to bypass the stringent guidelines established by these official rules.

D. Appeals. All penalties assessed by the Regional Administrator may be appealed to the Executive Secretary. As all complaints and penalty assessments as to memorials (except for late revisions or cases of fraudulent concealment) must be made prior to the beginning of oral arguments, appeals relating to memorials must be made by March 4. Appeals relating to oral arguments and all non-discretionary penalty assessments must be made prior to the conclusions of the Competitive Round. In no case may a complaint be placed with the Executive Secretary except by appeal from the decision of the Regional Administrator. All complaints arising from a semi-final round in Washington, D.C. shall be registered with the Executive Secretary, whose decision shall be final.

With regard to non-discretionary penalty assessments, a strong presumption of correctness as to the finding of fact shall lie in the decision of the Regional Administrator. Clear and convincing evidence must be shown in order to rebut such presumption on appeal. No such presumption shall exist with regard to a discretionary penalty assessment by the Regional Administrator.

VII. SCORING

In determining the winner of each individual Round, penalties must be accounted for. A penalty assessed against a memorial is subtracted from each judge's score before determining which team is awarded the memorial point (for example, if the applicant memorial

of Team X is assessed 2 points, each of the applicant scores given by the memorial judges to Team X will be reduced by 2 before comparing it to opponent Team Y's memorial). A penalty assessed against oral argument will be subtracted from the total speaker's points for the Round given by each judge before determining the winner selected by each judge. A score sheet and scoring instructions shall be given to each memorial and oral judge.

A. Winner of a Round. There are 9 possible judges' points for each Round. Points are awarded as follows:

Memorial Points - 3 Total

One point is given for each time that a team's memorial is scored higher than its opponents memorial by a memorial judge.

Oral Points - 6 Total

Two points are given for each oral judge that scores a team higher than its opponent in oral argument.

In extraordinary circumstances and with the special permission of the Executive Secretary two-member judging panels may be used for memorials or oral arguments. For memorials, a hypothetical third judge's score will be created by awarding the memorial the average of the other two scores (e.g., Judge A gives the respondent memorial a score of 81 and Judge B gives it a score of 85. The hypothetical score for Judge C is 83: 81 plus 85 divided by 2).

Where a two-judge panel is used for oral argument a hypothetical third score is not created. Three points are given each time one of the judges scores a team higher than its opponents.

B. Winner of a Competition. The winner of a Regional Competition or the National or International Semi-Final Competition shall be the team with the best win/loss record from the four Rounds of that Competition. If two or more teams have the same win/loss record, their ranking in the Competition shall be determined by comparing their totals of judges points. The team with the greater total out of 36 shall be ranked higher. (There are 36 possible points for each Competition: 9 points per Round times 4 Rounds.)

If two teams remain tied in a Regional Competition after comparing judge's points, a runoff Round will take place. The winner of the runoff will advance to the Semi-Finals. (A runoff is necessary only if the tie is for the first place team.)

If more than two teams remain tied for other than first place at a Regional Competition after comparing judge's points, their ranking shall be determined by comparing their total raw scores for the memorials (1200 possible points) and oral arguments (2400 possible points). Total raw scores are used only when there is a tie in judge's points.

If two or more teams remain tied in the Semi-Final Competition after comparing judge's points, the raw scores for the memorials and oral arguments shall be compared. The team with the greater total shall be ranked higher.

C. Final Round. The Final Round of the Jessup shall be an argument between the winners of the National and International Divisions of the Semi-Final Competition. There shall be a panel of three judges, each judge having one vote. After considering both the memorials and oral arguments, each judge shall cast his vote for the team which he considers to be the winner. The team receiving the most votes wins the Final Round and becomes the Jessup Champion.

D. Best Memorial Winner. The winner of the Best Memorial Award in the Regional Competition shall be based on the cumulative total of 100-point based scores of the three memorial judges. The highest possible score is 600 (300 for applicant plus 300 for respondent). The team with the greatest number of points is the winner. However, penalty points are deducted from each appropriate memorial score before computing a team's total point (i.e., if Team A's applicant memorial only is assessed a 2-point penalty, each applicant scored is reduced by 2 before computing the final total).

E. Best Oralist. The winner of the Best Oralist Award shall be that person with the highest average individual oral score, computed as follows: For each oralist, total all individual oral scores received and divided by the number of oral judges scoring that oralist. An oralist must argue at least 2 Rounds to be considered for an Oralist Award.

F. Notification of Scores. Upon completion of a Regional and prior the Semi-Final Competitions, the Regional Administrator shall as soon as possible submit to each of the participating teams the aggregate total points respectively assessed by the oral and memorial judges for each argument which took place during the Regional.

