

2-13-1978

## Caveat, February 13, 1978

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

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Caveat, February 13, 1978" (1978). *Caveat*. Paper 120.  
<http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat/120>

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](mailto:jfischer@ggu.edu).



# CAVEAT



Vol. XIII, No. 21

Golden Gate University School of Law

February 13, 1978

## Tuition Figures Presented

DO NOT REMOVE FROM  
LAW LIBRARY  
FEB 13 1978  
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY

which should be discussed and an agreement worked out.

Tuition increases mean only the rich need apply.

THE THREE STUDENT MEMBERS OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE HAVE PREPARED THE FOLLOWING REPORT. IT ANSWERS SOME OF THE QUESTIONS STUDENTS MAY HAVE ON WHY THE TUITION IS BEING RAISED TO \$112/UNIT NEXT YEAR. IT ALSO RAISES MANY OTHER QUESTIONS WHICH ARE UNANSWERED AT THIS TIME.

Golden Gate School of Law has prided itself in being among the lowest priced private law schools in the state, yet offering a quality education, and developing affirmative action to attract women and minority law students. But there is a point where one becomes the lowest priced caviar trying to attract those whose budget don't cover chicken. It doesn't matter anymore that you are the lowest priced, the lowest price is still out of reach. It doesn't matter that every penny of \$112 is justified if your NDSL loan of \$3,500 maximum per year will only cover 30 units of tuition and \$100 of books and supplies. The question becomes -- what will you live on? If you are full time on a maximum FISL of \$2,500, your position is even worse. If you are a night student taking 23 units per year (including summer session) you will pay \$2,576 in tuition alone -- an enormous amount of any paycheck -- and even worse if you are attempting to support a spouse and/or children with that same paycheck. This tuition increase and the increases surely to come will put a law school education out of the reach of minorities, single women (with or without children) and even the middle income wage earners. Law will be returned to being a profession for the rich -- and that's a damned shame.

### SOME THRESHOLD CONSIDERATIONS

Contrary to all we've learned in law school, we begin this report with our conclusions because we feel that it is of utmost importance to consider these questions while reading our budget analysis.

While tuition has gone up 133% in the last seven years, the University has stopped the law school's fundraising efforts (see below), and available student aid has not

(continued page 4)

### What if we don't move into the new building in August?

As you will see in the indirect budget discussion below, many of the costs and much of the increase is based on the assumption that the new building is completed on time. Workers on the building don't seem to feel that August is a realistic date. Could an agreement be reached with the University lowering the tuition if the money projected on this basis does not get spent? Alternatively, if we do pay full tuition, but don't move in when scheduled, where will the money projected but not used go? Into the building fund? There are serious questions here

## Minority Hiring Urged

The Coalition further requests that two full-time, third-world faculty members be selected this year for the coming 1978-79 school year.

The Third World Coalition has been working on Affirmative Action requests of the FSC Committees. Thursday, after the CAVEAT had gone to press, the Coalition met with the Administration to submit their request concerning the FSC Hiring Committee.

"The Coalition finally asks that the Law School Hiring Committee form a special "Search Committee" to do the intensive scouting necessary to find the third-world applicants desired by the school. This Search Committee would be formed only to signify the failure of the Hiring Committee to deliver on its expressed intentions of finding and submitting for selection third-world applicants who have reasonable chances of being hired. This Search Committee should include any third-world faculty members currently employed by the Law School and should be heavily weighted with third-world students of the Law School. This Search Committee should receive adequate and reasonable funding to properly carry on the function it is to be constituted to perform."

"The Third World Coalition requests that full-time, third-world faculty members be selected for the coming school year (1978-79) from the pool of applicants interviewed this year.

"The Coalition additionally emphasizes our desire for written confirmation of an Affirmative Action policy which mandates employing at least two full-time, third-world faculty members at all times and more generally reflects the percentage of the Bay Area population that is third-world. The term third-world is meant to include the Asian, Black and LaRaza people of the area.

The CAVEAT will cover the other Third World Coalition proposals in later issues.

## "Going Back to Houston .."

and Willamette to win the championship. Because of the large number of teams that entered the competition, the competition was organized into two pyramids of competing teams so that two champions were selected (the other was McGeorge's second team); both GGU and McGeorge will go to the National Competition.

