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UT WINS NATIONAL MOOT COURT COMPETITION IN 1976

The University of Tennessee College of Law National Moot Court Team, consisting of Sue B. Bohringer, Gregory G. Fletcher, and Daniel G. Lamb, Jr., won the Twenty-Seventh Annual National Moot Court Competition held at the House of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on December 13, 14 and 15, 1976. This is considered the premier competition for law students across the country. The final argument was presided over by The Honorable Byron R. White, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The best oral argument was presented by the University of Tennessee College of Law and the prize for the best speaker was presented to Gregory G. Fletcher.

Besides defeating Duke University in the final rounds, the Tennessee team defeated the teams from Brooklyn Law School, University of Dayton School of Law, Gonzaga University School of Law, and Southern Methodist University School of Law during the National Competition. The Tennessee team had placed second in the Regional Competition held in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in November. The team was coached by Professor Joseph G. Cook and Associate Professor Martha Black of the University of Tennessee College of Law.

In addition to Justice White, judges on the final court were: The Honorable Irving R. Kaufman, Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit; The Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of New Jersey; The Honorable Leonard I. Garth, Judge, United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit; The Honorable Edward Weinfeld, Judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; The Honorable Simon H. Rifkind, President of the American College of Trial Lawyers; Adrian W. DeWind, President of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Whitney North Seymour, Former President of The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the American College of Trial Lawyers and of the American Bar Association; and Joseph H. Flom, Member of the New York Bar.

Numerous prizes and awards were won by the Tennessee team. The Russell J. Coffin Award (silver tray) and the John C. Knox Award (silver cup) went to Tennessee in honor of the team being named National Champion. The Coffin tray is to be held permanently by the school, and the Knox Cup is to be held for one year. The College of Law also won for one year's possession the John W. Davis Cup for the best oral argument by a team and the Marian and Bernard Botein Tray for outstanding appellate advocacy. The team won $500 for the Law College from the Russell J. Coffin Fund, while Mr. Fletcher won for himself a silver tray from the American College of Trial Lawyers for making the best individual oral argument. Each team member was awarded a set of the Cyclopedia of Federal Procedure, Weinstein and Berger's Evidence: Commentary on Rules of Evidence for the United States Courts and Magistrates, Wigmore's Evidence, Wiener's Briefing and Arguing Federal Appeals, Fisch and Freed's Charities and Charitable Foundations, and the Benjamin N. Cardozo Memorial Lectures. Mr. Fletcher, for the best oral argument by an individual, will also receive a set each of American Jurisprudence 2nd and the Courtroom Medicine Series. The team has also been invited to be the guests of the American College of Trial Lawyers at their annual conference in San Diego, California, in March of 1977.

The Young Lawyers Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and The American College of Trial Lawyers sponsors the National Competition each year to enable law students throughout the country to match their abilities as appellate advocates against one another and to bring together law students, practicing lawyers and judges. One hundred forty-eight schools across the country competed in the regional rounds from which twenty-five winners and runners-up competed in the final rounds held in December. The University of Tennessee teams have previously won the Regional Competitions in 1975, 1972, and 1971.


All three members of the team are third-year students. Ms. Bohringer, a native of Cropper, Kentucky, is a grad-

continued on next page.
uate of the University of Louisville with an M.A. and Ph.D. in English from UT. Mr. Lamb, whose family resides in Murphysville, North Carolina, is a graduate of Wake Forest College. Mr. Fletcher, whose home is in Memphis, is a graduate of the University of Colorado.

Dean's Corner

**ABAn visit.** It is rare when any of us can see with objectivity and comprehension the institutions we serve on a daily basis. The importance, therefore, of a visit by the American Bar Association (and the Association of American Law Schools as well) to the school this spring can hardly be over estimated. It is seven years between such visits, and the team members (composed of deans, professors, librarians and practicing lawyers) look into every aspect of the College—from finances to classroom vitality. While the formal written report is not yet finished at this writing, several observations made orally by the team members during their three-day visit in early May are worth repeating here. The visiting team was impressed with the rapid growth of the school, although, of course, this has been a mixed blessing. The young, energetic and ambitious faculty was counted our most valuable asset. And the students seemed to be well served by a rich curriculum with notable innovations in clinical and similar programs. Several members of the team were particularly pleased with the quality and extent of such law center operations, the CLE program and the Judicial System Education Program of the Public Law Research and Service Program started a few years ago.

