

4-11-1977

Caveat, April 11, 1977


Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat>

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

"Caveat, April 11, 1977" (1977). *Caveat*. Paper 105.
<http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat/105>

This Newsletter or Magazine is brought to you for free and open access by the Other Law School Publications at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Caveat by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.



CAVEAT

DO NOT REMOVE FROM
LAW LIBRARY

Vol. XII, No. 25

Golden Gate University School of Law

APR 12 1977

(The following is an attempt to summarize the SBA minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, April 7, at 4 PM. The minutes were submitted by Judy Massong, SBA Secretary)

Correction of Minutes

There was a correction offered regarding the first year compression issue. Contrary to the Caveat report, first year night students overwhelmingly voted in favor of compression with Torts for Fall and Civil Procedure for Spring. A majority of first year day students also voted in favor of compression, however they did not want Crim. or Property compressed.

SBA Finances

Treasurer, Don Rosel, presented a detailed breakdown of University Held SBA funds, SBA checking account funds, and distribution of funds, which may not be totally accurate, but is at least a step in figuring out the financial status of the SBA. This information is posted on the SBA bulletin board.

Caveat Requirements

Student applications will be on file in the SBA office for review by SBA



START OF THE S.B.A. MINUTES

members who will be conducting the interviews on Thursday, April 14, commencing at 4 PM. Students will be notified and a time will be arranged for the interview which will last around 10 minutes consisting of questions about the criteria set out in the written application procedure. The interviewing SBA members will convene 30 minutes earlier to set out specific procedures for interviewing. Cindy Duncan presented the criteria she suggested for applications and asked the SBA members to formulate questions based on the criteria for interviewing.

Finance-Budget Committee

Reported on suggestions for implementing specific policies for dispersement of SBA monies, which will be put in writing someday and presented to the SBA for formalization. Cindy Duncan resigned as chairperson of the committee because she was too burned out. Someone will take her place.

Financial Aid Committee

Interested students contact Rick Clark at 398-2553 between 10 AM and 2 PM.

Special Committee

Mike Rosas will handle the arrangements for SBA speakers.

YMCA Passes

Ricky Rosen will chair committee to negotiate a deal with the Embarcadero Y for passes for law students. The interest for such an expenditure on part of the SBA was overwhelming.

Replacement of TV with Stereo

Forget it. The university owns it.

Caveat

The administration would like some input into Caveat since they pay the editors tuition. (ED. Guess who pays them the money to pay the editors?) Mary Minkus will be in charge from the administration end, mainly regarding registration information.

Hiring and Curriculum Committees

Only two applicants have signed up for the Hiring and Curriculum Committees. Interviewing will begin next Tuesday (12th) and Wednesday (13th). Tuesday, April 12 at noon will be application deadline.

TO TENURE OR NOT TO TENURE, THAT IS THE QUESTION.

Several weeks ago the following statement was read to the FSC by Ron Greenwood. It is being reproduced here today in order to emphasize the need for changing the traditional tenure system utilized by Golden Gate Law School.

Rather than just presenting this petition to the FSC, I have been requested to say a few words that pertain to how the petition was initiated, and why. I would like it to be known that I am representing an overwhelming majority of the first year section A students. Tuesday it was brought to our attention that Ken Hausman will probably not be rehired. Students came to me with the idea of a petition to demonstrate their support of Ken's qualities, and abilities as a professor, and their desire to see him rehired.

The petition reads as follows:

We the undersigned students express support for the re-hiring of Ken Hausman. While we support an affirmative action employment policy, we recognize from our first hand experience the proven excellence of Ken's teaching ability. Any decision formulated by the FSC should take into account student evaluations. Ken's qualifications are aptly demonstrated by the consistently high ratings he attained in the SBA Faculty Evaluations. Recognizing his demonstrated qualities and potential, we recommend that Ken Hausman be re-hired.

