Tuition Forum Proves Fruitless

By Paul A. Frejman and Bob Goldman

Despite student opposition, the NYLS administration refused to either reduce the $1,000 tuition increase or grant an extension that would be "enough time to make a difference."

Dean James F. Simon, speaking for the administration at a tuition forum on the first day of school, announced an eleven-day reprieve for those students who had not met the original deadline. Dean Simon added that those students who failed to meet the new August 1 deadline would be subject to the standard 1% per month late fee with a minimum penalty of $20.

Students at the meeting told Dean Simon that the tuition hike was excessive; there was little or no time to prepare for it, and the eleven-day extension was not enough time to meet full payment. Dean Simon responded that he would consider all proposals offered by the students. He said, however, that the 16% tuition hike was necessary because of inflation; increased salaries for faculty and support staff; and recent building renovations.

On August 28, Dean Simon issued his response. He made no references to any of the proposals suggested at the forum, but merely restated the need for a tuition hike and the fact that there had to be such a large increase in tuition, but Dean Graham apportioned some of the blame for hardships students will face on the policies of the Reagan Administration.

"It's the Reagan administration's fault," Dean Graham said. "Tuition is going up all over, not just here, but loans have not been increased as well. How can a student expect to pay for books and tuition and general living expenses on the kind of money that's available? It's ridiculous that students have to pay interest on the endowment [currently estimated at $10 million], the interest on the endowment [currently estimated at $1.2 million per year], tuition, and independent contributions. In order to meet payments, we use the interest, tuition, contributions and we have to dip into the endowment."

When reached for a comment, Dean Simon said that students should be concerned with the legal education they are getting and not the finances of the school. He did say, however, that "In my judgment, the Board of Trustees erred by not increasing tuition enough in the 1983-1984 academic year."

Last year's tuition increase was 40% or 7% over the 1982-1983 academic year.
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Transactions this term. He is an
Associate Professor at Texas Tech University Law School. He was a Staff Attorney with the Federal Trade
Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Division of Credit Practices from 1974-82.

Visiting Professor Donald N. Zeigler is currently teaching Evidence at NYLS. He is a Professor at Pace University School of Law. He clerked in the U.S. District Court for S.D. N.Y. and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

NYLS has also lost 17 professors during the past year. Some of the faculty who did not return include visiting professors who had completed the specific term for which they were hired, and other non-tenure track faculty.

The professors not returning this year are: Associate Professor George M. Armstrong Jr., Clinical Assistant Professor Lisa H. Bittman, Clinical Assistant Professor Lloyd Epstein, Associate Professor William Epstein, Visiting Professor Jesse A. Goldberg, Visiting Associate Professor Gustav Harrow, Associate Professor Lucille R. Kaplan, Visiting Professor William E. Kriekel, Visiting Professor Norrie L. Lay, Visiting Professor Alfred W. Meyer, Visiting Professor and Librarian Roy M. Mersky, Visiting Associate Professor James F. Parver, and Legal Writing Instructor Susan H. Rockford.

Three professors are on leave this semester. They are Professor Michael Botein, Associate Professor Marshall J. Berger, and Associate Professor Alice W. Cunningham.

Lawton Squires, Esquire (far right), NYLS ’82, participated in a Placement Office panel on “Career Opportunities at the Legal Aid Society.” Squires, who works with the Criminal Division at the Legal Aid Society, alerted students to the range of jobs available. Also on the panel were representatives from the Criminal Appeals Bureau, the Executive Director’s Office, and the Harlem Neighborhood Office.

Tuition Story
(continued from page I)
has been mixed. Some students have had to take new jobs and others have had to add on to the number of hours they work so they could afford to stay in school. In fact, a number of students are purposely avoiding documenting those jobs and long hours with school officials so they won’t be placed on part-time status.

There are also some students who are handling the increase without much trouble but by-and-large it appears that most students are having to cut back significantly on their outside expenses in order to continue in school. Indeed, some students see severe problems looming for the spring semester but their attitude is to take one semester at a time.

Many students accepted the inevitability of increased tuition and did not express much outrage. However, there was a good deal of negative feeling about the lack of sufficient notice they were given. Some first year students felt they were unfairly treated, saying that had they known the price they might have considered other law schools more seriously. One third year student felt cheated because there was not enough time to prepare for the increase. “I worked all summer long,” he said, “but come tuition time I found myself short so I had to dip into parental funds to meet the payments.”

