4-1-1972

Advocate, Spring 1972, Vol. 8, No. 2

Office of Communications and Public Relations

GEORGIA ADVOCATE

University of Georgia
School of Law
Spring 1972

GEORGIA ADVOCATE

SPRING 1972 **VOL. 8, NO. 2**

Table of Contents

Published three times during the year in the fall, spring and summer by the students of Georgia Law School. All communications should be sent to Georgia Advocate, University of Georgia School of Law, Athens, Georgia 30601.

It is with no small degree of regret that this is to be the last issue of the *Georgia Advocate* published during the tenure of Lindsey Cowen as Dean of the Georgia Law School. In the eight years since his arrival in Athens, Dean Cowen has been instrumental in moving the Law School to the forefront of American legal education. We of the *Advocate* would like to take this opportunity to thank him not only for his contribution to the Law School but for his interest in our publication and to wish him continued success at Case-Western Reserve.

Report of the Dean

As I spend my final days as Dean of the University of Georgia School of Law, a great many thoughts concerning the School race through my mind. Some of them relate to the past, but most of them look toward the future.

I have considerable pride in what has taken place during my eight years as Dean of the School of Law, but I am fully aware that what has been accomplished has been accomplished only because of the wholehearted cooperation of the alumni, faculty, students and friends of the School. Still, it is very satisfying to run through a list of the many things which have happened since 1964.

On the other hand, it is disconcerting in the extreme to consider those things which have not yet been done and which need to be done. Some of these were recognized as goals in 1964; others have developed since then, sometimes as a result of successes in related areas, sometimes because of developments external to the School.

In this last formal report to the alumni and friends of the School, I wish to address myself not to the successes of the past but instead to the problems which a new adminstration will face—in the hope and expectation that the School's alumni and friends will accept the challenge and move promptly to support the new dean, the faculty and student body in solving them.

Our problems fall into four general areas—those of the student body, the faculty, the law library and space generally. In the main they are interrelated as might be expected.

That there is a problem concerning the student body may come as something of a surprise. Recent successes on the bar examination with virtually all graduates passing on their first attempt and the high level of qualification of our entering classes are satisfying in the extreme; but our increasing popularity caused both by educational "results" and by the general increase in interest in legal education, causes us very real problems. With approximately 1,800 applications for admission for September 1972, and only 240 seats to be filled, the question of who is to be educated in the law is of the utmost importance and also of the utmost difficulty. Should the University of Georgia School of Law be expanded? Should there be another state supported institution? Should nonresident students be wholly excluded? There are no easy answers.

As for the law faculty, as it is presently constituted, it is a source of great pride to me. Beginning at the top with the holders of our endowed chairs, Dr. Verner F. Chaffin and Professor Dean Rusk, and moving on to the most recently appointed assistant professor, they have a level of prior achievement and potential which is the envy of other faculties throughout the country. But there are not enough members of the faculty, and on the whole they are nót paid salaries which are competitive with those paid by the better institutions around the country. Not too many years ago the faculty-student ratio in the Law School was one to thirteen. Next year it will be one to thirty. Under such circumstances the quality of education must decline; it follows that the State must provide additional faculty positions to permit the continuance of the high level of instruction previously achieved. As for our salary scale, a temporary, comparative deficiency can be absorbed without too much institutional damage; but if it long continues, the best people will soon be attracted away. This problem, like the others, must have immediate attention.

Our law library is one of the best in the nation,

yet it is inadequately financed. Because of a deficiency in funds its development has been curtailed during this past year, and this must necessarily continue next year if the estimated acquisitions deficiency of approximately $70,000.00 is in fact realized. If the law library is to maintain its relative rank nationally, and, more importantly, if it is to continue to be the research asset which it has been and which we all want it to be, then additional funds must be forthcoming promptly.