VIII. OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

Outside assistance rendered to a team in the preparation of its case, including that from faculty members, shall be limited to a general discussion of issues, suggestions as to research sources, and decision-making in intramural eliminations. Those who have rendered outside assistance and who are later requested to act as judges in practice rounds shall be requested to limit their questioning as judges only to those areas of the law which have been previously discussed. Outside assistance rendered by fellow students at a law school before or after the individual law school's selection process producing the representing team, is prohibited except that a student may judge practice rounds using the same parameters as described for faculty members who serve as practice Round judges (e.g., no critique on substantive issues, questions limited to previously raised issues, etc.). After the basic research is completed, critiques going to the substantive issues are prohibited. Those requested to act as judges must be informed of these rules. The purpose of these rules are to develop an unassisted appreciation and understanding of international law through individual and team effort.

The Administrator of the local Jessup program shall take steps to ensure that the memorials reflect the research of no more than 5 students. This can be done in a number of ways, such as having

intramural competitions based on a problem other than the 1980 Jessup problem and thereafter limiting research to the 5 selected students; and ensuring that all potential participants are aware that general discussion and general research suggestions alone are permissible within the framework of the Competition. No particular steps are mandatory, so long as effective steps are taken.

IX. PROMULGATION OF ADDITIONAL RULES

Either the Executive Secretary or a Regional Administrator, with the Executive Secretary's approval, may interpret the Official Rules, and may promulgate, prior to the conclusion of a Regional such other measures as may be deemed advisable for the orderly conduct of the Competition, provided that these measures do not conflict with any of the Official Rules.

X. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE COMPETITION

Any team withdrawing later than January 9, 1981, after notification of its intent to participate has been accepted by the Executive Secretary, shall forfeit its entrance fee. If notification comes before January 9, 1981, the Association will refund the application fee minus \$50. Failure to timely notify the Executive Secretary of intended withdrawal shall subject that team's school to probationary review at the Annual Meeting of the ASILS.

IX. SEMI-FINAL AND FINAL ROUNDS

The Regional Winners shall meet and participate in the Semi-Final Competition, which shall be held concurrently with the International Division Round of the Competition. The winner of the National Semi-Final Competition and the winner of the International Division Semi-Finals shall meet and participate in the Final Round, the winner of which shall be deemed the winner of the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition. The Official Rules, except for the appropriate dates which are included in the Official Timetable, shall apply to the Semi-Final Competition.

XII. ANNUAL REPORT

After the Final Round, the Executive Secretary shall send a report to all teams that participated in the Competition. This report shall, at a minimum, indicate the winners, the best memorials, and best oralists in the Regional Rounds; the winner, best memorial and oralist awards in both Semi-Final divisions; and the winner of the Final Round.

ANNEX A. [SAMPLE] TABLE OF CONTENTS
(For Memorial)

	Page
Index of Authorities.	ii
Jurisdiction.	1
Statement of Facts.	2
Questions Presented.	3
Summary of Argument.	4
Argument and Authorities.	
I. According to the 1923 Treaty, Karma is entitled to operate its nuclear power plant	5
II. According to customary treaty law and general principles of international law, Karma is not bound by the 1923 Treaty	9
III. According to general principles of international law, Karma is entitled to operate its nuclear power plant	10
IV. New Helios is not entitled to interim measures, permanent relief or reparations	17
A. Interim Relief	21
B. Permanent Relief	23
Conclusion	24
Appendix	25

ANNEX B. [SAMPLE] INDEX OF AUTHORITIES
(For Memorial)

Page

TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Treaty on Commerce and Navigation, Dec.3, 1938,
United States - Iraq, art. III. para 2. 56 Stat.
1790. T.S. No. 960. 7

CASES

Advisory Opinion on Certain Expenses of The
United Nations, [1962] I.C.J. 151. 9

TREATISES, DIGESTS, RESTATEMENTS

R. LILLICH, THE PROTECTION OF FOREIGN
INVESTMENT: SIX PROCEDURAL STUDIES ch. V (1965). 15

JOURNALS

Carey, Self-Determination in the Post-
Colonial Era: The Case of Quebec, 1 ASILS Int'l
L. J. 47 (1977). 21

STATUTES

International Claims Settlement Act of 1949,
as amended, 22 U.S.C. §1641. (1970). 4

Law of Jan 15, 1957 [1957] Bundesgesetzblatt
[BGB] I 343 (W. Ger.). 8

NOTE: This form is only an example, and may be altered as
teams see fit. Citation must, however, conform to
A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION, Harvard (12th ed. 1976).

PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

ORAL SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

(Please Review Prior to Oral Arguments)

Each team is given 45 minutes to argue, of which no more than 10 minutes may be reserved for rebuttal or surrebuttal. No single oralist shall argue longer than 25 minutes. Extension of team time beyond 45 minutes, which in no case shall exceed 10 minutes beyond the total time allocated for presentation, shall be within the discretion of the judges. Strict anonymity of school identities shall be ensured as far as possible. Teams shall be identified throughout the rounds only by number, not by names of schools.

