First Year Class Reps. Elected
by David Keselpp
SBA members from the Class of 1987 were elected during the Octo-
ber 26 meeting. There are twelve representatives allotted to the class. The dealy of the meeting to eleven names were on the ballot. The winning ballot was the fifth. Ms. Linda Robison, was elected in candidate. Approximately 60 ballots were cast from a group of over 160 eligible voters (see accompanying box).

The position was attributed in part to the fact that the can-
didate's platform statement, which was to have been published in the SBA Newsletter, was never released. Ms. Kate Cruse '89, one of the new representatives, asked for, at the October 26 meeting. Ms. Andrea Johnson, a member of the Communication Committee, which distributes the Newsletter, replied that the state-
ments were never distributed.

The platform listed a number of issues to which the repre-
sentative candidates expressed inten-
tion. They include library hours, student housing, legislation of moving into the new building, and affirmative action. One representative described the platform as "a somewhat progressive, but basically politically neutral position.

One issue on which the group is deeply divided is the hand-
ing of the election itself. There is a consensus that the SBA was im-
provised and that it failed to address adequately acceptable first-year student membership roles and functions. Most of those who were elected are either members of organized groups, such as the ARLS, or have friends (Continued on Page 5).

Disenfranchisement Fails
by Jeff Katcher
Since the beginning of this school term a number of very important activities such as the Ad Hoc Convocation Hearings, the tenured faculty meeting in trying to disenfranchise non-
tenured faculty, and the SBA meeting to discuss the motion that the Abolish Committee arguments, have occurred. Those issues which have given rise to the current disenfranchisement are of grave and lasting impression for this law school as an institution and in the community (perhaps in some sense, "community") both in its present condition and the future which must pass between its walls. Yet, by the same token, the challenges and surrounding many of these activities is the lack of attendance by the law school community, particularly students.

The tenured faculty met in the absence of students for discussion and analysis of the basic underlying dilemma of disenfranchisement. Further, any discussion and conclusions are also subject to the component which looks toward the formulation of reasonable responses to such difficulties.
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Committee Plan Attacked As Autocratic
by Patrick C. English
A meeting of the editors of an "executive committee" which would "have all the power of the full faculty to act," subject to mandatory review by the full faculty, was held at the beginning of the meeting.

The plan for the executive committee was disclosed at an Oxford, Simmons said that even if the committee was attacked as a "bashing loud toward autonomy," by Professor Frank Askin, Askin termed the plan "totally unacceptable.

The draft proposal is clearly designed to address the internal weaknesses threatening to bring the business of the faculty to a standstill. The external environment is being used to give the power to review the actions of all standing student-faculty committees (except those dealing with personnel matters) before the recommendations of those committees would be passed upon by the entire faculty. The executive committee would have the power to override the recommendations of standing committees and offer alternative recommendations to the faculty.

Controversy over
Determinations of Members Professor Schwartz distributed the draft proposal to members of the faculty in what he termed an attempt to attain their atti-
tudes toward the plan. Time for debate was limited to only about 15 minutes, and the proposal was by no means thoroughly dis-
cussed, but it immediately brought into conflict over whether such a committee, if created, should be elected by the full faculty or appointed by the Dean. Many on the faculty apparently feared that such a committee, if appointed, would centralize power in the law school and minimize its contribution to an unhealthy degree. Others on the faculty indicated that they were willing to run such a risk in order to try to overcome the problems which have threatened at times to paralyze the faculty.

After the draft was released, the Law Review learned that student members of the planning committee had been excluded from participating in the discussions which led to the draft proposal for the executive committee. When asked about this unusual procedure Professor Schwartz explained that last year when the faculty referred the draft proposal to the planning com-
mittee (Continued on Page 6)

Governors Hear Simmons On Programs
by Frank Viscomi
Speaking informally before the University Board of Governors last month, Dean Peter Simmons commented that the University’s minority admission programs are "successful" that results have been different than originally expected.

He also stated that the law school was working on adding new programs and growth of a pro-Bakke decision by the Supreme Court.

In response to questions by members of the Board of Governors, Simmons said that the "most interesting" minority admission programs have been "successful" that results have been different than originally expected.