Finally, space! Five years ago we dedicated a new building. This and the remodeled old building provided us with seven times the space which had previously been available and was planned to be adequate until the year 2000. These marvelous buildings are already filled to overflowing; even now we are pressed to find adequate classroom space for the classes we have. The library reading room is way overcrowded at peak periods. There are no more offices for additional faculty members, if and when we are able to obtain them. And within two years, even with a modified acquisitions budget, if additional stack space for shelving books is not provided, we will be compelled to begin repacking for storage books only recently purchased. Planning for substantial additional space in existing University buildings near the Law School, or more appropriately, an addition adjacent to the present building is a "must" if the School's activities are not to be seriously curtailed.

The new dean will become chief administrator of a School which is operating on a relatively high educational level; but as indicated, much remains to be done. The challenges and opportunities are here. The goal of true excellence in legal education is clearly achievable.

Lindsey Cowen
Dean

Do We Need "No-Fault"?

For the past year or so the public's problems with automobile insurance have been the subject of considerable comment around the country with the proponents and opponents of "no-fault" insurance presenting their cases forcefully to the people through magazine articles, newspaper reporters, editorials and advertisements, and to a lesser extent by commentaries on radio and television. To a casual observer, it might seem that all this developed "out-of-the-blue"; but the fact is that concern with our system of automobile accident reparations has been evidenced for almost as long as the automobile has been a part of our lives. Over the past forty years or so, various studies including those undertaken by researchers at Columbia University, the University of Michigan and Harvard University have concluded that the present reparations system based upon "fault" is inadequate for society's purposes, but recommendations for improvement have varied widely.

In 1969 the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, called for a definitive study of the problem. That resolution was based upon these four important findings:

> "...suffering and loss of life resulting from motor vehicle accidents and the consequent social and economic dislocations are critical national problems."
>
> "...there is growing evidence that the existing system of compensation is inequitable, inadequate and insufficient and is unresponsive to existing social, economic and technological conditions."
>
> "...there is needed a fundamental reevaluation of such system, including a review of the role and effectiveness of insurance and the existing law governing liability."
>
> "...meaningful analysis requires the collection and evaluation of data not presently available such as the actual economic impact of motor vehicle injuries, the relief available both from public and private sources, and the role and effectiveness of rehabilitation."

The Department of Transportation in accordance with this directive undertook the study which concluded in March 1971 with "A Report to the Congress and the President", in which it was said:

> "...the existing system ill serves the accident victim, the insuring public and society. It is inefficient, overly costly, incomplete and slow. It allocates benefits poorly, discourages rehabilitation and overburdens the courts and the legal system. Both on the record of its performance and on the logic of its operation, it does little if anything to minimize crash losses."

Then followed six recommendations, five of which were specific, the sixth equivocal. The five specific recommendations included:

1. Compulsory first party benefits;
2. Required medical benefits, including medical rehabilitation;
3. Income loss protection, providing for monthly benefits of a maximum of perhaps $1,000.00;
4. Loss service benefits, also up to a stated weekly maximum;
   and
5. Elimination of tort actions for damages based upon "fault", with certain exceptions designed to provide relief in extreme situations.

The sixth recommendation related to property damage. Unlike the others this recommendation was not specific, but instead it spoke in qualified terms: *"Ultimately*...covering damages to property including the insured vehicle *might* be required...."

In discussing "no-fault", opponents tend to react first to proposed solutions rather than to the problems which the Department of Transportation study has defined. My own judgment is that it is important to consider these matters separately—first the alleged evils of the present system, and then, if they are deemed to be real, the proposed solutions. Since there is no point in discussing a solution until a problem has been established, let me first address myself to the problems.

In April of this year a Special Committee on Automobile Insurance Plans of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York reported favorably on the "no-fault" principle. That report first undertook to outline the "short-comings of the present system". Its first point related to the extreme difficulties involved in the ascertainment of "fault". The report stated: "It is difficult to the point of being impossible in many if not most cases, to determine fault including the absence of contributory negligence." This proposition is based upon the fact, admitted by most, that in these days of high speeds and crowded highways, accidents occur in split seconds, and it is unrealistic to believe that persons involved as active participants or as mere witnesses have perfect recollections of what transpired. The fact is that in many instances these people do not know what happened other than that there was a collision; but they soon find out that unless they do accurately recall what transpired and unless they clearly recall that their own conduct was blameless or at least in Georgia, not as blameworthy as that of the other driver, they have lost their rights to recover in full or in part.