On the debit side the team found two matters of critical importance to the future of the school. One is the salary structure for the faculty as compared with that of other good law schools in this region. The danger is that we might not be able to keep the promising faculty so recently assembled if the salary base is not increased to the regional level. The second major problem highlighted in the ABA’s inspection is that the library does not yet provide an acceptable level of service to its readers. For example, because of the administrative tie to the central University library system, delays in ordering and acquiring books and other materials are months longer than should be the case. Also the rate of acquisition of new materials has not been sufficient to keep abreast of some fields of law.

These concerns have been presented to University leaders and will be given the attention they deserve in the weeks and months ahead.

"Tennessee Tomorrow" Endowment Campaign. As with accreditation inspections, there is a time in the life of an institution such as ours for its faculty, staff and alumni to assess the importance of the institution to them. I am pleased to report that the University has said the time is now, this year, for the Law School and its alumni. With the aid and encouragement of the Law College Alumni Advisory Council all law alumni will be provided a unique opportunity during the next twelve to eighteen months. Each of you will be contacted (probably by a classmate or other fellow alumnus or alumna) and asked to become directly involved in the campaign for "Tennessee Tomorrow."

Briefly, the campaign will seek substantial funds to create an endowment, the annual yield from which will assist the College in maintaining its strides toward enhanced quality by (1) supplementing the salaries of our most accomplished faculty, (2) providing stipends for summer research and writing by our faculty, (3) greatly increasing scholarship support for more of our deserving students, and (4) enriching the extracurricular life of the College through distinguished lectureships, practitioners-in-residence, moot court team travel and the like.

The campaign will be a coordinate feature of a University-wide effort to begin this fall. In the meantime every faculty member has been asked to contribute to this effort, and the response to date has been encouraging and reveals a depth of commitment which is gratifying to me and should inspire our alumni with the zeal appropriate to the tremendous challenge before us.

**TENNESSEE LAW REVIEW**

**Editorial Board, spring quarter 1977**

Julie Jones - Editor-in-Chief
Bill Sizer - Executive Editor
Cliff Knowles - Articles Editor
Juliet Griffin - Articles and Research Editor
Bob Underwood - Research Editor
Russ Headrick - Student Material Editor
George Caudle - Student Material Editor

New Members of the Tennessee Law Review

Fran Ansley
Ronne Greer

Turk, 1 to r) Cliff Knowles, Articles Editor; George Caudle, Student Material Editor, Julie Jones, Editor-in-Chief. (Standing 1 to r) Bob Underwood, Research Editor; Bill Sizer, Executive Editor; Dan Rhea and Russ Headrick, Student Material Editors. (Not pictured, Juliet Griffin, Articles and Research Editor).

**Elected to the Order of the Coif**

**August 1976**

Elizabeth Smith Jones
Mary Ellen Owen Summers

**December 1976**

Thomas C. Spring
G. Wendell Thomas
THOUGHTS ON LEGAL EDUCATION: PAST AND PRESENT
E.E. OVERTON

When I came back to the College of Law in 1946 it did not occur to me that thirty-one years later I would be here preparing to sing a swan song.

In 1946 the College occupied a building at 720 West Main Street which was so run down that students were not allowed on the top floor because of the fire-trap syndrome (faculty were deemed more expendable or at least more fire resistant).

The physical plant was so limited that we rented a top floor room from a local church in order to handle the influx of returning veterans.

We had six full-time faculty members and a part-time instructor who served additionally as our part-time law librarian. In addition, we had six practicing attorneys who taught one course per year. The clinical program was not yet established but the library claimed over 23,000 catalogued volumes (a few of which I hadn't read).