Neither SBA President Carmella Kurczewski nor the Student Organization Commission (SOC), sponsors of the August 20 forum, have any immediate intentions of keeping the issue alive. The SOC is composed of the leaders of all the student organizations.

The lack of people at the tuition forum indicated to me the lack of interest in the subject. I wish more students would have attended because their numbers can really have an effect,” President Kurczewski said. “I do what I can but I can’t do it without them. I’m not condemning the students. When they have an interest I’ll be there for them.”

In late May of this year the Board of Trustees of NYLS came to the decision that tuition would have to be increased by $1,000. This decision was arrived at without student input and at least six weeks later than last year’s decision to increase tuition.

Between the time the decision to increase tuition was made and June 20, when the bills were sent out to the students, no indication of the 16% increase was given to either those students returning to NYLS or those considering whether to accept the School’s invitation to attend.

On or about June 20, according to the Bursar’s office, notification went out to enrolling students that the total cost for full-time participation in the Fall of 1984 would be $3,653. Parttime students for the Fall were billed $2,752. The announcement specified
(continued on next page)
that payment was due "on or before July 15, 1984." If the Bursar's office is correct in its estimation that the notice was mailed around June 20, most entering students probably had about three weeks to find an extra $500. The only exception would have been those first-year students who had yet to receive their federal loan. Their final due date was September 17.

The bill sent out to returning students gave them until August 20 for payment (assuming there were no outstanding loans). Returning students were given a maximum of seven weeks to come up with the necessary $500. Both entering and returning students shared one thing, however, and that was the unexpected prospect of having to raise another $500 prior to Spring semester.

The reaction was swift and predictably negative.

In late July, the Student Organization Commission (SOC) decided to contact all the students and request that they hold off on paying their tuition until a school-wide meeting could be held to discuss the problem. The letter, sent without the approval or knowledge of the NYLS administration, was slipped into a Placement Office mailing. It said that serious hardship to students would result from the added cost, insufficient loans and delay in notification. Moreover, in the past, tuition was never due on the first day of school; rather a "few days grace after the commencement of school" was customary. The letter concluded by urging students to attend a forum on the first day of school before they paid their tuition. Approximately two-thirds of these letters were mailed before the Administration discovered the mailing and put a stop to it.

Prior to the forum, but after the letter staffing scheme was discovered, President Kurczewski felt obliged to send a letter of apology to Dean Simon. She emphasized, in her letter to Dean Simon, that her original letter did not urge the students to withhold payment on the day tuition (was) due.

She also explained the reasons for sending out the letter:

First, she mentioned that since the SBA was not permitted to have a mailing list of the student body, there was no other way to send it out.

Second, she felt compelled to take action because members of the SOC advised her that a number of students were going "to be unable to pay the tuition increase" due to insufficient loans and notice.

Third, she realized that since tuition was due on the first day of school "drastic measures had to be taken" if there were to be any chance of affecting change.

She believed that if she had gone to the administration first, "approval would have been withheld." She concluded the letter to Dean Simon by saying she was sorry for her actions and that she would be "willing to undergo whatever sanction the school feels is appropriate."

Moreover, she asked that Dean Simon attend the meeting because only then would she really understand "why I took such a drastic measure and risked having my integrity brought into serious doubt."

Neither letter included a specific set of demands for the administration to consider; rather, both letters included general requests for discussion.

At the tuition forum, President Kurczewski began the meeting by repeating her apology. She then turned the meeting over to Dean Simon for a question and answer period during which students expressed their annoyance over the insufficient notice and their serious concern about being able to continue at NYLS.

Some students suggested that the school stop raising tuition for each class but rather offer set tuition prices for three years. Other students requested either a significantly longer extension or a reduction of the increase.

Alumni Director Search

by Steven D. Grossman

As reported in the last issue of The Reporter, the position of Assistant Dean for Alumni and Development became vacant upon the departure of Lucille Hillman in March of 1984. The post has been unoccupied since then.

A search began sometime in August, 1984 for a replacement. According to Renee Grossman, Director of Alumni Affairs, and unofficially "pro-tem" Director of Alumni and Development, a private "head-hunting" firm was commissioned by someone at NYLS to find a qualified person to assume the new position of Director of Development. Grossman said the new director would actually be in charge of all alumni giving and development functions.

