

Editor's Note

Brainerd Currie was not only one of the most influential scholars in the area of Conflict of Laws, but is also Mercer Law School's most distinguished alumnus. *Mercer Law Review* is honored, therefore, to continue this Symposium, begun last year in Volume XXXIV, in honor of the memory of Brainerd Currie.

Section I of the second half of the Symposium is composed of traditional articles by Professors Juenger, Leflar, McDougal, and Trautman. Section II presents an article by Professor Brilmayer, built around a hypothetical conflicts problem, and responses to her article by Professors Allo, Martin, Weinberg, and Weintraub.

Conflicts of Law is unique in its amenability to the influence of scholars. As a result, the field bears the personal stamp of such distinguished scholars as Joseph Beale, Brainerd Currie, and a host of others. We sincerely hope that this Symposium has advanced the work begun by these accomplished intellects and continued it in their splendid tradition.

The four articles contributed by student authors to this issue focus on decisions regarding criminal procedure handed down by the United States Supreme Court in its October, 1982 term. These decisions are not only major alterations in the present law of criminal procedure, but may foreshadow even greater changes to come.

This student mini-symposium is an attempt to analyze a possible new trend in the law and to predict where that trend may lead in the future. We hope that these articles will not only be of assistance to the practitioner, but will also promote debate among scholars.

NEAL B. CHILDERS

Dedicated
to the memory of
Brainerd Currie
1912—1965