For the year 1945-46 there were ten seniors, twenty-five second-year students and eighty-seven first-year students who had entered during the preceding three quarters (students were admitted at the beginning of each quarter whereas now admission takes place only in the summer and fall).

Today we have a law school building with classrooms, seminar rooms, two library reading rooms, offices for nearly thirty faculty, six administrators (many of them teaching), plus a library staff that far outnumbers the total faculty count of just a few short years ago.

Last fall we had over 600 students enrolled—40 percent were first-year students, a little over 30 percent were second-year and a little less than 30 percent were third-year.

Not only are there more students than were present in the post-war era but the nature of the student body has changed. In 1946 there was no Law School Admission Test. Students could enter the study of law with two years of college. If the student had a degree he was eligible to enter no matter how low his pre-law average might be. If he didn't have a degree, he had to have a 2.0 average.

Today an entering student must have a bachelor's degree, a satisfactory LSAT score and an adequate pre-law average. (The average entering in-state student today has an average LSAT score of 600+ and a pre-law grade point average of 3.00+). This means that our present students come to law school with credentials that place them in the upper half of the college graduates in our prospective applicant pool.

In 1945 there were no minority students and almost no women. Today there are fifteen black students in the first-year class and women comprise close to 30 percent of the student body.

The curriculum in 1946 was pretty much hard-core basic material. We had no faculty, library, or students to justify or permit any doctrine of an enriched curriculum. This came much later, or much too soon, depending on your viewpoint.

The clinic was established in 1947 with a small staff and a limited number of credit hours available.

In the intervening years, writing courses have proliferated. Additions to the curriculum have included legal history, environmental law, estate planning, many more tax courses, international law, labor relations, jurisprudence, legislation, negotiation and dispute settlement, oil and gas law, sex discrimination, social legislation and employee benefits, unfair trade practices, water law, and seminars in a variety of traditional and newer subjects.

In the latter group we have arbitration, consumer protection, juvenile law, law and medicine, and law and mental health.

Additionally, we have cooperative and/or joint degree programs—an MBA-JD program and a course which allows credit for teaching environmental law at the undergraduate level.

Upon reflection, I find some of these trends to be worth comment. Student input into the decision-making process has increased markedly in the last five or six years. This input has had an impact on grading, required courses, and other academic matters and concerns. There are occasions, at least, when it seems that present students opt for the road of least resistance—a phenomenon which I don’t believe existed in the 1940s, 1950s and most of the 1960s. This is not to deny the value of feedback, but I seriously question the degree of student involvement in determining the policies and procedures of the college.

The other significant change is the increased urgency with which newer members of the faculty seek to institute changes in course offerings, areas of specialization and in reduction in core studies. If change is inevitable, I would at least suggest that we can better manage the rate of change so as to retain traditional values.

But one thing remains as true for me today as it did thirty years ago when I came to UT—in fact, as it was forty-five years ago when I started teaching at the University of Arkansas fresh out of the University of Chicago Law School. The thing that hasn't changed has been my joy in teaching. I consider myself blessed of all men to have been allowed to teach law for forty-five years.

Many years ago I considered entering private practice which paid young graduates in the Chicago area the staggering sum of $15 a week. Law teachers were, at the same time, being paid $200 a month. The money was certainly an inducement, but I believe that teaching was indeed my preordained vocation.

The association with young people has, I am sure, kept me far younger than my seventy years. Watching the development and success of the thousands of students I have taught gives me a wonderful feeling of accomplishment. Friendships made at the College have matured into lifelong friendships and have enriched my life.

But basically I have loved teaching as teaching. I have received various inquiries and some offers to teach elsewhere. The possibility is intriguing, but for the present I shall stay in Knoxville and maintain an office in the Law College.

My second love, after teaching, is research in law. I plan on doing some of that and, who knows, I may wind up working for some of my former students.
To those alumni who read this reflective note, I offer thanks to you for allowing me to have taught you, and for allowing me to have known and to know you.

This is not a farewell speech. I'll be seeing you.