The students realize the increasing quality and number of persons applying to GGU for law professorships, and we understand that highly qualified visiting professors and new applicants will be turned away despite their superb abilities. This seems

to present a problem that goes beyond Ken Hausman being released despite his outstanding qualities as a professor. The inequity and injustice of the situation confronts us with the fact that some of these people losing their positions or being rejected as applicants exceed the quality of some tenured faculty. We feel that Ken Hausman is in that predicament. However much this fact situation steps on some professor's toes, it must be faced if we are to deal with this paradox. We as law students, future lawyers, judges, and professors in our own right, are the ones who pay the full price of retaining inferior tenured faculty at the cost of losing nontenured professors of superior quality. We request that Ken Hausman's name be added to the list of finalists being considered by the FSC today.

(Ed - we were advised that Ken's name was put on the list of finalists for consideration.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS:

To the editors:

I realize this a novel idea, but has anyone ever considered using the Caveat as a means of conveying important information to law students? Having watched this newspaper rapidly dissipate into social chit-chat and frivolous inside jokes, I (for one) would like to see the Caveat address itself to issues more pertinent to law students: perhaps a survey of classes offered (including mention of prerequisites); articles on employment options open to students and graduates; a series featuring the various professors (their background, etc.).

I am tired of turning the paper upside down only to read something dumb like: FINALS HAVE BEEN CANCELLED. If students are charged a fee to help subsidize Caveat, I expect to see better journalism - or I want my money back.

Kathleen Quenneville

Open letter -

When I decided to enroll here, I was under the impression that one advantage to this school would be individual attention for students with special problems. Seemingly, I was incorrect. I have approached two professors this year and asked them for about an hour of their time, to discuss confusing aspects of their subjects. I was rebuffed by both. They were too busy (today, this week, and this month ...). Ironically, these were both full-time professors, with no outside practice. (Night students who work full-time can hardly be impressed with their workload). Both teachers objected to the fact that I had no specific questions. Well, that is the sign of a student with real problems! I couldn't even formulate a specific question, although I had read all the material and attended all the lectures. I would think that a real teacher would jump at the chance to encourage and help this student, by being his or her mentor for one hour. In fact, a professor could prepare an outline or a flow chart to put the pieces of the syllabus together, making efficient use of the hour. Not all students will need help, but a substantial number do feel overwhelmed at times. And what about the relatively shy student, after gathering the courage to ask this favor, then being refused? They keep quiet, drop out or transfer.

Let's hear how other students feel about this, and also the professors' side of it. Perhaps if we use the Caveat as a forum, we can improve the situation (and stop helping Gilbert's get rich). Or am I expecting too much for only \$94 a unit?

Nancy de Ita
First Year Night Student

NLG MEETING

Don Stang, president of the National Lawyers Guild Bay Area chapter, will talk about local activities at noon, on Monday, April 11 in room 205. The meeting will also focus on legal/political activities that will involve law students from Bay Area schools this summer. A report on the April 6 executive board meeting and a GGU chapter treasurer's report will be presented as well.

THE VALIDITY OF CRITICISM - (AN EDITORIAL BY CINDY DUNCAN)

I am of the opinion school that "criticism"--be it constructive, destructive, aimless moaning or plain-ole bitching -- is vital. I do not, however, make this statement in a vacuum. The vitality of criticism in terms of myself as the "criticizer" stems from the philosophy from which I analyze my environment (society) and attempt to define my role in it. The statement that criticism is vital does not go unqualified.

My original desire to write an editorial about criticism was stimulated by the letter to the editors criticizing the Caveat. This editorial, and even my response to this particular letter, supercedes this original stimulus. Too often and too frequently, many of us engage in criticism without really considering what it is we are actually criticizing and why. It is to that issue I will attempt to speak in addressing the function of criticism in general and responding to the letter.

