

June 2021

## The Lawyer and the Community

Carl D. Friebolin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Carl D. Friebolin, The Lawyer and the Community, 24 Dicta 60 (1947).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

cutions and of "the equal protection clause" of the Fourteenth amendment.<sup>59</sup> The rather recent mass sedition trial, held in the national capital, is an example of how counsel was made available *gratis* to the criminally accused. Despite the raging of war and the involvement of highly explosive political factors, the Sixth Amendment was faithfully given effect through the donation of professional services, in some instances leading to great personal hardship. Even those accused of the most heinous crimes receive benefit of counsel, appointed by the Court, if they are financially unable to employ counsel.

The future responsibilities of the bar in the maintenance and extension of the American system, both at home and abroad, are measurable in terms of the increasing pressure of forces which constantly strive to substitute opposing modes of social life, radically different civilizations, and above all, solely materialistic conceptions of the nature of man, and the purpose of his existence. It is indeed a gratifying sight to observe how the American system was used as a guide, approximately speaking, when the representatives of the United Nations met in San Francisco, to draw up the World Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. The keeping of world peace has always been the responsibility of lawyers, the designers of international law and of those juridical institutions which afford the means by which that law may be translated into action. May American lawyers ever seek to extend the blessings of the American system to the whole world.

## The Lawyer and the Community<sup>†</sup>

By CARL D. FRIEBOLIN, Cleveland\*

If you think for a minute that I'm going to apologize for the triteness of my subject, you're right. The subject was not of my choosing—nor the speaker, either. If he had not introduced me with such eloquent praise, I would name the man who is to blame. I can't suppose any subject could be more vague and less restricted and less definite.

After he had suggested the subject to me, I became curious to learn just how many times that, or a similar topic had been discussed at Bar Association Meetings. I suspected there were very many. So I examined the records for 12 years back. It was quite a task. But I had a lot of time. As most of you know the Bankruptcy Court has not been busy lately. It has become the Court that nobody knows. Apparently everybody has money and nobody

---

<sup>59</sup>Bradway, *The Challenge to Organized Legal Aid* (1944) 22 *Tex. L. Rev.* 327-344.

<sup>†</sup>Reprinted by permission from the *Journal of The National Association of Referees in Bankruptcy*, January 1946. This address was delivered before the Judicial Section of the Ohio State Bar Association, November 29, 1945. It was printed in the *Ohio Law Reporter*, Cincinnati, in its issue of December 17, 1945.

\*Referee in Bankruptcy since 1916; past president (1931-32) of the National Association of Referees in Bankruptcy; LL.D., Ohio Wesleyan University.

owes any debts. I have no doubt but that if Winston Churchill were a Referee in Bankruptcy, he would say: Never before in the history of human relations have so many, owed so little, to so few.

In looking over these various speeches, strange to say, I didn't find one entitled exactly as mine is today: "The Lawyer and the Community." There were a great many similar to it however, for example:

"The Lawyer and the Public," "The Lawyer and his Country," "The Bar and The People," "The Influence of the Lawyer in the Community," "The Legal Profession in the Community" and a lot of others, all of the same general tenor. Of course there were quite a number of them, which I could hardly describe as on the alkaline side. But many of them—I should say most of them—were interesting and provocative, made by able lawyers, who spoke obviously after deep study and with pronounced conviction.

The truth is, that I could do a lot worse—and I probably shall—than merely reading to you some excerpts and quotations from these many and varied speeches.

I was rather startled to find in my search, that upon this well-worn subject, some of the most distinguished members of the bar had made addresses: for example, Elihu Root, Chief Justice Stone, Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Jackson and Newton D. Baker. And I must not overlook several presidents of the Ohio Bar Association including Presidents George Murray and Howard Barkdull of our City. And only last month, at a meeting of the Trumbull County bar, I saw by the papers, that our current president, Mr. Taggart, in an address sneaked in a few words on the relation of the lawyer and the public.

The most striking thing about all of these speeches was, that invariably they began with some reference to the loss of prestige by the bar, the unfortunate reputation of lawyers among the general public, the decline of the lawyers eminence in the community from what it had been—if ever.