JUDGE FRANK WILSON ADDRESSES DECEMBER GRADUATING CLASS

“The old order changeth yielding place to new” was Alfred Lord Tennyson's romantic expression of the process of change. Tempered by his experience in practice and on the bench, Judge Frank Wilson ('41) urged a more deliberate and cautious appraisal of the process in his address to the graduating class at the College last December.

Reflecting upon his own thirty-six years of experience in the law, Judge Wilson reminded his audience “that a rapidly changing society and rapidly changing laws are the inevitable prospect one faces throughout one's legal career”; and “that much of what one has learned of both substantive and procedural law in law school will be amended, repealed or replaced before one's legal career is ended.”

In order to meet this challenge, Judge Wilson indicated that the graduates must constantly reflect upon and retain those four fundamental teachings and skills acquired in law school—the art of legal reasoning, a capacity for legal research, a desire to acquire a new legal knowledge, and a deep devotion to the cause of justice.

Judge Wilson went on to make two other observations concerning lawyers and the practice of law.

The first was based upon an impression that most lawyers come to the legal profession highly motivated and with ideals that are a true credit to the profession. However, idealism soon fades and one's interests, concerns and motivations gradually diminish until they scarcely exceed one's own economic advantage. When this occurs, the practice of law ceases to become a profession and becomes merely another commercial activity. It is only the person willing to subordinate his or her personal interest to the service of the client who is entitled to be called a professional.

Underlying this professional charge was the Judge's belief that costs of legal services and litigation were reaching a point at which effective legal representation is being denied to a large portion of our population. Citing examples of exorbitant pretrial and trial costs, Judge Wilson reminded the lawyers-to-be that law should be practiced on the basis of maximizing the interest of one's client and not on the basis of maximizing the legal fee.

The second area of concern of Judge Wilson was the role of the lawyer in public affairs. Conceding the advent of legal specialization, Judge Wilson nevertheless had this comment, “We pay a price for specialization and that price is the loss of interest and influence on the part of lawyers in matters of public concern outside of their specialty.... I would urge you to maintain an interest in and seek to exert an influence on matters of general public concern beyond your own specialty or your own economic welfare.”

Listing areas of public concern which lawyers ought to scrutinize carefully, Judge Wilson identified as worthwhile the preservation of the federalist concept of government, simplification of the law and the retention of trial by jury.

In concluding his talk, our distinguished alumnus offered the following guide to the graduates: “As you graduate from law school and enter upon your legal career, you could have no higher function in that career than to see to it that the law continues to be brought to the touchstone of common sense.”

NEW LAW LIBRARIAN

BARDIE WOLFE—NEW LAW LIBRARIAN

The College of Law is pleased to announce the appointment of Bardie C. Wolfe, Jr., as Head Law Librarian and Associate Professor. A native of Kingsport, Tennessee, he received his J.D. and M.S.L.S. from University of Kentucky.

Most recently he was Associate Professor and Head Law Librarian at Cleveland Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University. He previously has held the positions of Acquisition Librarian/Assistant Professor at University of Virginia Law Library, and of Circulation Librarian and Director of Reader Services, University of Texas Law Library.

About the author:

Associate Professor Douglas Q. Wickham has been at UT since the fall of 1971. Professor Wickham is a graduate of Yale University and Yale University Law School. In addition, he holds the LL.M. degree from Harvard Law School.

Doug has served on the College of Law Curriculum Committee since the fall of 1971 and served as its chairman from the fall of 1974 to the spring of 1976.

STABILITY AND CHANGE IN THE CURRICULUM: 1949-1977

DOUGLAS Q. WICKHAM

Much has been said (and even more rumored) about curriculum change here at the Law College. I obtained several catalogues dating back to 1949 from Professor Overton’s collection and set about comparing the offerings. The most striking result of the study is the remarkable stability of the first-year core upon which the curriculum is based.