TWO GGU LAW STUDENTS QUALIFY FOR THE NATIONAL MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION IN HOUSTON NEXT MONTH.

Margaret Petrie and James Molesky, both second year law students, represented GGU in the Western Regional Mock Trial Competition held on January 27, 28 and 29 at McGeorge Law School in Sacramento. Bernie Segal participated as coach of the team. This is the second time in the three year existence of the National Mock Trial Competition that GGU has won it. No other school has previously captured two Regional Championships.

The National Competition will be held in Houston on March 1-3, 1978. Fourteen teams, representing the seven Regional champions will litigate against each other. The case which is the subject of this year's competition is Otway v. Title Security Co., a pending case in which a customer of a quick-service food market alleges he was shot by a security guard and has sued for damages arising from the incident. The students are required to be

GGU's team defeated Arizona State University, McGeorge

(continued back page)

# And Then There Were Four

CROOKS, HANOVAN, SCHWARTZ, AND RUBINOFF  
ADVANCE TO REING PINBALL CLASSIC FINALS

The field has now been narrowed to four contestants in the Gary Reing Memorial Pinball Classic. In the Western Regionals competition, Tom Hanovan defeated Perry Hedin, while Don Crooks upset pre-tournament favorite Mark Derzon in order to join the select field who will be vying for the championship this week.

In the Eastern Regionals, held at Fun Terminal, Chuck Rubinoff, whose constant chatter from the sidelines seemed to unnerve his opponents defeated first Donna Courtney and then Bob Bonovich. Ron Schwartz handily disposed of Mitchell Kleinrock and Connie Tavel.

An anonymous M.O.L.E. spokesman told the Caveat, "We are tremendously pleased with the tournament so far. The caliber of play and the sportsmanship displayed by everybody except Rubinoff has been great! I do want to warn the four finalists that Gary Reing has issued a challenge to the eventual winner of the tournament. He has indicated that he will fly out to play the winner in order to determine the real champion. I also want to remind people that the M.O.L.E.s' next event will be the Eric Safire World Series of Poker. It will be open to all students, faculty, and administration at the Law School. We will have a more detailed announcement about this winner-take-all event next week. And don't worry Joey, we haven't forgotten about the pool tournament."

# SOUTH of MARKET GOURMET

by David Cooper

## B & M FAMILY RESTAURANT

I'd never been to B&M, 110 First Street, till this past week when I went there on the recommendation of students who thought I'd like their Asian food. B&M is a very familiar atmosphere to those of us who are aficionados of the Coffee Cup. They have similar food, a similar floor plan, and the same choice between ordering fresh from the kitchen wok or taking what's available on the hot plate.

B&M's food is certainly comparable to the Coffee Cup in quality, if not better. However their prices are considerably higher. Where most rice dishes at Coffee Cup are \$1.65 to \$1.75, B&M's like dishes are \$1.80 to \$2.00. But I must emphasize that their food is good. They carry Wonton soups, Beef \$1.60, Shrimp \$1.85. Also noodle soups at \$1.60 for Beef, \$1.85 Shrimp. Like Coffee Cup their hot plate Chinese Style Beef Stew is not very good, but their Curry (I think) Chicken looked good even though it was hot plate.

One thing that's different about B&M is that they carry American style breakfast from 7 AM to 10 AM. I tried their BBQ Pork Omelet which I found to be too greasy.

Other S of M Gourmet News: Although our first review was of a place that was open for night students, none of our subsequent reviews have been. I'm real sorry about that folks, but we don't have too many places in the area open after 3:00. However, I will be sure that the next one or two "restaurants" will serve supper clientele.

Also, a friend of mine asked me to write whether these places are accessible to people in wheel chairs. I said that there were no longer any people on the staff or among the students who were confined to wheels. She said I couldn't let people take it for granted that everybody walked. So, for the record -- Zazu Pitts, Friendly Cafe, Coffee Cup, and B&M are all accessible to wheel chairs. Jessica Stone's is not. Also, none of them are kosher.

LAURIE DEUTSCH HAS SENT THE FOLLOWING LETTER TO GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY LAW STUDENTS IN CARE OF THE CAVEAT.

Dear Students;

I would like to take this opportunity to share some personal good news with the Golden Gate Community.