The Reporter learned that the new director would oversee foundation and corporate giving, a major source of potential funds. However, no one in the Alumni and Development Office would discuss the requisite qualifications for the job.

Both Grossman and Mali Daum Katz, Heritage Fund Officer, said that alumni relations and development have not suffered during the absence of an "overall" director; Katz is continuing development work such as the annual fund drive, and Grossman has continued fostering alumni relations.
Editorials

Student Blunders, Administration Transgressions

At the beginning of this school year, the student body leaders and the administration of NYLS found themselves in a familiar situation: glaring across a chasm of distrust, misunderstanding, and suspicion.

This situation was caused by the rash measures taken by the Student Organization Committee (SOC) to select the student body about a month after the 16% tuition increase. Because of fear that students would pay their tuition before the forum, the SOC decided action needed to be taken right away. The action chosen was to insert a letter about the forum in a mailing being prepared by the SBA and the Placement Office about fall placement panels, sent out several weeks before the beginning of school. This was regarded as deliberately deceitful by many members of the administration. The SBA must get approval from the administration for all mailings to students. They failed to do so in this situation. First of all, it is absurd to deny students the right to receive this information directly from "Mission Control" on the second floor of 37 Worth Street. Second, despite the fact that apparently the controversy is over, we think it demands some close examination.

Not only was there no attempt to communicate with the students about the tuition increase, but the size of the increase was not made known to the students until the end of June or early July. That left little time for students to figure out how to raise an extra $500 by August 20. Why wasn't there an announcement when the decision was made at the end of May? Why was the decision to deny information made so much later than it should have been? Why can't the student body be given at least some idea of the size of upcoming tuition hikes? Why is it necessary for us to be kept in the dark?

If Dean Simon's administration had made some sort of effort to include the students, or at least to keep us informed of what was going on, the stifling scheme may never have occurred. That does not lessen the possible ethical implications of the SOC's actions, but it does make these actions more understandable.

This cavalier attitude about student input raises troubling questions about Dean Simon. Last year he indicated to the students advising the Faculty Dean Search Committee that he wanted to avoid these sorts of problems, and wanted to encourage communication between the students and the administration. We hope that impression was not illusory; but, we see no other conclusion to be drawn from the actions of Dean Simon and his administration.

In retrospect, another aspect of this affair is also troubling: the behavior of the student leadership, including ourselves.

It is disappointing that a student leadership that initially voiced outrage at the enormity of the issue and the lack of sufficient notice, could not, at least, follow up on the ideas expressed at the forum. If we, as student leaders, cannot more clearly define what the problems and their potential solutions are, we will never be able to truly call ourselves leaders. If we expect the students of this school to rise up en masse, spontaneously, we will probably be consistently disappointed.

Perhaps there is little anger among the students about the increased tuition and the lack of proper notice; but, we will never know because we passed up the opportunity to tap into it. If there is ever to be effective student leadership in this school, then we must learn from this experience. We must have a clear idea of our objectives, our options and our principles and then we must plan and stick to a course of action.

Moreover, we must not back down unnecessarily.

President Krczekowski took a bold step when, in conjunction with the SOC, she sent the tuition forum letter in the Placement Office mailing. While the content of the tuition letter was mild, the action was justifiable and should not have been advertised. We apologize for it. If a decision is not worth supporting in the long run, it should not be taken. However, once taken, it must be stood by if the student leadership is ever to be taken seriously.

We, the student leadership, were "mad as hell and weren't going to take it anymore" when we made that decision. We didn't ask what we believed was right, or we wouldn't have done it. Even though it may have been rash, we should have been more willing to defend our actions. The fact remains that by apologizing so vociferously we put ourselves on the defensive. That was not and is not a very tenable position from which to bargain.

We are both sides, in reality, did have the actions to apologize for (and, in fact did apologize for them), the administration's policy was far less vocal and far more important. Indeed, it should have been the administration that was on the defensive, not the students.

Many students feel that nothing can be done in this type of situation. They feel that the administration has the final word and, thus, there is no reason to even try to have an impact. Yet, this is plainly not true. Just last semester, for example, the school calendar was changed because enough students showed their concern. It may be futile but we can make a difference. However, in order to make a difference we must be organized and willing to make it clear. The battle to protect and enhance our investment can be a successful one, we just have to decide to do it.
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ATTENTION ALL NYLS STUDENTS:

First Year
Second Year
Third Year
Fourth Year
All Mid-Year Students:

Please attend an informational meeting, Wednesday, September 26 in Student Lounge Room 102 at 5 p.m.
by Jerry McCarthy

As the United States and the Soviet Union diplomatically haggle over the scope of the agenda on the proposed Vienna talks to ban weapons in outer space, the American people must not lose sight of the fundamental issue: Is it in the interests of the United States and the American people to engage in bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union on the demilitarization of outer space?