President Murray, at the Annual Meeting of this Association, spoke of the loss of respect for the bar: he said:

"From time immemorial the public has been prejudiced against the lawyer."

He then traced that hostility beginning with quotations from Shakespeare, through Charles Dickens and others.

Mr. Barkdull, when he was president, speaking on "The Bar and the Public" referred to "the decline in the prestige of the bar in our present day life, as compared with its high position in the past."

He then showed how we got this way, by tracing the position of the lawyer beginning with Rome and Athens down to date.

At the last American Bar Meeting in Cleveland, Mr. Paul Bellamy speaking on "The Public and the Bar" threw at us the verse from St. Luke:

"Woe unto you also, ye lawyers; for ye lade men with burdens grievous

to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers."

It remained, I think, for Chief Justice Stone, several years ago, to describe our situation as it exists today most tersely, completely and fairly; his words are worthy of quotation; his subject was "The Public Influence of the Bar." After discussing the valuable services of the bar in earlier days, he says that we can not shut our eyes to the laymen's general dissatisfaction with lawyers today. He then proceeds to analyze it:

"The rise of big business has produced an inevitable specialization of the Bar. The successful lawyer of our day more often than not is the proprietor or general manager of a new type of factory, whose legal product is increasingly the result of mass production methods. More and more the amount of his income is the measure of professional success. More and more he must look for his rewards to the material satisfactions derived from profits as from a successfully conducted business, rather than to the intangible and indubitably more durable satisfactions which are to be found in a professional service more consciously directed toward the advancement of the public interest. Steadily the best skill and capacity of the profession has been drawn into the exacting and highly specialized service of business and finance. At its best, the changed system has brought to the command of the business world loyalty and superb proficiency and technical skill. At its worst it has made the learned profession of an earlier day, the obsequious servant of business, and tainted it with the morals and canners of the market place in its most anti-social manifestations. In any case, we must concede that it has given us a Bar whose leaders, like its rank and file, are on the whole less likely to be well rounded professional men than their predecessors, whose energy and talent for public service and for bringing the law into harmony with changed conditions, have been largely absorbed in the advancement of the interests of clients."

This my friends is not a harrangue by a crack-brained demagogue. They are the measured words by the universally respected Chief Justice, and they deserve pondering by every lawyer.

You will have to say this for the legal profession: Unlike any other occupation of which I know, it continually and openly year in and year out, indulges in self-examination, self-criticism and soul-searching, always with a view to an improvement of its members and in the hope of promoting a better and more favorable attitude toward lawyers on the part of the public.

As you may guess, the various speakers upon this subject have advanced many remedies, palliatives and schemes to meet the condition they describe—one or two, even going so far as to advocate direct advertising by the Bar Associations. I shall not retail them to you. But perhaps I may, quite humbly, add to them; perhaps merely emphasize some of them. You know it has been well said: The world needs not so much to be taught as to be reminded.

May I say that I realize also, that unlike Doctors, Dentists and Clergymen, our profession is one, which by its very nature is easily misunderstood. While these other professions always appear to the public to be on the side of the angels, a lawyer, as has been frequently mentioned, represents his client no matter how unpopular he, or his cause, may be. It can't be otherwise; that is inherent in his profession. As I told my brother Referees in Bankruptcy on one occasion, no matter how well the Bankruptcy Law may be administered by them, there would always be outcries of the "evils of bankruptcy." The nature of the law and its unhappy consequences both to debtors and creditors are such, that their labors can never be popular. They are in a position similar to that of the unfortunate chap who spent \$1,000.00 to cure himself of halitosis, only to find that his friends didn't like him anyhow.

1. At the outset it must be apparent to all of us, that in order to create a more friendly public atmosphere, we can't do much without organization. In these days of mass production and mass action, the individual—unless he be the exceptional one—is quite impotent in creating a general public attitude towards anything or anybody. It is largely through our Bar Association that we must, and can, influence the mind of the community.

The American Bar Association has done nobly in this regard, in my judgment. It has come a long way since 1906, when Dean Roscoe Pound, delivered an address at the St. Paul convention on "The Causes of Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice" and the Old Guard, so-called, was unwilling to have his address printed.

Since that time our American Association has gone a long way to expand its activities to meet the issues of the times. It has extended itself to discuss, and to take a position on, many problems not relating peculiarly to the legal profession but which affected the people as a whole.

