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is the type magisterial or imperative; the type laconic or sententious; the type conversational or homely; the type refined or artificial, smelling of the lamp, verging at times upon preciosity or euphuism; the type demonstrative or persuasive; and finally the type tonsorial or agglutinative, so called from the shears and the pastepot which are its implements and emblem."

In his previous works Chief Judge Cardozo has drawn very largely upon his learning; in this he gives us of his wisdom. Each of the essays has been published elsewhere or has been delivered as an address. The titles suggest the subject matter, and necessitate little comment. *A Ministry of Justice* is a marshaling of the possible functions which such an agency could fulfill. *What Medicine Can Do for the Law* was addressed originally to an academy of medicine, and points out some of the contributions we can ask from that science, especially with respect to criminal law and the defense of insanity. *The Home of the Law* was a dedicatory address for a new home of the New York County Lawyers' Association. The other titles, *The American Law Institute, The Game of the Law, The Comradeship of the Bar*, are self-explanatory.

One sentence from the book will bear repetition here. It is a courageous admission from a notably courageous judge. In discussing the writing of opinions Chief Judge Cardozo says: "I often say that one must permit oneself, and that quite advisedly and deliberately, a certain margin of misstatement." How many judges would like to make that admission to the host of disappointed advocates who have had private thoughts, doubtless not too often complimentary, as to the width of that margin?

Daniel James.

Harvard Law School.

The review for 1930, prepared by Alfred Z. Reed for the Carnegie Foundation is of particular interest to the profession in Indiana by reason of the movement to advance standards for admission to the bar in this state. The present publication is full of valuable facts for those who are interested in the local problem. It records changes made during the past year in bar admission requirements, and outstanding developments among the law schools. Comparative tables show the present requirements for admission to the bars of each of the sixty states and Canadian provinces, and changes in the number of law schools of different types, and of their students during the last forty years. The individual schools are listed, with their tuition fees, student attendance, and the time required to complete the course, in parallel columns, distinguishing from the 82 full-time law schools of the United States and the 5 full-time law schools of Canada, the 98 part-time or "mixed" schools of this country that offer instruction at hours convenient for self-supporting students, and the 5 Canadian schools in which the students serve a concurrent clerkship in a law office.

The groupings of the various states, according to standards for admission are not flattering to Indiana. To quote from the report: "... it will be found that fifteen states are more advanced than the rest, in that at least they require all applicants to have secured a specified amount of
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general education, however small, and, following this, to study law during some definitely prescribed period, long or short. These fifteen states are the following:

"Bar Admission Systems of a Technically Advanced Type

Colorado Kansas Minnesota Ohio South Carolina
Connecticut Maryland New Jersey Pennsylvania Tennessee
Illinois Michigan New York Rhode Island Washington State

"Nineteen jurisdictions resemble the above group in demanding both a specific amount of general education and a definite period of law study, before the bar examination. They do not insist, however, in all cases, that the general education be secured before the period of law study begins. This technical defect in the rule encourages the diversion of time that is really needed for legal study to concurrent "cram work" that is a most inadequate substitute for a sound preliminary education. The states included in this intermediate group are the following:

"Bar Admission Systems of a Technically Intermediate Type

Delaware Kentucky Montana Oregon West Virginia
Dist. of Col. Louisiana Nebraska South Dakota Wisconsin
Idaho Maine New Mexico Texas Wyoming
Iowa Massachusetts Oklahoma Vermont

"Finally, the remaining fifteen states have systems of still more primitive type, in that reliance is placed solely upon the bar examination to test either general education, or legal attainments, or both. This failure to winnow out the applicants before they come up for examination now only adds needlessly to the bar examiners’ labors, but exaggerates the possible efficacy of any unsupported examination. The states that are in this most backward group of all are the following:

"Bar Admission Systems of a Technically Primative Type

Alabama California Indiana Nevada North Dakota
Arizona Florida Mississippi New Hampshire Utah
Arkansas Georgia Missouri North Carolina Virginia
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