Contracts and Torts remain unchanged at 9 hours each, and Property is now given the same 9 hours. Prior catalogues had allocated 11 hours to Real and Personal Property, although not always in the first year. Criminal Law and Procedure were both required until 1972 when Procedure was expanded to two quarters and made elective. Legal Bibliography remains a fixture, now expanded to a Research and Writing program spanning the entire first year. Domestic Relations disappeared as a requirement during the mid-1960s. Judicial Administration evolved to Introduction to Law and then to Legal Process, all first-quarter offerings. Civil Procedure made its first appearance in the core curriculum during the 1960s, first as a 2-hour offering in Federal Procedure and then as a 4-hour course at the head of a multi-quarter sequence.

The post-World War II student would hardly recognize much of today’s upper curriculum but would feel quite at home in the first year. In the spring of 1949, all first- and second-year courses were prescribed. Agency and Partnership, Evidence, Tennessee Procedure, Constitutional Law, Equity, Wills, and Bills and Notes composed the bill of fare. A foundation for general practice in the Tennessee courts was provided, and all students were expected to follow the same path. Given the high post-war enrollment and the small size of the faculty, it is doubtful that many more courses could have been offered. The spectre of the bar exam colored the entire program.

By 1955, the required second-year program had been eliminated, but the courses remained available to students as electives. The number of electives offered had increased from twenty to thirty-two, but most of this represented a reduction in the number of required courses beyond the first year. All but four of those subjects are found in today’s catalogue: Mortgages, Suretyship, Military Justice and Landlord and Tenant. The forerunners of today’s Uniform Commercial Code subjects made their first appearance. General practice in Tennessee still appeared to be the sole curricular goal.

In 1962 there was an increased federal presence in the catalogue. Courses in Taxation and Labor Law had expanded and Federal Procedure was a requirement. The size of the faculty (seven full-time) and the number of electives (thirty-two) remained stable. There was now an “area requirement” which directed students into five functional parts of the curriculum and which effectively controlled course choice in four of their six upperclass quarters. Two courses of four offered were to be taken in Business Organizations, Commercial Law, and Property; three of six in Public Law; and five of eight in Procedure and Evidence. In various forms, the idea of area requirements remained in the curriculum until 1974. Its demise was attributable to faculty dissatisfaction with the existing scheme. The curriculum committee is presently considering the area requirement approach along with others in a comprehensive study of the upper curriculum.

The major developments during the 1960s were the introduction of seminars and the growth of the Legal Clinic. By 1971 there were eight seminars being offered and each student took one as a graduation requirement. By 1969, Clinic I had become a required course.

The clinical program has always been considered a close complement to the traditional classroom offerings. Under the guidance of Charles Miller, the UT Legal Clinic grew to one of the largest and most active “teaching law firms” affiliated with any law school. In some respects it can be said that the Clinic became too successful. Even though our student body grew and all were required to take Clinic, the faculty did not grow apace and the caseload skyrocketed. Four years ago, the Clinic was dropped as a requirement for graduation. It still remains one of the more popular electives, so it has been necessary to limit the size of the classes in some quarters. The course offerings within the program have been reorganized and broadened, offering a two-quarter sequence on both the civil and criminal side. In addition, an Economic Development Clinic has been set up to provide experience in counseling small bus-
iness clients—organizing non-profit corporations, assuring their tax-exempt status in administrative proceedings before the IRS, etc.

It is in the elective courses that today’s catalogue is barely recognizable. If one looks carefully, one can find much of what was in those older numbers. Many areas, such as taxation, in which there were but one or two offerings now have four or five plus an occasional seminar. New subjects such as environmental law, anti-trust, race and sex discrimination and local government law appear. Skills areas are now addressed in such courses as Trial Practice and Negotiation and Dispute Settlement. The number of seminars has more than doubled with offerings ranging from land acquisition to trade regulation to law and mental health. Courses in legal history, jurisprudence, and law, language and ethics now appear. With faculty approval, up to three law-related graduate courses from other departments on campus may be taken; there is a coordinated program for simultaneous pursuit of both the JD and MBA degrees.