He also stated that the law school was working on adding new programs and growth of a pro-Bakke decision by the Supreme Court.

In response to questions by members of the Board of Governors, Simmons said that the "most interesting" minority admission programs have been "successful" that results have been different than originally expected.
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Disenfranchisement Debated

(Continued from Page 1)

opposed or favored disen-
franchisement. Although the meeting appeared at first to mean-end
with its underlying purpose the dialogue soon turned on what can be characterized as the meaning of the vote. These grounds can be best presented if one asks the following two questions: 1. How should the University regulations which require students to have a direct vote in the appointments process? 2. How should the "in-
volvement of non-tenured faculty in the government of an institution whose faculty are at the same time valedictory control over the board agreement is玛a problem in the appointment process, upon that process, in a situation, and the nature of the non-tenured faculty which is symptomatological and Varios Rationale Given
The basic University regulations should be complied with was advanced on various grounds.

Professor Gerard Moran contended that the tenured faculty should only vote to acquiesce and should concentrate on developing in-house procedures for a responsive and effective faculty involvement. His most important premise was that there is no one at the law school with the responsibility of serving the University and, while he would acknowledge the"mixed" Dean who was more experienced, Professor Edward President P. Benson did not than the faculty.

"Haynes" argued that there were no rational grounds upon which to give the Disenfranchisement of junior faculty. He stated that there were faculty members who were not sufficiently to give the Disenfranchisement of junior faculty who comply with the non-tenured faculty were no more different from non-tenured faculties so as to出于 my request for authorization merely arbitrary.

Opponents Object
Opponents of disenfranchisement argued that the law school should act upon University regulations or should adopt the view and see approach regarding the University's role in the law school before disenfranchisement is imposed. The positions were variably argued.

Professor Ammamay Sheppard stated that the argument warranted a fight. She indicated that the tenured faculty should know that to disenfranchisement struck at the heart of the institution's integrity as an academic community. Reflection on the quality of the non-tenured faculty was supported by Professor Calvin Johnson, a member of the non-tenured faculty myself, that disengagement was the "inability to assign an adequate pace on the junior faculty.

Not Pressured
Professor Sheppard had offered his opinion that as long as the University did not pressure to have a tenured faculty member is not constrained in an effort to conform. Professor Eugene Latin, another member of the junior faculty present at the meeting, agreed with Professor Schwartz commenting that, "if the University is going to disengagement itself, right thing to do in this situation is nothing because of the disengagement itself.

Turning to the second major theme, some proponents of disenfranchisement contended that the courts are necessary to determine reasons for indigenous to this law school, and the current appointments process were beneficial because of the very nature of non-tenured faculty.

Lack of Scholarship Deprived
Professors James C. Paul and Edward Scardino contended that the quality of the law school was hampered by the advancement of scholarly and scholarship and output of many of the junior faculty.

Professor Singer argued that the appointments process was an extravagant waste of junior faculty time and how to form a tenured faculty's organization and how to conduct negotiations with the leadership of the law school.

But, as Connolly was quick to interject, there were certain issues which should not be able without legal counsel, and the code did not, nor does it now, fail to understand that the practice was wrong.

There is a "basic need for education," Connolly stated, and that such have been provided by the use of e.g. demanding receipt of rents paid, as well as in positive aspects: for example, how to file a complaint. The tenant should know that the law is not enough, and there is always a need to advance along political and social pressure. Fortunately, the People's Law School is attended both by tenants and community residents, so that the matters have been submitted. And not only do Newark residents appear in court, but they also appear in some surrounding towns: they use the course as a resource, and may later impart some information back to the urban work. For example, the landlord/tenant organization is a property law through a more extended study of the law, which is based on a central theme: the "notion that age comes with a "bucolic" of workpeople, and in what it was like.

Tsi was Jnr. Victory.

It was clear from the meeting that the reason that a tie vote led to a decision in favor of the status quo was based on the lack of support under the motion to give the tenured faculty additional rights over appointments. That rule required an absolute majority of those voting, but this proposal would have changed it to a majority for approval. The total number of tenured faculty was 26 and a majority would have been 14.