Several years ago, in 1938, at Cleveland I believe, it established a Committee on Defense of Civil Liberties, with the President of the Association boasting, that it had steadily broadened its activities "in the fields in which there seemed to be possibilities of helping men and women generally rather than mere clients or lawyers." More recently it has, with considerable force, asserted itself in the struggle for an international organization to promote peace with particular emphasis on an International Court of Justice.

So far as I can learn the State Bar Associations and local Associations, lag far behind our national organization in asserting themselves in the field of public affairs of general appeal. They continue to confine themselves almost entirely to matters relating strictly to lawyers and the courts.

Frankly, I have until recently been lukewarm, to say the least—perhaps a little "right of center"—upon the question of our state, and particularly our local Bar Associations' extending their field of activity into the broader field of public questions, not merely confining itself to matters affecting only lawyers and the courts. But I have, with some reluctance, come to the conclusion

that only in this way can we enlist the sympathy and the confidence of the community in the legal profession, for which we have been constantly striving and which has been stressed in endless numbers of speeches. In his speech to which I have referred Mr. Bellamy, an experienced and discerning newspaper man speaking of the means that might be adopted to improve the standing of the bar with the public, said:

"I should like to see you step out more in all good efforts—I plead with you to increase your extra-curricular activities. I implore you to interest yourselves in the economic, social and political affairs of the doubtful present—do not be parrots, and rest content merely to echo the voices of the comfortable past and comfortable client."

There has been also an occasional voice lifted by a member of the bar and in law journals to the same purport.

You say that puts us into politics. It does. What's wrong with that? Politics after all is merely the science or art of getting things done in a free government.

"If war is the game of Kings, Politics is the game of free peoples."

I know that we lawyers have been conditioned by years of teaching and tradition, to regard political and economic questions as tabu in our Bar Associations. It seems to be regarded as undignified, plebeian; "it isn't done." But you will have to admit, that frequently it is pretty difficult to draw the line. When does an issue become political? When we propose a scheme for the appointment of judges is that not a political question? How are we ever going to get it without going into politics? We shall never achieve it without practicing the art and the method of securing its enactment into law by appealing to the electorate to vote for it. That's democracy in action. That's politics. Any proposal, that contributes to the greater ability of people generally to enjoy the benefits provided by our constitution and protects them under it, should not be beyond, nor beneath, our consideration. The community is entitled to the benefit of the special abilities and skill that lawyers possess. How can we justify leaving it to those less competent? More than that, it will arouse in the community a feeling of respect and confidence in the bar if we show ourselves interested in *their* problems and in *them*, rather than merely in our pet schemes and in ourselves.

You may say: we have other organizations that occupy that field: The Civic League, the Chamber of Commerce and perhaps others. It the first place, unless the bar as an *organization of lawyers* take a stand—in cooperation with such organizations if possible,—the people will not know that the legal profession as *such* has interested itself in the people's common problems. The public should be told—and as frequently as possible. We will find the Press willing to give adequate publicity. It is bound to bring results.

I have already said, that it seemed to me, that the American Bar Association is away ahead of us in this particular. It occurs to me, that in some

way State and Local Bars should in their organization detail, follow more closely that of the American Association. Our several committees in America, state and local associations are not alike; they might well be, so far as consistent with our respective areas of operation. It would encourage exchange of information and ideas. It would tend to promote united effort and thus more effective effort. The National, State and Local Committees might prove sources of inspiration to each other.

More than that, it seems to me, that some thought might be given to integrate the memberships of State and Local Bars with the American Association. What I mean is, that membership in a local bar might well include membership in the State and American Associations. That, too, would give us the advantage of a united front with the added influence which *that* would produce. Although, myself, not sold on the so-called integrated State bar, so much at least could be done. It would invigorate all of them. Just for example: in the last few months, locally, a committee of the Cleveland Association with Walter Stewart as chairman, has labored hard and long on a method of promoting better candidates for Judges and for a more discriminating plea of endorsement of candidates. They have produced a splendid report. It doesn't seem right, that the state and National Association should not have the benefit of that thoughtful contribution to a perplexing problem. And when our local Legislative Committee makes a recommendation upon some bill proposed in the legislature, how much more effective it would be, if there were such cooperation with the State Bar's Legislative Committee by all local Legislative Committees, so that when the recommendation reached the legislature, it would be the voice of the Ohio Bar rather than merely that of Cuyahoga County or Geauga County.