One function served by criticism is the fostering of discussion and debate - criticism in response - which in turn prevents complacency and stagnation. Defensive criticism is as vital a component of the dialectic of the critical process as initial criticism. The year is drawing to an end. Perhaps the criticism in the letter and my response to it in the form of this editorial will plant the seeds for some positive change and continued improvement for next year's Caveat editors.

Criticism of the Caveat abounds and will continue to, as it should, as long as there is a Caveat. (Just for the record, this criticism is engaged in by the editors as well as the readers.) As much as I actually enjoy the criticism and even occasionally solicit it, I also get sick and tired of it, and feel the need to return the criticism. I appreciate at least that the author of the letter took time to write down her criticisms and suggestions, rather than simply mumbling something to me in passing. I feel much more inclined to take the time to respond.

The idea of conveying important information to the students is not novel. This has been the goal of those involved in the production of the Caveat since its inception. Whether or not this has been accomplished is another question, the answer to which I suspect most people would be inclined to initially say "no." In regards to any given weekly issue I vacillate between thinking the paper is great or that it sucks. Occasionally I feel that we, as editors, could and should write more than we do, however, taking everything into consideration, I have absolutely no guilt feelings about our collective job as editors this year.

Three people could possibly spawn a revolution; they could never sustain it nor win it without a hell of a lot of consistent support. In the context of the Caveat and the law school itself, even major change will not occur or be sustained without more basic institutional support, especially when we are ultimately dependent financially upon the school. It is this lack of awareness that permeates much of the criticism I hear about everything that I find most offensive, and thus feel the need to criticize in return. It is many times too easy for us to strike out at each other and those who are at least trying to make the best of a system that lends little support to their effort, without understanding where much of the criticism should ultimately be directed (a product of frustration which I do respect and also find myself engaging in).

(SEE PAGE THREE)

(CRITICISM - CONTINUED FROM PAGE TWO)

We bitch about what we see in the Caveat, but do we know what is entailed (or try to find out) in being an editor. Do we offer input or articles? Are we aware of working conditions and budget problems? We bitch about the SBA, but do we attend meetings or attempt to change what we dislike? Are we aware of the rude reception that students sometimes receive when they do organize and attempt to effect changes in their interests? We bitch about the elitism of law review and the selection procedure, but are we aware of the efforts of those who have tried to make changes and will continue trying? We blast the clinic program and those who are involved, but do we consider how little supportive energy this school lends to the idea of clinical work being a major part of the law school "experience."

Am I saying that we should not criticize one another? Absolutely not! But, we function daily in a hierarchical system that thrives by its nature on those in nonpower positions hassling the shit out of each other because none of the hassling ever gets directed where it should - at the TOP. Therefore, criticism of one another must be only a beginning step in the critical process.

Caveat editors are paid by the law school to disseminate notices to the student body and maintain an open forum where students can express their opinions. Gathering notices and information from the Dean's office, Wally, the Registrar, SBA, student committees and organizations; typing; doing lay-out; selling ads; paying bills; corresponding with other newspapers is in and of itself very time consuming. This does not include creative writing, editorializing or reporting, which has been prevalent in this year's Caveat in comparison to the past when the Caveat has indeed served only as a bulletin of notices and a place where an irate student could occasionally articulate his or her anger.

I ran for Caveat editor on the platform that, along with accepting the traditional responsibility of getting the damn thing put out once a week, I would try to write about current political issues. I've done that. We wanted to expand the Caveat's role so that it would indeed be a forum where journalistic talent could be exercised. This entails more than idealistic visions which we quickly realized. A response from one administrator early in the year was that it would never work and that our function was to just get notices out to students. I personally went to every student organization and asked for weekly or monthly columns. Only the Environmental Society has ever contributed more than one substantial column. In specific response to the letter to the editor, we run a regular column based on information from Wally in the Placement Center. There is a very complete survey of classes offered, including prerequisites, in the yearly catalog. Following Diana's feature article on Bill Weiner in an earlier issue, three faculty members expressed disinterest in such an article on themselves. On the other side of the coin, I have been told "Who the hell wants to read about a professor?", "How come you guys didn't put any jokes in this week? The paper is really boring!".