This critical point is made implicitly in the Department of Transportation's Study, quoted in part above, where it is stated in part: "...the existing system ill serves the accident victim, the insuring public and society".

With respect to the "accident victim", because of the "fault" principle of the present system, a substantial percentage of persons who are injured in automobile accidents receive no benefits at all. Another substantial percentage receive inadequate benefits because, among other things, to procure prompt payment they are willing to settle for less than that to which they might be able to show themselves entitled.

The present system "ill serves the insuring public" because, while estimates vary, there is general agreement that for every premium dollar returned to injured persons in benefits, another premium dollar is paid in cost of administration, including the commissions of insurance agents, the costs of investigations of accidents and the costs of trial including attorney's fees. In other words, for every dollar paid in premiums to an insurance company at least $ .50 is lost insofar as payments of future benefits is concerned.

"Society is ill served" because many of those who received no compensation or who receive inadequate compensation must be supported in one way or another by public programs such as social security and unemployment compensation.

The Study's findings continue:

"The present system discourages rehabilitation". It is obvious to all who think about it that if payment of loss is subject to negotiation and ultimately to trial, it is psychologically better for an injured person to *appear injured* during the period of negotiation and during the period of trial. This situation discourages any attempt on the part of an injured party to rehabilitate himself at the earliest opportunity and to resume his role as a productive member of society.

The problem of overburdening the courts may well not be a critical one in Georgia except perhaps in the Atlanta metropolitan area. But if the present system of automobile accident reparations is not otherwise an appropriate system, certainly it is an unnecessary addition to the work-load of the courts to compel them to adjudicate cases which ought not and need not be the subject of adversary proceedings.

With respect to the problem of minimizing crash losses, at present, liability insurance covers other persons' automobiles. No one knows in advance what type of automobile it will be—whether it will be damage prone or crash resistant. But, if each insurance company knew in advance, as it does with collision insurance, the specific automobile it was insuring, it could fix the insurance premium in accordance with the crash resistance of the automobile insured. This would put pressure on buyers to buy crash resistant vehicles and therefore upon automobile manufacturers to make such vehicles available to the public. Requiring each person to insure his own automobile and not someone else's would be a major step toward encouraging the production of crash resistant automobiles.

The report of the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance Plans of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York also stated: "...it is universily agreed that (the present system of compensating automobile accident victims) does not

work well." I suspect that this is an overstatement, but I for one am convinced that the present system does have serious defects. Indeed, some of the associations which have fought and are fighting "no-fault" are now advocating their own reforms of the present system. Many of these are highly desirable but most, in my judgment, do not provide all the reform needed.

Assuming, then, that the present system is so defective that substantial reform is required, is "no-fault" the answer? The Department of Transportation thinks so and the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, which has recently approved a national bill, thinks so. Legislators throughout the United States obviously think so as evidenced by the variety of "no-fault" bills and near "no-fault" bills which have either been adopted or which are currently being considered for adoption in the states.

The federal bill reported on favorably by the Senate's Committee on Commerce on May 26, 1972 basically provides minimum federal standards for state action and absolute federal requirements in the event that the States individually do not act by the "second July 1 following the first day of the first general legislative session following enactment of the national bill." The Committee's action was taken by a substantial majority, and it is reported that the bill's sponsors believe they have enough votes in the Senate to pass it there this legislative session. There is apparently, however, no hope of immediate favorable action in the House. This suggests then that the States have a minimum of three years in which to draft and enact plans which will meet federal standards. Fortunately, this provides the study time necessary if the state legislators are to draft appropriate legislation based upon the varying conditions in the individual states.

In the meantime, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws through a special committee to draft a Motor Vehicle Accident Reparations Act (UMVARA) is moving rapidly toward the final stages of a "no-fault" bill which as it presently stands does not meet in every detail the federal standards but which in basic concept is consistent with the federal bill.