Locally, I think it regrettable that we should have three Associations—to the public it must look like three local unions, who at times seem to be engaged in a jurisdictional dispute. That doesn't help us with the people of the community, either. Being a member of only the older group, I feel that I can say that we perhaps are at fault. We have been too exclusive—too country-club. Right or wrong, we give the impression of trying to be the dudes of the bar, and of being unfriendly, not to say hostile, to the "lower priced," the "run of the mill" lawyers.

Mr. Justice Jackson in an address several years ago referring, as usual, to the bar's loss of prestige said:

"In our bar associations we generally pyramid conservation until at the top of the structure our bar associations are as conservative as cemetery trustees."

Even though we do not change the top, we certainly can broaden our base by a more widely distributed representation in the position where opposing views will be encouraged, may be fully aired and receive attention. Remember, it is these "common" lawyers, that are the most numerous and

that circulate in the community. It is they, who make friends and influence people. Some of them, even though they never met a payroll, know how to carry a precinct. We must enlist their whole hearted interest if we want to persuade the average voters upon whom we must finally depend to support our programs.

2. To be more explicit on the questions in which we may become effective as an organization in this broader realm, would take more time than I have.

(a) We should, I think, continue our campaign for the appointment of judges on some such plan as we proposed several years ago. It was probably a mistake to quit the agitation when we lost at the polls. That isn't the way causes are won. It requires a continuous campaign. Ever since the Dry's, after years of effort, put over Prohibition, no one should despair of accomplishing anything in time. It is difficult to explain and convince the layman that our plan is clearly in his interest. But it can be done. Like all reformers who think in the phrases: the voters should and the people *ought*, we too have got to realize that our major premise must be. The People *Do* and the People *Won't*, and work up from that. Yes, that's politics.

(b) In this connection we might also begin to study a plan of nomination for Federal and State Supreme Court judges proposed by Dean Wigmore 5 years ago—I haven't heard of any Bar Association that has considered it. He proposes what he calls, an "Eligible Roll of Judicial Honor" composed of lawyers chosen as qualified for the positions upon the Federal Supreme Court and the Supreme Courts of the States. *Immediately*, and not for the purpose of filling a current vacancy, the various State Bar Associations would choose as eligible for the Federal Supreme Court, one lawyer from the particular state and one from some other state. Thus there would be two choices by each State Bar. For the State Eligible list, each State Bar would choose four, as eligible for the State Supreme Court. These lists would be given national or state wide publicity at once. As Dean Wigmore contends, while there would be no compulsion by law, requiring the executive to appoint from this list, the force of an organized opinion would in many cases prompt the executive to appoint a man whom the bar had freely chosen as worthy of the honor, at a time when there was the least political complication and influence. This scheme on the face of it at least sounds better than our current practice.

(c) Judge Wilkin this morning, has spoken of the need for an international organization. After that eloquent address anything I could say would be an anti-climax.

We can all agree that the United Nations Organization was an epoch-making event. Perhaps it was, as one columnist said:

"The greatest international meeting ever held on United States soil and the most important human gathering since the Lord's supper."

But we must never forget that it was a mere beginning and that since that time has come the atomic bomb.

Thoughtful and far seeing men in and out of our profession, are coming to realize that the only answer to the split atom is a united world. Some are even daring to speak of the need of restrictions on sovereignty—that bugaboo of statesmen and congressmen—in the interest of a world order governed by international law, made effective by a world court to determine all disputes among nations. You say that's a dream and can't be realized. I'm not so sure about that, once the people understand that the only alternative is another world conflagration and blood-bath.

Surely that is a worthwhile undertaking for every Bar Association. They should lead in this crusade, whose object is not of peculiar benefit to the bar but for all mankind.

(d) High on the list of questions of general public interest with which we can concern ourselves and achieve merit in the eyes of the public, is that of Industrial Relations. President Truman in his message several weeks ago said that people don't like strikes. I don't suppose anybody likes them. But there seems to exist a shocking lack of intellectual capacity and ingenuity, in this country to cope with a situation which continually threatens the domestic peace.