As many of you know, my primary professional interest in the past has been delivery of legal services to the poor. Upon graduation from law school, I worked for two years on a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellowship in the Mission Community of San Francisco. For the last several years I have served as vice president of San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation and have been an active member of the Board of Directors, and the Board's Executive and Personnel Committees.

Thus, when I was contacted by the Legal Services Corporation in Washington and asked to be in charge of several legal services programs in California and other states, I felt constrained to give the offer serious consideration, even though they wanted me to start work with them immediately. Ultimately, given the challenge of the job, the contribution I felt I could make, the increase in responsibility and concomitant compensation, I decided to accept the offer.

The decision to leave academe for the "real world" was not an easy one. I have enjoyed many aspects of teaching at Golden Gate; above all I have enjoyed working with the students. I was delighted by the wonderful evaluations you gave me this year, and I was overwhelmed by your letters and telephone calls, expressing disappointment that I was leaving. Inasmuch as my new office is located close to Golden Gate, at 177 Post Street, I hope that the friendships we have formed will continue.

I wish you all the best in coming years.

Sincerely,

Laurie Deutsch

## PRESIDENT BUTZ REPLIES

Just before press time on Thursday, the Caveat talked with University President Otto Butz to get his side of a story which we printed in our article on the SBA Meeting last week. We reported then that SBA President Richard Wright had told the SBA that he requested the Board of Trustees to delay the tuition increase until their next meeting in February so that students could have a chance to consider the raise. We also reported that Butz "denounced" the delay and that his grounds for not delaying were that "students needed to learn that they were not running the school and that they could do nothing about the increase anyway." Butz denied that he had denounced the delay but admitted that he explained to the trustees that it would not make any difference if students did consider the matter. He explained to this reporter that if the Board had actually delayed a month, that if he had been challenged during the delay on whether students input could alter the raise that he would have to admit that it could not. He said that it was the University and Law School Administration's responsibility to make the decisions concerning the budget and tuition and that what students were owed was an explanation. He further explained that there was no fat in the budget and that the expedited nature of the budget-tuition decision process was due to the delay in getting the final budget figures and not due to any intent to exclude student input.

D.C.

# announcements

## PROTEST USF PLAN TO CUT SPECIAL ADMISSIONS, T O D A Y

The USF COALITION (BALSA, La Raza and Asian Law Students Associations, NLG, and other concerned students) has called for a picket and rally at USF TODAY, Monday on the USF campus to protest the school's announced decision to cut special admissions in half. This administration decision will be presented to the USF Faculty for their approval today at 3:30. To demonstrate the concerns of Third-World students there will be a:

Picket line: 9 am to 3 pm  
Rally: 3 to 3:30

## COALITION OF CONCERNED LAW STUDENTS

We'll meet this week at a time and place to be announced. Watch for notices.

## LEGAL ESSAY CONTEST

Each quarter, Lega-Books will pay a \$150 scholarship for the best essay on a selected subject. The winning article will be published in the next Legal Update. The topic for the next issue will be "New Developments in Dividing Pensions since In Re Brown, 15 C.3d 838. The length of the article should be around 750 words. Articles must be submitted no later than March 31, 1978.

## HOLIDAY!!

Monday, February 20th will be a holiday for all members of the staff and faculty in observance of George Washington's birthday. Both the Business and Law Library will be open on the weekend of February 18th, but closed on the 20th.

## COLORADO BAR EXAM

Recently received requirements of the Colorado State Board of Law Examiners are posted on the Dean's bulletin board and are on file in the library.

## CHILDCARE CENTER MEETING CHANGED

The child care meeting which had been scheduled for Feb. 13 in order to discuss blue prints for the new center has been changed to Tuesday, Feb. 28 at 4 PM. The meeting will still be held in John Teitscheid's office.

Pat Warner

## ANNOUNCEMENT TO STUDENT BODY FROM CAVEAT EDS

AVEA VEAT  
CAVEAT AVEATC  
CAVEATCAVEATC  
CAVEATCAVEATC  
AVEATCAVEAT  
VEATCAVEA  
EATCAVE  
ATCAV  
TCA  
T

## OPEN MEETING WITH TEITSCHIED & MCKELVEY RE: TUITION

Student members of the Budget Committee have arranged for Financial Affairs Vice President John Teitscheid and Dean Judy McKelvey to meet with students to answer questions concerning the tuition increase.