The National Conference's Special Committee has been working on UMVARA for approximately a year and will go to the National Conference in August with a draft which the National Conference through its Committee of the Whole will refine and hopefully, as refined, will promulgate.

The bill as presently drafted does meet four of the specific recommendations of the Department of Transportation. It is first of all compulsory. Every person driving in a state which enacts this bill must be covered by "no-fault" insurance.

Second, it does provide for payment of all reasonable medical expenses including costs of rehabilitation without limitation as to dollar amount and time.

Third, it does provide for income loss protection with a weekly dollar limit but without limit as to time.

Fourth, the same general provision is made with respect to loss service benefits with appropriate limitations designed to minimize fraudulent claims.

Fifth, with respect to the elimination of actions for damages based upon fault, UMVARA does not go as far as the Department of Transportation would apparently like. Yet the exceptions to tort elimination may well be required politically if any extensive "no-fault" bill is to pass.

As for property damage, the Committee has determined that with respect to non-vehicular property, the regular fault system shall continue to apply. There is still, however, considerable discussion concerning the method of compensation for damage to motor vehicles and their contents.

The whole subject is complex, complicated and controversial. It is important to virtually every person. It merits serious study and thought.

Lindsey Cowen
Dean of the University of Georgia School of Law;

Georgia Commissioner, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws;

Chairman, Special NCCUSL Committee to draft a Uniform Motor Vehicle Accident Reparations Act (UMVARA)

THE BAR EXAMINATION— WHY?

by
Roy Barnes,
President, Student Bar Association, 1971-1972

In the 1971 regular session of the General Assembly two pieces of legislation were introduced which were of vital importance to law students. House Bill 1124 and House Bill 1126[1] failed to become law, but their ideas no doubt will continue and become the subject of future discussion.

House Bill 1124 would have relieved graduates of American Bar Association accredited law schools in Georgia from the burden of standing the Georgia Bar Examination. Much has been spoken, argued and written about this proposal, but it is my belief that it is sound.

The most telling argument against the bar examination is that if the law schools are doing their job there is no need for the bar examination. It is my contention that the law schools are doing their job. I only have access to the figures of the passage rate of the University of Georgia graduates on past bar examination, but I believe these figures show that a bar examination is largely a formality costing precious time and money. The percentages of persons passing the bar examination the first time from the University of Georgia for the past three years are as follows[2]:

1970 - 92.25%
1971-- 96.6%
1972 - 97% (February only)

I believe that this shows that the law schools (using the University of Georgia as an example of the accredited law schools) are providing an effective legal education.

The next point of inquiry is whether we can be sure that the law schools will continue to provide a quality legal education after a diploma privilege bill is instituted? The law schools to remain accredited must meet the requirements of the American Bar Association, and if their standards become too lax then the accreditation of the ABA would be endangered. The should be a sufficient incentive to keep the standards high in the accredited law schools in Georgia.

The necessity of a bar examination is also lessened when we consider the quality of students who enter law school today. An extensive screening process selects those superior students for seats in the first year classes. At the University of Georgia, for example, 1725 applications were received for 240 seats in the 1973 first year class. As Dean Gordon D. Schaber recently summarized at a meeting of the National Conference of Bar Examiners:

> "As a theoretical device it is hard, if not impossible, to argue against (the diploma privilege). If only qualified individuals are to enter the profession and if the function of law schools is to prepare men and women to become qualified members of the profession, it seems, to be a very logical conclusion that the function of determining who is and who is not qualified should be given to the law schools, and that those who are certified by the law schools as qualified by virtue of their graduation diploma are entitled to enter the profession".[3]

Dean Schaber was not the only voice at the National Conference who expressed doubts on the necessity of a Bar Examination. Bayley Lang, Chairman of the California Committee of Bar Examiners observed the following:

> "For one who has lived for a considerable part of his life connected with the bar examination it's a little shocking to think that maybe all of this apparatus is unnecessary; but after thinking of it a while, I am not at all sure the world would collapse if we didn't have bar examinations".[4]

A last ditch argument of some educators is that educators should not be saddled with the responsibility of determining who practices law. This to me is a facetious argument. Professors decide everyday who will and will not practice law. A failing grade on a final exam is just as effective as a rejection by the Board of Bar Examiners. Surely the fear of responsibility should not be a deterrent to change.