The Reagan Administration seems reluctant to accept the Soviet offer for a number of reasons:

— The U.S. wants to include the now disbanded European Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) discussions on the outer space agenda.

— Agreeing to the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) testing while the talks proceed would prejudice the U.S. from testing its F-15-mounted ASAT in the Fall, thus leaving the Russians "ahead of us" in space weaponry because their "hunter-killer" satellite has already been tested.

— The Soviet proposal includes not only ASAT's but "all" weapons systems, including the space-based missile defense system proposed by President Reagan in his "Star Wars" speech in March, 1983.

— The Soviet negotiating team walked away from the INF bargaining table in Geneva the day that the U.S. began implementing its plan, in conjunction with NATO, to deploy Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe to counter the Soviet Union's SS-20 missile force. The Russians have agreed to return to Geneva when and if these missiles are removed. The U.S. position is that its missile deployment is necessary to defend Europe against the threat posed by the Soviet buildup of multiple-warhead SS-20's and, therefore, will not be dismantled.

— The United States and the Soviet Union may be, the Administration should not stubbornly insist on including this topic on the outer space agenda if the alternative is that no meeting in Vienna will take place. Discussions between the two space superpowers, even if "limited" to the topic of the demilitarization of outer space, are clearly preferable to no discussions at all.

— The convention that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in ASAT weaponry is without merit. Not only have more than half the tests of the Soviet hunter-killer ASAT's failed, but the satellites are launched from large, conspicuous ground facilities and go into an easily tracked orbit that is much lower than, and not threatening to, U.S. early warning satellites in geosynchronous orbit 22,400 miles above the earth. The Soviet ASAT is certainly not a weapon of surprise attack. The U.S. ASAT, however, is far more devastating. It is a small but fast moving missile, launched from a high-flying F-15 fighter plane, that collides with its target. Although it too can reach the low-orbit targets, most Soviet satellites are in low-earth orbit and thus within its range.

— Unlike the Soviet ASAT, which can be tracked as it is launched and shot down, the Soviet U.S. ASAT can strike without warning from F-15's located anywhere in the world. Daniel Deudney, a senior researcher at the Worldwatch Institute, predicts that "a globally coordinated U.S. strike could probably destroy most operable Soviet satellites within one day." So much for U.S. vulnerability.

— If the U.S. insists on testing its superior weapon this Fall, there will be an almost sure and volatile new dimension added to the already alarming arms race. The Soviet Union cannot be expected to sit on its hands while the U.S. develops and deploys the capability to destroy the Soviet satellite system "within one day." The U.S. must agree to the moratorium, if for no other reason than to try to prevent a costly, dangerous and unnecessary space arms race. Indeed, that seems to be the purpose of the Vienna talks.

— The Administration's desire to exclude space-based defensive systems from the agenda raises serious doubts about its sincerity to engage in a constructive space arms control dialogue with the Soviet Union.

In his nationally televised "Star Wars" speech on March 23, 1983, President Reagan announced that the U.S. was embarking "on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive in nature, to intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our own soil or that of our allies." The Administration plans to spend $26 billion, 000,000 in this decade to develop this space-based system of high-technology weapons.

What the President failed to tell the American people was that the development, testing or deployment of his Star Wars defense system is expressly prohibited by Articles II and V of the 1972 ABM Treaty. Article V provides: "space-based ABM systems; Article II defines an ABM system as one "to counter strategic ballistic missiles on their elements in flight trajectory . . . ." There is no doubt that the U.S. understood that future Star Wars-type ABM systems were included in the Article V prohibition.

In a statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1972, then Secretary of State William Rogers said that "the Parties have agreed that future exotic types of ABM systems, i.e., systems to intercept missiles or laser devices as lasers, may not be deployed."

An Administration that professes its respect for law and order hardly needs reminding that a duly executed and ratified treaty beats the "Supreme law of the land" under Article VI of the Constitution, obligating the President to ensure that the ABM Treaty "shall be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States of America . . . ." For the Administration to declare its acceptance of the Soviet offer to discuss proposals for banning the militarization of space, while insisting on the exclusion of defensive space systems, is to engage in conduct that borders on the hypocritical.