TODAY, Monday, re: Indirect costs. 5:30 room 205.  
Also Tuesday, Feb. 15, 12 noon, room 207

Tuesday, February 21, re: Direct costs.  
12 noon and 5:30. Both in room 205.

## LAW LIBRARY

The law library will be closed Monday, Feb. 20. It will follow its regular schedule on the week-end preceding the holiday. The law library will be open its regular schedule during the entire Spring vacation.

## Y PASSES

The "Y" passes are now being handled by the Law Library. Ask for them at the desk.

## **SBA Business**

### VERY IMPORTANT SBA MEETING

Wed. Feb. 15, 1978; 4:30-6:30; Room 406

- Agenda: 1) SBA Elections - selection of persons interested in running them, discussion guidelines, dates, procedures, etc.
- 2) SBA Book Exchange - Georgia Schwaar, ideas for next year.
- 3) SBA selection criteria for FSC Committees.
- 4) Selection of ABA-Law Student Division Rep.
- 5) Tuition increase - Student position/action.
- 6) SBA Faculty Evaluation.
- 7) Caveat Editor selection guidelines
- 8) Financial Report - Don Roszel  
SBA Accounts, check-off money received.
- 9) FSC Committee reports  
Evaluations - Connie Tavel  
Academic Standards - Ruth Ratzlaff  
Budget - Gail White  
Admissions - David Rubinoff  
Hiring - Joanne Schulman  
Curriculum - Beth Price
- 10) Case book section in library - Tom Pearly
- 11) Affirmative Action, SBA meeting report - Mary Chabazzi
- 12) SBA Scholarship Fund/ Financial Aid - Richard Clark/Kathy Reilly

(TUITION FIGURES, from page 1)

increased substantially on a per student basis. Recall also all the suggestions in the Report of the Financial Aid Committee for improving the Financial Aid Office's handling of students' needs analysis. The criterion of need has to be realistic -- part help is not enough.

New additional financial aid in the form of loans or grants has to be instituted and financed now, in time to be available for the fall semester, and available to incoming first year students as well as to the rest of us who need it. Information about financial aid must be made available to those students who have applied for admission next year and won't come when they find out they can't afford the new tuition.

If the University and the Law School won't or "can't" do something to assist students through the ever increasing tuition we would rather see them be honest about the whole thing and say they no longer care about affirmative action nor about the middle income wage earner. What we are afraid will happen, though, is lots of talk, but not enough additional financial aid to meet the needs.

We have to put pressure on the administration of this University to ensure that the talk turns into a working financial aid plan before August. We have just covered the surface of this problem -- we have no concrete answers for it at this point.

#### No Fundraising by the Law School

Since the building plan was begun, the University has put a moratorium on fundraising by any of the schools in the University so that the University could pull in every available cent for the new building. Before the moratorium on fundraising, the law school did not do any significant amount of fundraising; tuition was low, and it was not needed. But tuition has gone literally through the roof -- and fundraising for the law school could help keep the tuition down in future years by raising money from places other than our pockets.

The moratorium has not been lifted, but we need the ability to raise funds now. The fundraising must begin soon in order to have any significant effect on keeping the tuition increase from going far above \$112. We have no idea at this point how to attack this problem nor any probability for success. We need suggestions from you.

#### Why the students weren't allowed input into the tuition setting.

The stock answer to that is that the three student reps to the budget committee were your input.

But we promised to bring the budget to the students for comments and concerns before the tuition was set. We were unable to do so. All the information we needed to bring the budget to you was not received by us until January 23. Dean Judy met with the committee on January 26 to report on negotiations concerning the indirect costs. At that time she announced \$112 would be the tuition. It was voted on by the Board of Trustees on the following day.

We feel that the tuition increase was run through us whether unintentionally or not. Dean Judy assured us that the numbers had never been this late before -- but that doesn't help us this year -- the tuition increased 19.1%. We wanted to bring the figures to you for discussion -- Richard Wright was unable to persuade Otto Butz and the Board of Trustees to delay the decision for a month so that the students could have more input into the figures.

Will it happen again? Next year? Why did it happen? What will prevent it from happening again? We have no answers.

#### Why go listen to rationalizations?

Meetings are scheduled between the students and those primarily in control of the two parts of the budget (see below). If the students don't show up to voice their concerns and ask for explanations for what they don't understand or agree with, the University will be justified in feeling that we don't care what the tuition goes to. They merely sit tight for the two weeks each year that everyone is indignant, and will just wait for the storm to blow by.