However, some of your criticism is valid. I agree that turning the paper upside down and reading FINALS HAVE BEEN CANCELLED is dumb. That's why we put it upside down. (Some would disagree.) But what relevance do phrases like "important information" and "better journalism" have to three people who are sincerely trying to put out a paper and also trying to improve it when they only have a few notices and a couple of articles that they have written? In final response, we have made major improvements in the Caveat this year. (Past issues are on file in the library.) Next year's editors will undoubtedly continue to improve, but without a major change in the theory of what the law school sees the paper's function as and much more support and input from all students, idealistic visions of journalistic masterpieces should be set aside.

In summary (if that's possible at this hour of the night), keep criticizing each other, folks. But don't stop the criticism there. And if possible, offer a little support and help occasionally too. Remember, we're all BOZOS on the same bus.

For the next issue of Caveat, and the last issue of Caveat, turn in all items for publication by noon on Thursday, April 14, 1977, to the Caveat box in the faculty center east or to one of the editors.

Please bear in mind that the views expressed in Caveat are not necessarily those of the Law School, the Student Bar Association, etc.

It is now midnight and I have absolutely nothing relevant, amusing or

SUMMER OF '77

The following classes are being offered this summer:

Employment Discrimination - Mondays, 7½ wks. and Wednesdays, 3 wks. Room 203.

Accounting for Lawyers - Tuesdays, 7½ wks. and Thursdays, 3 wks. Room 203.

Origins of American Constitutional Law - Fridays, 10 wks. Room 203.

Community Property - Mondays, 7½ wks. and Wednesdays, 3 wks. Room 205.

Corporations - Tuesdays and Thursdays, 10 wks. Room 205.

Tax 1B - Mondays and Thursdays, 7½ wks. Room 207.

Contract Drafting - Wednesdays, 10 wks. Room 207.

Professional Responsibility - Mondays and Wednesdays, 5 wks. Room 209.

Appellate Advocacy - Tuesdays, 10 wks. and Thursdays, last 5 wks. Room 209.

All classes meet from 6:50 - 9:30 PM unless otherwise stated. Term is from May 31 - August 5. (10-week courses end week of August 1 and 7½ week courses end week of July 18.) Final examinations will be given at the last meeting of each class.

Registration schedule for summer classes:

May 2 to May 27 - Open registration for all students who will attend summer session. (This includes students from other law schools as well as GGU students.)

May 31 to June 3 - Extended hours for registration; all students may register until 6:45 each evening.

June 3 - Last day to register without a late fee.

June 6 to June 10 - Late registration is in effect. A late registration fee of \$10.00 will be charged.

June 10 - Last day to register or add courses.

even mildly interesting to add to the weekly box. I'm worried about catching a bus at this hour. Oh well

Editors: Diana Baker
Cindy Duncan
Carlos Kaslow

Staff: We were deserted in our time of direst need.

WHERE HAS ALL THE \$ GONE?

Since Caveat is the largest SBA expenditure, you should know what we did with your money.

RECEIPTS:

SBA Allocation	\$1060.00
Reversal of bank service charges for prior year ...	5.65
Advertisements:	
B.A.R.	190.00
B.R.C.	1.00
San Francisco Symphony ...	70.00
Personal	30.00
Carry-over from last year .	54.97
 Total receipts	 \$1411.62

MONIES OWED CAVEAT:

C.A.S.S. (Student advertising agency)	\$ 90.00
B.A.R.	20.00
 Total outstanding	 \$ 110.00

DISBURSEMENTS:

Supplies:

Paper, tape, scissors, keys, stapler, liquid paper, scotch tape, typewriter ribbons, rubber cement, etc.	\$ 80.38
Fancy issue	229.22
Total for other issues	731.16
Typing	25.00
 Total disbursements	 \$1065.76

DEBTS:

3/14 - 4/4 issues	\$ 160.86
-------------------------	-----------

(We will also owe for this issue and 4/18)
(This has not been paid because we just got authorization for the remaining \$200.00 SBA allocation to-day.)