District Judge Knox of New York has recently proposed the establishment of a Federal Court for hearing all labor disputes. Our own former Senator Burton, in collaboration with two other Senators, some time ago fostered a bill calculated to furnish a means of peaceful adjustment of such disputes. A Labor-Management conference is now being held in Washington. It may well be, that none of these plans, nor any other thus far advanced, are workable. But certain it is that the general public is anxiously awaiting some peaceful solution of a condition which in many particulars has the aspects of civil war. Public opinion has a way of refusing to be damned very long. It is therefore of the utmost urgency that some one devote serious thought—not emotion—to this particular problem which threatens to be with us for some time.

Of course it is a delicate subject. Even open attempt to discuss it will require not only intelligence, but even more, courage.

Here is a challenge to the organized bar to step forward and lead in an endeavor, not of personal benefit to lawyers only, but one that will bring to it the cheers and blessings of a long suffering public.

3. Just one word more: this has to do with the individual lawyer and his relation to the community.

President Taggart in that Trumbull County speech said:

"The lawyers will not only help themselves but the nation as well, by giving service to the community and recognizing that the public service phase of their profession is the reason for the powers and privileges they enjoy."

Of course you can point to many individual lawyers who devote some of their time to public affairs; some of them a great deal of time. Second only to the efforts of the organized bar I have referred to, the desirability of getting lawyers into politics is to me self-evident. And I mean lawyers who are the best equipped, who have had the benefit of a rounded education and who perhaps do not intend to make public office their life's work.

It used to be said: Scratch a lawyer and you'll find a politician. Unhappily that isn't so today. It almost seems that the most competent and best equipped for public service dread it the most. Speaking as a sort of vagabond politician myself, I can tell you it isn't all grief; its fun; at least when you're young. And it is not without its satisfactions and rewards.

Mr. Justice Douglas in a speech on this subject suggested that every lawyer upon admission to the bar be required to serve in public office for a year or two—a sort of political peacetime conscription. He said:

"When it becomes fashionable for the young lawyer to give a few years of his life to City or State, the lawyer will have resumed his traditional role of leadership in public affairs."

Judge Thatcher of New York, now sitting in the state's highest court, an able and distinguished lawyer and a fearless public official, referring, as usual, to the fading influence of the bar, suggested that every lawyer as a matter of duty, give some part of his time to public affairs. He said:

"I believe this may only be accomplished by dividing our time between our clients and the public, making clear in all of our *public* relations that we serve the *public* interest with the loyalty and confidence which are enjoined upon every lawyer when he undertakes to represent interests other than his own.—Certainly the retainers we accept imply no restraint upon our freedom thus to serve the public interest. If they do, they should not be accepted."

President Murray in his speech to this Association, to which I referred earlier said:

"Devotion to a client does not require a lawyer to adopt his client's social, economic or political ideals."

I'm afraid that is too often the fact. Even if it isn't, the public is all too likely to jump to that conclusion, and quite unjustifiably in many instances. It will take some unequivocal action by lawyers to remove that belief—and I am not pointing to lawyers of any particular class of clients either.

Some of you may recall that years ago John H. Clarke, later Justice of the Supreme Court, ran for the U. S. Senate against Calvin Brice. At that time Mr. Clarke was well known as a railroad lawyer. When in the campaign, he was asked how he reconciled some rather strong statements in the public interest, with his retainer as attorney for railroads, he said:

"They pay me merely for my services as a lawyer; my conscience is my own."

He was quite unlike the famous English nobleman of whom it was said: His conscience, instead of being his monitor, became his accomplice.

I should like to see our larger law offices, give some of their young men leave of absence for a year or two to serve in the legislature or City Council. That would be a practical demonstration of high minded citizenship which would reflect credit on them. It would be of benefit to the community, it would be a broadening influence to the man himself and make him a better lawyer.