In addition, if nobody seems to care enough, there is little reason for the student members of the budget committee to attempt to change any of the concerns voiced above. No concern = no action = no change.

What the budget committee accomplishes the rest of the year depends on how much you are willing to voice your concerns. It's up to you.

The meetings are scheduled as follows:

Indirect Budget: John Teitscheid, V.P. Finance; Monday, Feb. 13, 5:30 pm Room 205; and Tuesday, Feb. 14, noon, Room 207.

Direct Budget: Judy McKelvey; Tuesday, Feb. 21, noon, Room 205; and Tuesday, Feb. 21, 5:30 pm, Room 205.

Your signs are fine, but your presence controls the influence.

#### THE BUDGET ANALYSIS

Finally, we get to the budget. Since the budget is composed of two parts, each determined by different people, we will analyze the two parts separately.

#### The Direct Budget

Direct costs are those costs which exclusively benefit the law school, such as teachers' salaries, our own administration expenses, the law library, etc. Dean Judy has the most direct control of these costs. The following is a summary of the increases and decreases in costs and the dollar per unit cost for each category. After the summary, each area will be explained.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>\$ PER UNIT INCREASE</u>
2 new faculty & fringe	\$3.00
Estimated total faculty salary increases	2.88
New writing & research teaching asst.	.50
Development program/clinic/continuing education	1.25
2 new law school secretaries	1.00
Decrease in rental of 55 New Montgomery and 552 Mission	(1.11)
All other costs	<u>2.48</u>
TOTAL	\$10.00

The addition of two new faculty members brings us up to the bare minimum requirements for AALS accreditation. The decision to increase to 24 faculty as well as to seek AALS accreditation was made several years ago, thus we are not going to explore the pros and cons of AALS accreditation in this article. Any further hiring of new faculty positions after this year, however, could be offset by admitting additional new students to pay for the increase instead of letting the burden of further new positions fall upon a static law school student population as it is now and has in the past.

(continued next page)

We have received a suggestion that one of the two new positions be delayed one year thus delaying AALS accreditation one year. The trade off involved is accreditation next year versus a \$1.50 tuition decrease. Is the trade off worth it? We would like comments on this.

The increases in the existing faculty salaries is not finally set until the first of April and is the subject of negotiation between the individual faculty members and Dean Judy. Suffice it here to say that we pay neither the lowest nor by any means the highest salaries for law schools in this area, and increases are needed to attract and keep qualified professors. The Budget Committee has no quarrel with this budget item.

As you can see, even half of the increase in direct costs goes to the faculty, both present and proposed.

The new writing and research teaching assistant is proposed to be a graduated law student whose responsibility will be to research, structure, and write the problems to be used in the writing and research courses. Anybody remember writing and research last year -- or the year before? If you do, that is why we need this position.

The two new law school secretaries are desperately needed. The present secretarial staff is grossly overworked and putting in overtime just to keep up with the most pressing of assignments. Faculty members are having problems getting items typed -- and this is reflected in such things as assignment sheets not being ready on time.

The category of Development program/Clinic/Continuing Education is an alternative personnel position. People are needed for all three areas, but we are unable to finance all three at this time. Dean Judy is going to try to get a person to raise funds for the law school from outside sources. She feels that the present moratorium on fundraising probably will shoot that down though. If so, the funds will be used for either a clinic person, or a continuing education person, or to pay part time for both.

The clinic program is growing by leaps and bounds. It needs an administrator. This need will not go away. The clinic program is beneficial to both the law students participating in it, and to the reputation of the law school in that our capable students get a chance to go out into these various programs and impress the hell out of everyone, thus increasing the number of employers willing to talk to and hire out graduates.

The continuing education program has a similar effect. This program reaches the young attorneys in the Bay Area and presents programs of interest in specialized areas. The research for these programs is done by a person paid from the law school budget. We feel that the position probably will pay for itself within a year from the income generated by the fees charged for the program.

Since we will be consolidating all of the law school faculty, administration, and library into one building, we will no longer have to rent space, and these items are not budgeted for the next year.