The most recent attempt by the faculty to articulate general principles around which to plan a curriculum occurred during 1972. We identified and agreed upon these statements: “...dimensions of the learning experience to which our students should be exposed (include):

1. the development of analytical skills in respect to decisional law and statutes.
2. an awareness of the historical growth of the law.
3. a knowledgeable appreciation of the interrelationship of law and society.
4. the use of law as an implement of societal control.
5. the development of communication skills, written and oral.”

With a large faculty of diverse interests, it is not surprising to have observed the recent sharp growth in elective offerings. As society itself changes and the law adapts to keep pace, new subjects do come into view. It is fair to say that the 1972 faculty statement does not represent a sharp departure from the past; rather it stands as a reaffirmation of the traditional goals of legal education. We differ considerably in our approach, but the objective remains—a well-educated candidate for admission to the bar.

Douglas Q. Wickham

LAW WEEK ACTIVITIES

LAW DAY MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Opposing Counsel and Judges—left to right Bill Haltom, Sharon Lee, Judge Bryant, Judge Tuttle, Judge Edwards, Joe Manuel, Cliff Knowles.

Cliff Knowles argues for the appellees.

"Yes, but your Honor," says Bill Haltom, for the appellants.

The prizes.

THE LAWN PARTY

Dean Penegar with UTK Chancellor Jack Reese.

Southern womanhood and "finger-lickin goodies."

"Every Man a King"—shades of Huey P. Long. On the left Professor Fred Le Clercq as Auctioneer and Student Bar Association President Buddy Young.
LAW DAY BANQUET

President Jack Draper ('57) of the Knoxville Bar Association presents KBA Outstanding Professor Award to Professor Fred Thomforde. Dean Penegar and Willard Rooks applaud the award.

CLE MARCHES ON

Based upon the response to our spring questionnaire, we have tried to develop a continuing legal education program which is responsive to the wants and needs of the practicing bar. The results of that survey are set forth below.

Given an expanded resource base and continued support from the bar, we hope to provide an even richer program selection in the near future.

As always, I welcome your suggestions and constructive criticism. We'll look forward to seeing you at one of the programs.

Curtis L. Wells
Assistant Dean for CLE

RESULTS OF STATEWIDE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Law</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord/Tenant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancery Practice</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors’ Rights</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Rules</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn. Appellate Practice</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Businesses</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Partnerships</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Real Estate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tort Actions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Law</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statewide: 310 responding

CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION CALENDAR 1977-78

October 7—Mineral Law in Tennessee—Knoxville

October 28—Representing the Small Business: Commercial Agreements and Other Problem Areas in Day-to-Day Operations—Chattanooga

November 4—Tort Claims Against Governments, Governmental Agencies and Officials Southeastern Practice Institute—Knoxville

November 18—Chancery Practice—Memphis


January 13—Creditors’ Rights—Nashville

February 10—Representing the Small Business: Commercial Agreements and Other Problem Areas in Day-to-Day Operations—Memphis


March 17—Representing the Small Business: Commercial Agreements and Other Problem Areas in Day-to-Day Operations—Nashville


April 21—Tennessee Appellate Practice—Knoxville

May 5—Southeastern Practice Institute—Knoxville

May 19—Tennessee Appellate Practice—Memphis

May 20—Tennessee Appellate Practice—Nashville

June Mini-Institutes (dates to be announced)—Quality of a Lawyer’s Life—Anatomy for Lawyers

RESEARCH SERVICE

Please note: The Southeastern Legal Research Council is available for any research projects that cannot be handled within the firm or agency. The organization is directed by David A. Burkhalter, 4212 South Garden Road, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37919. The standard rate is $8.00 per hour.
Law Alumni Notes

R.A. ASHLEY, JR. ('52), formerly Attorney General for the State of Tennessee has become a member of the firm of Ashley, Ashley & Lawson, Dyersburg.

LOUIS C. WOOLF ('60), formerly of McCamphill, Young, Bartlett, Woolf & Hollow, and JOHN A. McREYNOLDS, JR. ('64), formerly of Lee and McReynolds, have become members of the firm Baker, Worthington, Crossley & Stansberry, Knoxville. DENNIS R. MCCLANE ('76) has joined the firm as an associate.