Current bank balance is \$145.12. I figure I'm off by 74 cents ... when I figure it with an adding machine, I hope to find it.)

The fancy issue was an experiment that obviously did not work out. Our budget just cannot sustain a cost of \$229.22 per week. The fancy issue also required over a week of lag time. Few people meet our noon deadline on Thursday so it seemed ridiculous to require notices of meetings, etc. two weeks in advance.

So, we went back to doing our own layout and using off-set printing which runs about \$45.00 for a four-page issue. (We latched on to a memo from Spectrum that stated that they had cut their costs from \$430.00 per issue to \$117.00. We print between 400 and 500 copies - Spectrum probably prints more so their cost should be somewhat higher.)

That's it for what we have done with your bucks. More about what we did for our third tuition off will follow.

Diana C. Baker
Co-Editor and Bookkeeper.

Note to Nancy Carter:

"A student complained about flies around the trash cans upstairs." - Herschel

"Maybe we could feed them to the mice." - Joyce

YOU IDIOTS!

The Editors received a message from one of our readers. (Since it was merely a corner of last week's Caveat at it doesn't reach the standing of a letter.) Someone had circled the paragraph concerning the registration fees in the article on the California Bar Exam, underlined "nor later than four months prior to examination", drew an arrow to this section and added the words "You idiots".

If you assume that this information was for the benefit of graduating seniors only, you are correct, we are idiots. Obviously, it is less than four months prior to the examination. However, since the applications for the Bar Exam have not been supplied yet, you do not have to meet this requirement.

If you assume that this information was for the benefit of all students who will be taking the Bar Exam in the coming years, then it makes sense to include this jazz about deadlines.

(We may indeed be idiots - but for different reasons.....)

I'VE HAD IT!

(AN EDITORIAL BY DIANA C. BAKER)

This was going to be a calm, straight-forward explanation of what we do as Caveat editors. It is not. I drafted up another article and got madder and madder as I did so.

The Caveat position is tuition free. This year we had three editors (in case you didn't know) and we split the tuition equally. This worked out to \$435 per semester per editor. While I believe the job is a good deal in comparison to SBA President and Editor-in-Chief of Law Review, it's not exactly fun and games.

When I applied for editor, I did so on a platform suggesting more humor, less tenseness and a general "get down-home" attitude. It was and is my view that the Caveat ought to give up aspirations of being the Wall Street Journal of the West and do what it's supposed to do -- disseminate information and act as an open forum for a free exchange of views.

Our efforts in this direction have been met with criticism as being too "ingroupie". Some of this criticism is well-founded. I think it stems from a natural reliance on people and things one knows when desperately searching for fillers rather than an innate elitism. It has always been our feeling that Caveat is open to everyone and is for everyone. We have stressed that we welcome articles and letters from everyone and we print virtually anything. But if people don't want to contribute, what the hell are we supposed to do about it?

Our staff is totally volunteer. We appreciate all the help we have received. However, since they write articles out of the goodness of their hearts, we are in no position to mandate that they do anything.

To put out a four-page issue, we start around three o'clock and usually finish around ten o'clock. This depends on how much material was submitted for publication. If we do not have enough for a four-pager, we try to keep it to

(SEE PAGE FIVE)

"I'VE HAD IT" EDITORIAL - CONTINUED FROM PAGE FOUR

two pages because it costs more than twice as much for four. If we have "must print" material for only three pages, we have to stretch to make the fourth page since there is little saving on three. This is no problem if we have a back-log of material. If we do not, we have to be very creative to fill a page. A big complaint about Caveat last year was the wasted space. (See last year's Caveat at the library reserve desk.) For this reason, we have tried to avoid filling spaces with printer's garbage (i.e., chickens, deer, cupids, etc.) Some of you would have preferred printer's garbage to our garbage. You can't please everybody.