All other costs include such things as overtime for secretaries, fringe benefits, certain student assistants, AALS, conferences, duplicating, readers and tutors, part time faculty, law review, law library.

Golden Gate uses a lot of law students as paid assistants. Of the \$112 tuition, \$6.50 per unit goes directly to pay students or student's tuition. This is totally separate from any financial aid going through the Financial Aid Office.

As set out here, we can see very few items in the direct budget which can be cut. Much development (read that as jobs for students and graduates) is presently being done -- using our tuition money to finance it in as much as our tuition finances nearly all of the budget.

We feel that cutting the programs would not be in the students' best interests. Finding alternative sources of funding and/or financial assistance would be a better solution. Come to the meeting to discuss this with Dean Judy.

INDIRECT BUDGET

Indirect costs are those costs which are needed to run the University as a whole, and are allocated on any of a number of bases to the law school, such as guards, janitorial service, heat and light, maintenance of the building, administrative salaries, etc. John Teitscheid, V.P. Finance, has the most direct control of these costs. The following is a summary of the increases in costs and the dollar per unit cost for each category. After the summary each area will be explained.

Since the budget committee was unable to spend the same amount of time with the indirect budget, nor to take part in its formulation, we have more questions and possible alternatives to suggest here than in the more thoroughly studied direct budget. Furthermore, we have presently no substantiation for the validity of these figures. Perhaps this should be a subject for students' questions.

We are scheduled to move into the new building this August. Until then we are being charged with 21% of the University's indirect costs. This figure is based on proportional usage of University floor space. In the new building complex we will have access to the following floor space:

	Sq. Ft.
Law Library, including offices and conference room	28,801
4 classrooms - day and evening use	6,190
Our share of the new building's auditorium	8,033
The 2nd floor of the present building, including the three mezzanine offices	13,804
Moot courtroom	2,400
½ use of present 5th floor auditorium	1,777
10% of common areas (halls, stairs, etc.)	6,000
TOTAL LAW FOOTAGE	<u>67,005</u>

The breakdown of the tuition increase for INDIRECT COSTS:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>\$ PER UNIT INCREASE</u>
Additional Janitorial services	\$2.00
New telephone system	.34
Increase in building maintenance due to floor space increase of 21% to 32% of total area.	3.24
Cost of living increase plus miscellaneous costs, building maintenance	1.04
Increase in non-plant services and costs: administration salaries, guards, etc.	<u>1.38</u>
Total increase for indirect costs	\$8.00

Janitorial services are provided by a private firm, and new bids are required every two or three years. Bids have been accepted for the new building. The increase in janitorial services comes to 97¢ per square foot in the new building.

The installation of the new telephone system is a one-  
(continued next page)

(GOING BACK TO HOUSTON, from page 1)  
able to try either side of the case. They go through an entire trial, including opening statements, direct and cross examination and closing statements. They are judged in all these categories as well as on their knowledge of evidence and their courtroom demeanor.

The Caveat congratulates Bernie, Jim, and Kiwi for the great job they did. We also congratulate Jeff Shapiro and Charlie Specht who were also entered in the competition but were defeated in the second round. We would also like to thank all of the GGU students who enrolled in Bernie's Mock Trial class, and also those who acted as witnesses and bailiffs while the local school competition was being held to determine who would represent the school at Sacramento. Without their help Kiwi and Jim would never have been able to do as well as they did.  
M.D.

(TUITION FIGURES, from page 5)

time cost which must be paid at the time we move into the building. (ED. NOTE: This appears to be a capital expense to us.)

Until the fiscal year's end (June 30), we will be paying 21% of the building maintenance expenses. This \$3.24 per unit increase reflects the same cost multiplied by 32% rather than by 21%. Since we will have more use of the total complex, we will be paying for more of the heat and light, janitorial services at the old rate, monthly telephone, repairs, and other building maintenance costs.

The cost of living increase item represents the higher costs of the building services described immediately above.

Increases in non-building services include cost of living increases, as well as limited expansions to cover the increased space.

To give you an idea of the size of the new law school space, the new law library will be 2½ times the size of our present one. (ED. NOTE: No chairs.) The professor's offices which now average 90 sq. ft. will be 150 sq. ft. on the average. The new auditorium will be roughly 4 times the size of the 5th floor auditorium. While our total space will be increased by about 2½ times, 43% of our total new space is our new library.