One final argument should be made for a diploma privilege for graduates of accredited law schools in Georgia. The time between the date of examination and the date grading is complete can be a matter of weeks and sometimes months. I must commend the present Board of Bar Examiners for a concerted

effort to shorten the grading period, but the sheer physical efforts required to grade hundreds of examination papers consume too much time especially for active practitioners. Consider, however, the plight of a graduate who completes his legal education in March or August. He must wait 4 months to stand the bar examination and another 2 months for the results. Few people can afford such a wait, especially if they have families who are dependent upon them. House Bill 1126 would have allowed law students to stand the bar examination during the last two quarters of their legal education. This piece of legislation, however, also failed to become law.

In summary, it is my firm belief that after 7 years of education an accredited law school graduate in Georgia should not have to expend more time and money for a costly wait in order to practice law. During the last session of the General Assembly there was general agreement that the bar examination needed change, but the course of change was far from clear. Now that the assaults on the examination have subsided the cries for reform have also died. Unfortunately that will probably be the situation until the assault begins anew.

---

[1]House Bill 1124 failed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 86-82. House Bill 1124 passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 163-1 but never came to a vote in the Senate.

[2]The following information was obtained from Dean Lindsey Cowen.

[3]Symposium, *A Bar Examination - Why?* 40 *Bar Examiner* 46,49(1970).

[4]*Id.*, 55.

As the two preceding articles deal with controversial questions of some concern to Law School alumni, the Advocate *would welcome any contribution which takes issue with the positions taken by Dean Cowen and Mr. Barnes.*

Mock Law Office Comes to UGA

The Mock Law Office Competition, a new form of competition designed to provide a supplement to the standard moot court program, was introduced to the Law School during Winter Quarter 1972. This competition derives its importance from the fact that the typical lawyer spends many more hours of his professional career counseling clients in his office than arguing before appellate tribunals. Yet at most law schools, students participate extensively in moot court competitions, but receive little training in office counseling skills.

The Mock Law Office Competition is designed to teach these essential lawyering skills in a setting which combines the rigor of a realistic law office interview with the competition and challenge of a contest. It was created in the late 1960's by Louis M. Brown, who is both a law teacher at the University of Southern California and a practicing lawyer in Los Angeles, and is supported by The Emil Brown Fund of Los Angeles. The heart of the competition is an interview of a "client" by students assuming the roles of lawyers in a simulated law office practice situation.

The mechanics of the competition are that each team of two students receives a short memorandum of an anticipated client visit about a week before the interview; they prepare a pre-interview memorandum or checklist during that week; on the day of the competition, the actual client interview lasting 45 minutes takes place. This is followed by the dictation of a post-interview memorandum. The interview and the post-interview memorandum dictation take place before judges and an audience.

As is appropriate, the judges were experienced office lawyers as opposed to the appellate judges who ordinarily preside at moot court competition. At the University of Georgia competition, these judges included Henry L. Bowden, Daniel Hodgson and Daniel O'Connor of Atlanta, Kirby Turnage and Foy Horne of Athens, as well as Professors Rusk, Beaird, Leavell, Saunders, Robson and Covington of the Law Faculty. The Faculty Advisor to the competition was Professor Shepard.

The most interesting part of each competition was the judges' critique which followed the announcement of the winners. This was the opportunity for professionals to comment upon and discuss with the competitors the strengths and mistakes of the interviews. These comments related to the substance of the advice given, but more importantly to the techniques of dealing with clients in an interview situation. For example, suggestions on how to deal with employees of institutional clients were offered by some of the practicing lawyers, and suggestions as to how to conduct interviews in relaxed conversational form were offered by Professor Rusk based upon his experience as a client.