The working conditions leave a lot to be desired. The office was designed for a munchkin who sees in the dark. It's hot in the summer (I used to bring a halter top to change into on Caveat days) and cold in the winter. Basically, it's GGU library weather conditions. There is one skinny desk for the SBA which Carlos uses for doing ads and drawing lines. The typewriter sits on a rather good-sized table (but then, it's a good-sized typewriter). I've grown to know and hate the IBM. The ribbon has to be changed after 3/4s use of it gets jammed and takes about a half hour to unjam (Carlos's specialty). The trick is that you can't tell when the ribbon is at the 3/4th point. Another attractive feature is its hop when you type. It eventually hops right into the wall. Cindy does lay-out on a window seat. This causes backaches (I know from the times I did lay-out) and it's so poorly lit that after a while your eyes give out and everything becomes a fuzzy blur. (Working with rubber cement may contribute to this.)

In addition to approximately seven hours per week under these bizarre conditions, it takes time to do the bookkeeping which consists of paying the bills and billing for advertisements. Periodically, we send out current issues of the Caveat to other law schools (twenty-two to be exact). Any articles, interviews, coverage of meetings, etc. adds additional time. For example, covering the FSC meeting and reporting on it took me around four hours.)

The Caveat editors are also responsible for preparing the orientation handbook for new students. This amounted to over forty hours of work for Cindy and myself this summer.

For our efforts, we have been subjected to cute quips about boring Caveat issues, requested rebates, "What only two pages?", etc. Needless to say, we received very few constructive criticisms along with these charming comments. Frankly, I don't know how last year's editor retained her sanity. We are quickly losing ours along with our patience.

I feel that we have improved on last year's Caveat and I trust that next year's editors will improve on this one. I sincerely hope that they receive more support - financially and otherwise - than we did.

CORPORATION STUDENTS

Corporations will meet in Room 209 on Thursday, April 14 ONLY.

THIRD WORLD COALITION PRESENTS ...

The Third World Coalition will present a film, "Puerto Rico", on Wednesday, April 13, at 3 PM in room 205. The movie will be presented in two parts, depicting a socio-economic analysis of present day Puerto Rico and re-enactments of key historical events. Included will be filmed interviews with participants in the Puerto Rico Independence Movement recounting the long history of United States involvement there.

All students are invited to attend!

WEDGE OF
GOOSE →



FINGER-PRINTING FOR THE JULY CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION

Assuming that the July California Bar applications arrive by then, a fingerprinting service will be here on Wednesday, April 13. The finger-printers will be in the hall on the second floor between noon and 6:45 PM.

The first set of prints will cost \$2.75. A second set will cost \$1.50.

If the Bar applications do not arrive before Wednesday, the fingerprinting service will be re-scheduled for a later date.

PUSH BUTTON RESEARCH

Interested in having your legal research done for you at the push of a button? The Law Library will be sponsoring a demonstration of the LEXIS automated legal research system. LEXIS is Mead Data Corporation's on-line computer system that indexes court decisions from all U.S. District Courts, U.S. Courts of Appeals, the U.S. Supreme Court and the higher courts of the major states (including California). It includes the United States Code as well as full-text libraries of cases and materials relating to federal tax, securities and trade regulation law. All are searched rapidly and accurately using simple commands. Many large law firms are now using LEXIS, and students are urged to familiarize themselves with the system. The demonstration has been tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, April 19 in Nancy Carter's office. Groups will be limited to ten people to insure that everyone has a chance to see the terminal in operation. Sign-up sheets will be available at the Circulation Desk of the Law Library when the date has been confirmed.

