

1-1-1970

A Note from the Editor

Buffalo Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/buffalolawreview>

Recommended Citation

Buffalo Law Review, *A Note from the Editor*, 19 Buff. L. Rev. v (1970).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/buffalolawreview/vol19/iss2/1>

This Editorial Note is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at Digital Commons @ University at Buffalo School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Buffalo Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University at Buffalo School of Law. For more information, please contact lawscholar@buffalo.edu.

A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

FOLLOWING close behind the recent upsurge of student activism, with its accompanying strains on and violations of university codes of discipline, are the often unpopular student dismissals or suspensions. With increasing frequency, the courts are being asked to review the penalties imposed by the universities. In our lead article, Professor Robert O'Neil vigorously and eloquently argues for a reexamination of one of the fundamental propositions of "campus constitutional law." The editors agree with Professor O'Neil's arguments and hope a change in the law may be forthcoming.

The *Review* is delighted to publish another article of topical interest. Richard D. McCarthy, Congressman from New York, reviews the latest developments in environmental defense law, a field in which he has shown an interest and ability in Congress. Our readers should also enjoy Hilary Bradford's article on the Securities and Exchange Commission's Rule 10(b)(5). Further analysis of Rule 10(b)(5) is always timely, but Mr. Bradford's article is especially so, reflecting the Second Circuit Court of Appeals' recent decision in *Iroquois Industries, Inc. v. Syracuse China Corp.*

In our last issue, we published Professor Sutherland's article on reform within legal education, a subject of considerable importance. One aspect of reform, not directly touched upon in that article, is the current effort to write casebooks which, wherever possible, reflect the interrelationship of the law and contemporary socio-economic conditions. A recently published casebook which attempts to satisfy the demand for relevance in real property law is Professor Lefcoe's *Land Finance Law*. Since the real property curriculum, in particular, has been marked by revitalization and change, and the revision of the teaching materials has not been without significant differences of opinion, the editors have invited eight scholars to present their views on *Land Finance Law*. The results, appearing in this issue, not only reveal a healthy debate about Professor Lefcoe's concept of a casebook, but also illuminate a significant number of problems crucial to the reform of legal education.

* * *

Traditionally, feedback from our readers has been confined to business affairs. We are, however, interested in your views regarding the content, variety, and quality of the articles published. At the discretion of the Board of Editors, responsible criticism of positions taken in articles appearing in the *Review* will be published. We invite your comments.

* * *

One of the few occasions on which *Review* editors will be heard to question the honor and worth of their positions is during the last few weeks of preparation of the Winter issue. Unavoidably, the time to send the issue to the printer and the time to study for final exams coincide. For the participants, one is as intense a process as the other. The volume of work appears to increase while the

BUFFALO LAW REVIEW

allotment of time decreases. That the *Review* does not suffer is a tribute to the cooperation of our faculty members supervising student research, to the patience of our secretaries, and to the skills of our printer.

* * *

The *Review* takes pride in the efficiency of its business operations. As part of this year's effort our managing editor took to examining the contents of a dusty drawer in the office. A past board member, no doubt a collector of camp mementos, had neglected to deposit a check from the State of Hawaii for a past volume. Reference to the Uniform Commercial Code told us that the almost two year old check was indeed stale. Our editor, preferring hard cash to primordial artifacts, sent for another. In a letter dated August 13, 1969 the State of Hawaii advised us that the new check would become void after June 30, 1971. Our hats are off to the Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services; they will be most happy to learn that our June 29, 1971 advance calendar has been indelibly noted as the last date for deposit.