President Reagan would not be risking the security of the American people by agreeing to delay the testing of our ASAT weapon for at least the duration of the talks. He would be risking American security by sending delegates to Vienna to discuss with the Soviet Union the mutual interest that exists in preventing outer space from becoming the weapon-filled theater that the terrestrial theater has become.

Space has not yet become the scene of laser duels or laser duels or Luke Skywalker fighting for God and (American?) flag against the forces of Dark and the Evil (Soviet?) Empire. The leaders of the U.S. owe a duty to the American people and the Free World and legitimately say, "We tried." If history and the mutual distrust that exists between the two countries are our guide, the Vienna talks, even if they were to take place, will fail to prevent the introduction of sophisticated weapons into outer space. If, however, there is any truth to the maxim that politics is the art of the possible, the Vienna delegates are urged to reflect on one of Robert Kennedy's favorite refrains, "Some people see things as they are and ask, 'Why?' I dream of things as they might be and ask, 'Why not?'" When examined in the light of reason and fact, the Administration's objections to the space negotiations collapse like a house of cards. The Vienna talks will undoubtedly serve the interest of the American people, who will be both paying for and benefiting by a space arms race. It is time to stop haggling and start negotiating. May the Force be with them.

Jerry McCarthy is a third year student and the Notes and Comments Editor of the Journal of International & Comparative Law.


**Organizations**

On Thursday, September 6, 1984, Sara Jones, Esquire, NYLS Clinical Professor, and Dr. R. Schaler, NYC Medical Examiner spoke in the Student Lounge. This lecture was sponsored by the Criminal Law Society. Both addressed the audience on the use of blood tests in criminal investigations. Dr. Schaler talked about how to link defendants to crime scenes by using blood samples. Jones spoke on the need for defense attorneys to be aware of the use of blood tests, so they are better equipped to defend their clients.

**Criminal Law Society**

The Criminal Law Society’s Fall program commences with a lecture series on the practical problems of dealing with scientific evidence in criminal cases. At each lecture, a scientist will explain what scientific tests are done relevant to a criminal case. A practicing attorney will then explain how to use the test results. The topic of the first lecture, scheduled for September 6, was Serology. On October 11 a second lecture will deal with the chemical analysis used to detect narcotics. The third lecture, which is on the subject of fingerprints, will be held on November 8. A fourth lecture is tentatively scheduled on physical injuries.

Students who have had Professor Blecker for criminal law know that “What’s the story?” is a test question about the trend of judicial decisions and the effect of some recent inconsistent decisions by the Supreme Court. The Criminal Law Society is following up the “story” by instituting a lecture series, co-sponsored by Professor Blecker. The first speaker will be Sid Zion, formerly Supreme Court correspondent for the New York Times. He will discuss recent Supreme Court decisions in the field of criminal law. Also planned for the spring is the imitable Bob Leuci (Prince of the City) and his talk on the erosion process. Additional programs provided by the Criminal Law Society are field trips to the night court and a tour of the Tombs.

Stephanie Kaplan, President of the Criminal Law Society, invites everyone interested in criminal law to stop in at the Criminal Law Society office in the student lounge. Night students will find that the office is usually open until late in the evening. First year students will find the office to be a helpful supplement to the second semester required course.

**Legal Association For Women**

L.A.W. (The Legal Association for Women) has announced its 1984-85 Executive Board. Its members are: Marla Wolfe, President; Kay Mackay, Administrative Vice-President; Carol Marofkoff, Financial Vice-President; Joanne Kaminisky, Procedural Vice-President; and Gail Hennessy, Evening Vice-President.

The first major L.A.W. event for the year will be the annual “Women in the Law Today” symposium on October 27. The stimulating topics for the all-day event will be: Office Politics, Comparable Worth, Rape, Discrimination in the Courts, Private Practice—How to, and Self-Defense. Interested students are invited to drop in at the L.A.W. office for information about this and future events to offer their help.

Vice-President Emeritus, Lenore Boyarin Laracaucene, is Co-Chairperson of the Law Student Committee of the New York Woman’s Bar Association. She may be contacted through the L.A.W. office. L.A.W. has and encourages male members.