Based on the analysis above we find the overall figures

# Clinic Column

ATTENTION ALL STUDENTS CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN GENERAL CLINIC OR EXTERNSHIPS.

Many of you have not fully complied with the rules concerning these programs and run the risk of losing all units for this semester unless the requirements are fulfilled.

1. EVERY STUDENT ENROLLED IN GENERAL CLINIC MUST FILL OUT THE APPLICATION FOR CLINIC, LAW REVIEW AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS. THIS FORM IS AVAILABLE FROM THE REGISTRAR AND SHOULD BE RETURNED WHEN COMPLETED TO THE REGISTRAR -- NOT TO THE CLINIC OFFICE. IF YOU HAVE CHANGED JOBS SINCE REGISTERING, YOU MUST FILL OUT A NEW FORM FOR YOUR NEW JOB. EVERY STUDENT ENROLLED IN A LEGAL OR JUDICIAL EXTERNSHIP MUST ALL FILL OUT THE APPLICATION FOR CLINIC, LAW REVIEW AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS. FINAL DUE DATE IS FEB. 26.

2. EVERY STUDENT ENROLLED IN GENERAL CLINIC (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE PARTICIPATING IN THE ARBITRATION CLINIC OR THE WESTERN CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WITH PROF. COHEN) MUST FURNISH A SUPERVISING ATTORNEY STATEMENT PRIOR TO FEB. 26. THIS FORM IS AVAILABLE ON THE CLINIC MATERIALS SHELF IN THE FACULTY CENTER EAST (526 MISSION), AND SHOULD BE RETURNED WHEN COMPLETED TO THE TRAY ON THAT SAME SHELF. DO NOT GIVE THIS FORM TO THE REGISTRAR. IT IS ALSO DESIRED THAT A RESUME OF THE SUPERVISING ATTORNEY BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM, OR SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENTLY.

3. UNLESS THESE FORMS ARE PROVIDED, STUDENTS MAY NOT ASSUME THAT THEIR PLACEMENT HAS BEEN APPROVED, AND SHOULD NOT BE SURPRISED WHEN CREDIT IS NOT GRANTED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE SEMESTER.

acceptable. We did not look at individual budget items and nitpick as we were able to do with the direct budget, but we satisfied ourselves as to the reasons for the increase.

If you want to hear these figures explained or want to ask questions, John Teitscheid will be meeting with all interested students today, Monday Feb. 13 at 5:30 PM in room 205 and tomorrow, Feb. 14 at noon in room 207.

The Budget Committee  
Gail White  
Paul Kondrick  
Judy Middlesworth

## Editorial

"WITHOUT POLITICS, YOU'RE LOST"

The following editorial is a spontaneous response to the Budget Committee Report.

Excerpted from the article:

"If the University or the Law School won't or can't assist students through the ever increasing tuition, we would rather see them be honest about the whole thing and say that they no longer care about affirmative action nor about the middle income wage earner."

The title of our response is "Without Politics, You're Lost". Basically this response to the Budget Committee's Report comes from a sense of perspective that appears to be left out of the Report. Do we really care if the Administration is honest? It is not acceptable to us that the Administration no longer cares about affirmative action whether they are honest about it or not. Frankly, it is not something that we need to have admitted to us; it's already clear. The issue is not one of whether the University cares, rather it is one of priorities. Like most liberal minded capitalists, those who run the University probably care about affirmative action and access of the poor to the University only to the extent that such concern does not interfere

with their goals that this University be a respectable institution.

It is a serious error for people to determine whether the tuition raise is "justifiable" on the basis of whether the administration can show that they really need the money. If the raise is contrary to our reasonable expectations of a good education at a modest price, it is unjust regardless of floor space figures. If the raise will cut off third-world applicants, it could never be justified.

It is also an error to determine whether the raise is justifiable on the basis of other non-public law schools' tuition. If their tuitions are going up that is only an indication that the problem of unjust tuition hikes is epidemic.

The point is that when this system's institutions get tight for money, they shift their weight onto the least able to pay whether it is in New York City, in the unemployment programs, or even in their cherished institutions of higher learning. The question to be asked should not be directed at administrators, but at ourselves in terms of what we are going to do about it -- not what justifies administrative fiat.

The Marx Sisters + 1  
(Ruth Edelstein, Cindy  
Duncan, David Cooper)