It was significant that the winners were not necessarily those students who were best able to lecture their clients as to the black letter law, but those students who were best able to deal most effectively with the actual problems raised by their clients. Each interview situation contained a "surprise" sprung by the client during the course of the interview and competitors were judged in part on their effectiveness in shaping their interviews to deal with this unexpected development. The legal areas covered included commercial, securities and tax law.

The winners of the competition were Donald Wetherington and Kevin King. It is expected that the Mock Law Office Competition will continue in future years, with intramural, intrastate and national competitions to be held.

Moot Court Completes Successful Year...

1971-72 was a most successful and rewarding year for the Moot Court program at the Law School. Three of the interscholastic teams registered outstanding performances in their respective competitions, and they deserve great credit for the awards which they garnered for the Law School.

In February the Southern Intercollegiate team journeyed to Chapel Hill, North Carolina, for competition with Duke, North Carolina, and Tulane. Pitted against the best from these schools, Georgia's team captured the award for Best Brief as well as the overall competition. The team was comprised of John Allgood, Jason Archambeau, Jim Warnes, Harold Horne, Jim Patrick, and Bill Solomon. Allgood, Archambeau and Warnes were the Team's oralists.

Birmingham's Cumberland School of Law was the setting in March for the annual regional contest in the nationwide Jessup International Moot Court Competition. Although the team from the University of Miami copped the overall honors, Georgia's team of Bill Poole, Allan Shackelford, Sarajane Love, Brooks Franklin, and David Pettis was able to return to Athens with the second of three Best Brief Awards for the year. Poole and Shackelford were Georgia's oralists in Birmingham.

The final interscholastic competition of the year took place in late April at the Law School. In the annual Intrastate Moot Court Competition sponsored by the State Bar of Georgia, the Law School's team faced archrivals Emory and Mercer. Although Mercer's team received the overall award for the best team, Georgia completed its sweep of Best Brief awards for the year, and Bill McDaniel was designated the Best Oralist in the competition. In addition to McDaniel, Robert Fortson, John Griffin, and Bill Kitchens contributed their efforts as oralists. Mike Garrett and John Woodall were the remaining members of the six man team.

Two further competitions which were conducted on an intramural basis culminated the Moot Court's program for the academic year. First, there was the Third Annual Richard B. Russell Moot Court Competition which is open only to members of the Law School's first-year class. This year's finalists were Pat Cain and Jackie Hinton with Miss Cain taking the final honors. Secondly, the annual Law Day Competition was held with second-year students in the Appellate Practice program as participants. With a bench comprised of Federal District and Circuit Court Judges, the finals matched the team of John Allgood and Jim Warnes, oralists in the Southern Competition, against Harold Horne and Bill Poole, members of the Southern Intercollegiate and International teams, respectively. The final victory went to the team of Horne and Poole with John Allgood receiving recognition as the Best Oralist in the Competition.

1972-73

The Moot Court Board for the coming year will be chaired by William McDaniel, a rising third-year student from Sarasota, Florida. Assisting him with the administration of the Law School's Moot Court program will be Jason Archambeau, Sarajane Love, Brooks Franklin, and John Griffin. Also, it should be noted that next year's National Moot Court team will be comprised of four of the School's most outstanding oralists. They are McDaniel, Robert Fortson, John Allgood, and Pat Cain.

LAW DAY '72

Justice Tom Clark with Bill Anderson '72 at Annual Law Day Cocktail Party.

Judge Lawrence conversing with Howell Hollis.

Around the School

International Law

An Atlanta banker, speaking at the Law School, remarked earlier this year that the increasing number of international transactions between Georgia firms and foreign businesses would inevitably lead to Georgia law firms with international law expertise. To illustrate his point, he took note of the World Trade Center to be built in Atlanta, the increasing volume of exports by Georgia businesses and the interest in acquiring products from foreign countries. But for many Georgia firms in and out of Atlanta, the term "international law" still has no daily relevance. Like tax courses a few years ago, this field is really not considered bread and butter. The trend, indicates otherwise, and a number of programs, extracurricular and academic, are being offered at the University of Georgia Law School, so that international lawyers' services will not have to be "imported" commodities.