William Benemann
Technical Systems Librarian

NO EVIDENCE THIS SUMMER

We had hoped to offer Evidence at night during the summer but no teacher was available to teach it then. However, it will be offered in the evening in the Fall of 1977 so that those night students who wish to enroll in the year-long litigation course can fulfill the requirement that Evidence be taken before the second semester of litigation.

It will also be offered in the day this summer at a time to be announced next week - either 8:00-9:40 Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays or 9:00-10:00 on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

WALLY'S WORKSHOP

Judicial Clerkships - Second Year students interested in applying for a judicial clerkship beginning Fall 1978 should see Wally. Earliest application date is this April 15; should be completed no later than June. Don't wait until August.

Summer Jobs - Now is the time to get crackin' on organizing your job search, before finals. Let me know if I can assist with resume preparation, resource materials, etc. We will get job listings from now through June primarily from small law firms; check the placement board.

GRUISING THE CITY BY D. CARLOS KASLOW

Engines roar, dust as thick as smoke from a three alarm fire fills the air and passersby with mouths half open stare glassy eyed as a ten ton steel ball rains destruction upon a once proud building. These are the scenes next to 536 Mission Street as Golden Gate University begins construction of the long awaited "new building". Nowhere on Mission Street is there a better show. A five million dollar plus budget and a cast of hundreds makes this construction project the place to be if you're looking for lunch time excitement.

The star of the first act is a diesel powered crane and its operator, who has a keen sense of the dramatic. On several occasions this master of the demolition ball has held audiences in spellbound suspense. He tickles their interest with near misses and slow drops. When interest is about to wane he brings cheers from the crowd with a fall of his ball that

sends tons of concrete and plaster to the ground.

Supporting this human and mechanical duo is a smartly dressed construction worker, with optic yellow hard hat, spraying water into the air in a vain attempt to settle the bellowing dust. This part of the show has brought tears to the eyes of the Marin commuters as they look thirstily at the flying water. However, the oohs and ahs of approval consistently drown out the cries of anguish.

Wonder where the best spot to view the show is ??? My favorite spot is the 5th floor men's restroom at G.G.U. The windows along the west wall of the fifth floor also offer good viewing, but most require that you be over 5'11" if this is to be done in comfort. Last week casual watching of this mechanical extravaganza could be done from the street, but this

will soon be impossible when the walk tunnel is completed.

The nihilistic first act of the show is coming to an end. Soon cement trucks will be roaring up Mission Street signaling the beginning of the second act, which could be more exciting than the first. Those cement trucks will be carrying the foundation of G.G.U.'s new tomorrow. Once a proper foundation has been laid, new heights will be reached as the steel skeletal frame of the edifice reaches five stories into the sky. The cast of work-persons will follow the building skyward performing death defying deeds of construction high above the earth without a net.

Thank you Dean Judy McKelvey for the part you played in bringing Golden Gate University one of the most exciting shows in its history.

QUACK QUACK QUACK QUACK QUACK QUACK QUACK



The basic idea for this cartoon is from TENANT SURVIVAL, booklet by the Tenants Action Group staff, S.F.G.A. Mary Mattson.

WE NEED YOU IN AUGUST! New Student Orientation

Once, long ago, you were new to Golden Gate Law School. Did the orientation program you went through help you? Depress you? Bore you? Do you remember what you needed then that you didn't get? Or that you got very well? Would you be able to give an hour on August 11 or 12, and talk from the shoulder to a small group of incoming students? They have so many questions that you know the answers to.

If so, see Georgia Schwaar or leave a message for her on the board or in locker 414, second floor, or phone 321-0737.

CAN WE DUPLICATE THE DUPLICATOR?

Many students have requested that a second Xerox machine be installed in the Law Library. An order was placed several weeks ago but, so far, Xerox has been unable to supply a machine. The Xerox manufacturing plant is in Rochester, New York. According to the local representative, the severe winter weather caused production stoppages which have resulted in a shortage of machines. The Law Library has been assured that its order has priority status and that a second machine will be installed as soon as one is available.

Nancy Carter