The law firm of Ridenour, Ridenour, Ridenour & Bowers announces that W.F. SHUMATE, JR. ('65), became a partner in the firm effective January 1, 1977, and the name of the firm is now Ridenour, Ridenour, Ridenour, Bowers & Shumate, Knoxville.

MICHAEL J. BLACHMAN ('69) has become a partner in the Portsmouth, Virginia, firm of Bangel, Bangel & Bangel. The Knoxville firm of Butler, Vines, Babb & Threadgill announces the addition of two associates from UT, ROBERT P. MURRIAN ('74) and WAYNE CHRISTESON ('76).

Taylor, Tilson, Inman & Reams, of Morristown, announce that PHILIP J. LAWSON ('75) previously an associate, assumed the status of partner on January 1, 1977. The firm name became Taylor, Tilson, Inman, Reams & Lawson.

WALTER BOLLING ('75) writes that he is now associated with James L. Banks, Chattanooga. In addition, Walter is a partner with Bolling and Bolling, Dalton, Georgia.

CHARLES PATTERSON ('76) announces the opening of his office for the general practice of law in association with Walter J. Key, Jackson, Tennessee.

WILLIAM STEPHENS ('50) is now Executive Director of Legal Services of Upper East Tennessee, Inc., with headquarters in Johnson City. Previously he was Staff Attorney for the Tennessee Commission on Aging.

The law firm of Kemper, Weis, and Stansberry, Knoxville, announces the addition of two associates from UT, ROBERT P. MURRIAN ('74) and WAYNE CHRISTESON ('76).

The Editorial Board of the Tennessee Law Review is pleased to announce the addition of twelve new members to the Review staff at the end of spring quarter. The new members are:


Cliff Knowles, Editor-in-Chief
Bill Sizer, Executive Editor
Dan Rhea, Articles Editor
George Caudle, Student Material Editor
Bob Underwood, Research Editor
Dale Grimes, Articles Editor
Jeff Beuse, Student Material Editor
Mark Olive, Research Editor

CONTRIBUTORS FOR 1975-77

The following list mentions alumni and friends of the College of Law who have made financial contributions to one or more funds supporting our programs (mainly scholarships) here at the College and, to some degree, programs of the University generally. This listing covers the time since such a list was last printed in 1975.

If we have overlooked anyone, please forgive us and let us hear from you to make sure your gift was actually received and credited. We are proud of this significant and sustained effort and find it greatly encouraging.

Thomas J. Abernathy, Pulaski, TN
Charles Robert Ables, South Pittsburg, TN
William E. Balfour, City, TN
Grady W. Agee, Memphis, TN
Mr. and Mrs. Earl S. Altor, Knoxville, TN
Frances Albecker, Evansville, IN
Robert E. Alderson, Jackson, TN
John C. Ale, Memphis, TN
William P. Alexander, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Mr. and Mrs. John L. Chamberlain, TN
Mr. Earl S. Altor, Knoxville, TN
John Lambert Cleary, McMinnville, TN
James Robert Cunningham, Cincinnati, OH
Mildred A. Cunningham, Knoxville, TN
John L. Cummings, Huntington, WV
Roy De Lay Cummins, Camden, NJ
James Edward Beckner, Morristown, TN
William Frank Crawford, Jr., TN
Mrs. Frank B. Creekmore, Maryville, TN
Robert Allen Crawford, Asheville, NC
William Frank Crawford, Memphis, TN
Mrs. Frank B. Creekmore, Knoxville, TN
Robert P. Crockett, St. Paul, MN
Robert L. Crossley, Knoxville, TN
William J. Cullinan, North Quincy, MA
Richard J. Curran, Jr., Memphis, TN

Scattered throughout this contributors list are pictures of former UT College of Law students and faculty selected at random from our files of the past twenty years. The staff of Law Alumni Headnotes thought these photographs would be of interest to our readers. Perhaps the faces have changed a bit, but can you recognize yourself or an old friend?