The *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law* has just completed its second year of publication. Two supplements and one regular issue will have been published by July. These include the Joint Meeting of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the American Society of International Law, held in London in June of 1971. Along with articles on public international law, a series of articles dealing with comparative tax and business laws are planned for publication next year in the *Journal.* Georgia businessmen are incorporating businesses outside of the United States for the tax advantages these corporations can offer. In line with this trend the *Journal* plans to offer information to practicioners on some of these possibilities.

The *Georgia Journal's* managing board for 1972-73 will be composed of ten editors. Second year students will be invited to try out during the summer and fall quarters for editorial board positions. Those selected as editors are William M. Poole, Editor in Chief; John F. Allgod, Executive Editor; C. Donald Johnson, Jr., David W. Pettis, Jr. and John Philip Rivers, Articles Editors. Notes Editors are B. H. Levy, Jr. and William A. Pierce while George W. Cone has been named Decision and Comments Editor. Associate Editors for the next year will be Steven E. Fanning and W. Dennis Summers.

In addition to the *Journal,* the Georgia Society of International Law has been sponsoring a series of programs during the year. A panel discussion on International Business in Georgia was sponsored during the Fall quarter. During the Winter quarter Nolan Harmon, an Atlanta attorney and delegate to the World Peace Through Law organization, addressed the Society. Student representatives have also been sent to regional meetings of the American Society of International Law. Among these were the conferences held on Latin American Trade in Miami; international corporations held in Boston; and environmental law developments held in New Orleans. The Society was also represented at the Annual Convention of the American Society of International Law in Washington, D.C., by William Poole, Don Johnson and John Allgood. Allgood was a reporter for the panel discussion "A New International Monetary Policy and World Public Order" which will be published in the Proceedings Issue of the American Journal of International Law. Those elected to serve as officers for the Society next year are Bill Aileo, president; Don Johnson, vice-president; and John Fitzpatrick, secretary-treasurer.

The Society and the *Journal* have encouraged students to supplement their programs academically by participating in summer study courses in Europe. Five students will be attending the annual study of international law at The Hague this summer. They are Don Johnson, William A. Pierce, B. H. Levy, Bill Aileo, John Fitzpatrick, and Bill Aycock. The Hague has two sessions during the summer, one on public international law and the other on private international law. Legal experts and attorneys come from around the world to instruct and to study at these sessions.

A number of other students will be studying international law in England this summer under a program sponsored by William and Mary Law School.

Local international law programs will be given a boost next year with the addition of Mr. Gabriel Wilner to the law faculty. Wilner, who graduated from Columbia Law School with a LL.M. degree and practiced law in Belgium, will be teaching courses in private international law and the law of admiralty. He is currently working with the United Nations. Professor Dean Rusk will continue to teach courses and seminars in public international law.

As the Southeast and Georgia, in particular, continue to grow, international dealings will be more and more a question presented to lawyers by their clients. The programs being developed through the law school are aimed at equiping lawyers to answer these questions with some degree of expertise.

Bar Exam

The results of the February, 1972, Georgia Bar Examination have been released, and, again, the Law School's graduates have distinguished themselves by their performance. Thirty-four members of the Class of 1972 took the exam and thirty-three were successful, a passage rate of 97% . Those members of the class who completed their law school careers in the top three-quarters of the class enjoyed 100% success on the exam. In addition, two new members of the Law School Faculty took and passed this examination.

This performance by the University of Georgia School of Law is to be commended.

Alumni Notes

1930

JOHN F. BARNES, SR. (LL.B.) retired in December 1970 as assistant manager of the Land Department of Appalachian Power Company in Roanoke, Virginia after 40 years service.

1942

WILLIAM B. GUNTER (LL.B.) has been appointed to the Georgia Supreme Court by Governor Jimmy Carter.