During the argument, each oral judge should tentatively score each oralist at the conclusion of his or her presentation. Following the argument, the judges shall retire to deliberate. They shall then individually mark their scoring summaries without comparisons with the scoring summaries of their fellow judges.

Team scores shall be the total of the two individual oralist scores. The team with the greater total wins that Judge's ballot.

Please evaluate each speaker independently rather than in comparison to the other speakers in the round (or other rounds you may have judged). Each judge should start at an average score (65-75) and move up or down from there. A general guideline is: Excellent (85-100); good (75-85); average (65-75); poor (60-65).

Factors to be considered in assessing points without regard to order of importance, include, but are not limited to:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) Correct and articulate | 6) Ingenuity |
| 2) analysis of the issues | 7) Organization |
| 2) Familiarity with international authorities | 8) Persuasiveness |
| 3) Response to questions | 9) Ability to argue by analogy from related aspects of international law. |
| 4) General knowledge of the substance and process of international law | 10) Knowledge of the facts |
| 5) Clarity | 11) Knowledge of legal principles directly applicable to the facts. |

Judges should be familiar with the Problem, the law, and the teams' memorials before judging. The judges Bench Memo outlines most of the issues in the case and should be read carefully. However, the Bench Memo is not the only solution to the problem and should not be regarded as such.

Finally, a team has no choice as to which side of the dispute it must argue in a given Round. Scoring should not reflect the merits of the case but only the advocacy skills and legal analysis of the participants.

ANNEX D

PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Division:

Location:

Date:

ORAL SCORING SUMMARY

<u>Applicant:</u> Team No. _____	Score	
First Oralist (Name) _____	_____	
Second Oralist _____	_____	
TOTAL TEAM SCORE		_____

<u>Respondent:</u> Team No. _____		
First Oralist _____	_____	
Second Oralist _____	_____	
TOTAL TEAM SCORE		_____

I deem Team No. _____ the winner with total team score of _____
and Team No. _____ the loser with total team score of _____

Signature _____

ANNEX E

PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Memorials shall be scored individually by each Memorial Judge independently of his colleagues, by assigning a grade between 60 and 100. Excellent is 85-100; good is 75-85; average is 65-75; and poor is 60-65. To avoid a tie between memorial scores, all scores for applicants shall be even numbered, and all scores for respondents shall be odd numbered. These scoring requirements shall not be construed to discourage a comparison of applicant's memorial with respondent's memorial. The scoring factors to be considered (without regard to their order of importance), include, but are not limited to:

1. Knowledge of the facts and the legal principles directly applicable to the facts
2. Proper and articulate analysis of the issues involved
3. Use of authorities and extent of research
4. Logic and reasoning
5. Ingenuity (ability to argue by analogy from related aspects of international law)
6. Clarity and organization
7. Persuasiveness
8. Correctness of format and citations
9. Thoroughness
10. Grammar, style

Judges should be familiar with the Problem before reading the memorials. The judges' Bench Memo outlines most of the issues in the case and should be read carefully. However, the Bench Memo does not represent an airtight resolution of the case and a sound presentation of creative ideas should be viewed favorably.

The substantive merits of the case shall not be considered in judging the memorials.

Scores shall be tendered to the Regional Administrator prior to the first oral argument of the Regional.

Memorials are to be judged on the type of criteria enumerated above, and not upon their appearance. Memorials are not to be penalized for being of less pleasing physical appearance unless this results from the infraction of a specific rule of the contest (i.e., form), or from a general carelessness of preparation.

ANNEX F

PHILIP C. JESSUP INTERNATIONAL LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Division:

Location:

Date:

MEMORIAL SCORING
SUMMARY

Team	Applicant Memorial (Even-numbered Score)	Respondent Memorial (Odd-numbered Score)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		

Signature of
Memorial Judge _____

JUDGE EVALUATION
(Confidential)

The Jessup is interested in improving the quality of the Competition wherever it can. To that end you are asked to complete this evaluation so that we may try to use only the best judges available. The information received will be kept confidential.

JUDGE'S NAME _____
DATE AND ROUND _____

I AM: COMPETITOR _____
BAILIFF ' _____

1. The judge was well prepared.
2. The judge played an active role in the proceedings.
3. The judge asked clear, understandable questions which were directed to relevant issues.
4. The judge afforded me an opportunity to explain my position.
5. The judge did not display hostility or bias toward any competitor.
6. The judge did not monopolize the proceedings.
7. The judge should be invited back next year.

strongly agree	
agree	
disagree	
strongly disagree	
no opinion	

COMMENTS