4. "The Lawyer and the Community": a trite subject to be sure, but always new and of vast implications. Even if I haven't said anything new, the language of the eminent lawyers which I have quoted, should convince all of us, that to recover that prestige with the public, which they all tell us we have lost, requires something besides chest-pounding. We can't merely sit tight and "let the *status quo*." We can't rely on past glories: "there are no birds in last year's nests." It is a time for boldness, boldness to shake off this Old Man of the Sea to which these many speakers have so monotonously called our attention.

Let us not forget, that as lawyers our professional values depend upon the maintenance of such a free world as we now enjoy. Are we aware of the dangers to it? Our situation may be more serious than we think. With socialized medicine on the horizon, it may be *later* than we think.

If you have concluded that I am too much of a Cassandra, let me leave you with some encouraging words from Chief Justice Stone, found in the same speech from which I have previously quoted:

"Notwithstanding all the pressures of modern economic life upon the lawyer, and his absorption with the demands of client-caretaking, we could make no greater mistake than to assume that ours has become a profession without ideals. \* \* \*"

No one familiar with the history of the Bar, knowing its life and personnel, can doubt that it has the idealism, the will to sacrifice, the capacity for leadership, which will continue to enable it to play well its part. \* \* \* None will respond more willingly, with generous expenditure of time and effort, to the intelligent call for action. But none so much needs to know the *facts* which reveal, in clear relief, its altered position in the social structure and the manner in which under new conditions it is meeting its public responsibilities."

### Newly Admitted Members of the Bar

WM. FRANCIS KELTON, admitted April 8, 1946, under special war service rule. Univ. of Colo., B.A. 1939, LL.B. 1942. Member Phi Delta Theta and Pi Alpha Delta. In school was active in debating and on the school paper. Was with Title Guaranty Co. for five months, and in the army 3½ years—communications officer 2 years and in the Army Air Force 1½ years. Is interested in property, torts and trial work. Is practising on his own at 613 Majestic Bldg., Denver.

MRS. KATHRYN L. STALLINGS, admitted as result of June exam, Sept. 30, 1946. Univ. of Colo., A.B. 1944, LL.B. 1945. Member Kappa Kappa Gamma. Was editor Rocky Mountain Law Review, member Phi Beta Kappa and Order of the Coif. Was instructor in law, Univ. of Colo. Interested in business and public law. Now with Federal Power Commission, Bureau of Law, Washington, D. C.

DAVID EUGENE JOHNSON, admitted June 1946 on motion. Arkansas U. A.B. 1908, law degree 1909. Member Delta Phi Delta. Taught school and farmed. Practised law in Arkansas 1912 to 1945. Interested in general practice, probate, title work. Now practising alone at Springfield.

JOHN A. MENTER, admitted July 1946 on motion. Nebraska U. B.A. and LL.B. 1934. Member Delta Theta Phi. Has practised in Nebraska since 1936. Interested in general civil practice. Is now trying to locate in Julesburg.

RICHARD D. HALL, admitted Oct. 1946 on motion. Chicago U. A.B. 1937; law 1939. Member Phi Alpha Delta. Was on law review. Admitted to Illinois bar 1939, and practised there until 1943. Army 1943-1946. Interested in insurance and real estate. Doing claim adjustment work for January and Yegge, Equitable Bldg., Denver.

## ALUMINUM

*Permanent* *Ventilated*

## AWNINGS

Provide permanent protection for doors, windows and porches. The natural airy shade of a tree.

**NO FLAPS . . . NO RAGS  
NO RATTLES . NO SAGS**

Indestructible, permanent. Inside vision. Do not absorb moisture—do not rust or corrode.

Manufactured in Denver by  
**ALUMINUM AWNING CO.**

6000 W. 13th Ave.

FREE Estimates Gladly Given  
Patent applied for

Business Phone MA 6016  
Home Phone PE 6010

## MEMBERS OF THE COLORADO BAR ASSOCIATION

### Again You Have the Opportunity

We have arranged with our Company to re-open the enrollment of members under our SPECIAL DISABILITY PLAN for Members of the Bar Association on the same basis as the original enrollment.

This means that underwriting restrictions are relaxed and every member up to 69 years of age can apply.

Watch for complete details which will be mailed to you from this office.

**Edw. G. Udry Agency**  
**Commercial Casualty Insurance Co.**

500 California Bldg., Denver, Colorado  
Keystone 2525