1948

GORDON KNOX, JR. (LL.B.) has been appointed judge of the Brunswick Judicial Circuit by Governor Jimmy Carter.

1952

WILBUR OWENS, JR. (J.D.) of Macon has been appointed to succeed W. A. Boodle as U.S. District Judge of the Federal Court for Middle Georgia.

1953

Judge MARION T. POPE, JR. (LL.B.) of Canton, Georgia recently was selected president of the Council of Juvenile Court Judges of Georgia.

1958

WILLIAM SHAW ABNEY (J.D.) on March 26 resigned from the Georgia State Senate after serving 11 years in the legislature. He is now Juvenile Judge of Walker County and continues the practice of law in LaFayette.

1962

GERALD J. RACHELSON (J.D.) is chief of the Labor Relations Bureau of prisons in the Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

1966

NORMAN UNDERWOOD (LL. B.) has been named a partner in the Atlanta law firm of Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman and Ashmore.

1967

JOHN T. CROMARTIE, JR. (LL.B.) of Gainesville is director of litigation and associate director of the Georgia Indigents Legal Service in Atlanta.

1971

H. MICHAEL BRAY (J.D.) has joined the Canton law firm of Henderson and Snell.

IN MEMORIUM

1899

ARCHIBALD BONDS (B.L.) of Muskogee Okla. died May 27, 1969. He was retired judge of the City Court of Muskogee County.

1913

FRANCIS M. SCARLETT (B.L.) U. S. District Court judge of Brunswick, Georgia died November 18, 1971.

1915

GRADY H. GASTON (B.L.) of Dallas, Texas died January 29, 1972.

1918

WILLIAM S. TYSON (B.L.) of Darien, Georgia died February 5 in Savannah. A former Georgia legislator, he was senior judge of the U.S. Military Court Review from 1951 to 1965.

1922

Judge EDWIN A. McWHORTER (B. L.) Savannah Superior Court Judge, died January 28. He had served as judge since 1955.

JULIAN HARTRIDGE, SR. (B.L.) of Savannah, died October 27, 1970. He was the former assistant district attorney for the Southern District of Georgia.

1928

WILLIAM H. YOUNG (J.D.) prominent Columbus attorney, died January 20. He was a member of the law firm of Thompson, Redmond and Young.

1929

ROBERT L. CARR (LL.B.) of Glennville, Georgia died May 30. He had served as judge of State Court of Tattnall County since January 1, 1955.

1935

The *Advocate* has received word of the death of ROBERTS H. BROWN (LL. B.) on November 16, 1971. A resident and civic leader of Opelika, Alabama, he served as City Judge and Attorney for the City of Opelika. From 1939-41 and again from 1946-55, he was a member of the Alabama House of Representatives and served as Speaker of the House from 1951-55. At the time of his death Mr. Brown was a member of the Auburn University Board of Trustees, a position he had received during the first administration of Governor George C. Wallace.

To increase the amount of available information for this section of your magazine, the Advocate asks the assistance of interested alumni. Many other schools have experienced great success from the use of Class Representatives. These representatives assume the responsibility of contacting and maintaining contact with their classmates for the purpose of gathering alumni news. Any alumnus who would be interested in serving in such a capacity for his class should write:

Class Representative
% Georgia Advocate
School of Law
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Association Officers

The Law School Association recently elected its officers for 1972-1973. They are President, Kenneth M. Henson of Columbus; President-elect, Kirk McAlpin of Atlanta; and Secretary-Treasurer Upshaw C. Bentley of Athens.

Professor Thomas H. Coode

The biography of Bryant Thomas Castellow which appeared in the Fall issue was written by Professor Thomas H. Coode of California, Pennsylvania. The *Advocate* extends its apologies to Professor Coode for failing to acknowledge his contribution at that time.

GEORGIA ADVOCATE
University of Georgia
School of Law
Athens, Georgia 30601

Non-Profit-Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
P A I D
Athens, Ga. 30601
Permit No. 390