**International Law Society**

The International Law Society has embarked upon an ambitious program of events for the upcoming year. It intends to present a series of lectures by distinguished speakers, and various activities to enrich the extra-curricular life of the New York State Law School Community. Our goals are to add to the student’s knowledge of international law, to open possibilities for careers in this field, and to enhance the international reputation of New York Law School as a center for the study of international law.

**SPEAKER PROGRAM**

**Tuesday, September 25**

David Winter, Senior partner of Baker & McKenzie in London, on East-West Trade Today. Faculty Dining Room, 12:30 p.m.

Professor William Simons, one of the foremost experts on Soviet law from the University of Leiden, on The Role of the Communist Party in the Soviet Legal System. Faculty Dining Room, 5:30 p.m.

**Wednesday, October 3**

Henry C. Wallich, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, on the International and Domestic Aspects of Bank Capital. Froessel Library, 5:00 p.m.

**Thursday, October 18**

Ambassador of Antigua, Faculty Dining Room, 5:00 p.m.

**Thursday, November 1**

Dr. Frederick Chien, Representative of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, on the role of this organization in U.S.-Taiwan relations.

**Amnesty International**

The ILS is sponsoring a chapter of Amnesty International, the worldwide organization which is trying to prevent the abuse of human rights. Participation in the Amnesty program is open to all students and faculty. Please see William Hough, Director of NYLS chapter of Amnesty International.

**Jessup Moot Court Competition**

Every year the ILS selects members of the Jessup team to compete in the annual international law moot court competition. The team must research and write briefs, and in the spring the team orally defends its briefs in competition with other law school teams. Because of the extensive researching which must be done in preparation, the members of the team will be chosen in October.

**national Lawyers Guild**

by Tom Mansfield

We at the NYLS Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild would like to welcome all new NYLS students to law school. To all returning students: we hope you had a chance to recuperate over the summer.

The NYLS Chapter of the Guild is committed to the goal of promoting students’ awareness of the field of law as a means of working toward greater social and political justice. The Guild encourages and promotes progressive discussion, activities and struggles, both in the NYLS and the New York City communities of legal and social activists.

We at the NYLS Guild Chapter strive to provide a friendly and stimulating atmosphere for progressive students. This atmosphere helps to foster, rather than stifle, new ways of looking at old problems which the present political system is so clearly incapable of addressing and solving. We also introduce students to alternative legal practice options available as either summer jobs or permanent careers. We believe that more than ever it is possible to make a living fighting for justice without having to prostitute oneself by redefining justice in the interests of some wealthy client.

This year we are planning an even more varied agenda of events and we invite the entire NYLS community to become involved, either as organizers helping to arrange the events or as active participants during the events.
RES IPSA LOQUITUR
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Phi Delta Phi

Phi Delta Phi, the oldest professional fraternity in the Western Hemisphere, was established in the Law Department of the University of Michigan in 1869 (nine years before the American Bar Association was established). The fraternity has grown to over one hundred forty-one chapters in four countries, with a membership of over 120,000 men and women.

Dwight Inn fall Phi Delta Phi chapters are referred to as Inns, after the English Inns of Court, was established at New York Law School in 1899, and is still active on campus today. We have planned a number of activities for the upcoming year. These include a survival seminar (to take place prior to final exams) to aid first year students in adapting to the law school exam process, symposium on relevant, contemporary legal topics, and semi-annual rush parties. The dates and locations for these activities will be conspicuously posted to give adequate notice to the NYLS community.

The officers of Phi Delta Phi (Robert E. Erlich, Magister; Edward J. Johnson, Vice-Magister; Judy Reeves, Historian; John R. Rieger, Exchequer; and Nicholas J. DiCarlo, Clerk) would like to extend an invitation to all NYLS students to become members of this prestigious organization. Please visit the office (C-105—Student Lounge) any day during school hours. We will be happy to answer any of your questions.

SBA News

On Wednesday, September 19, 1984, the SBA Senate for the 1984-85 term was installed by Dean James F. Simon. The ceremonies were held in the Student Lounge and were attended by over 60 students, faculty and administration.

At the ceremony Dean Simon was presented with a plaque by the SBA in recognition of his concern and understanding. He was also presented with a plaque by the Students. The Dean said that this was the first time he had received recognition of this type for all his efforts.

The new Senators:

DAY DIVISION
1987:
Section A: Elliott Budashewitz, Herbert Lazar, Michael Conron, Victoria Van Horn
Section B: Ted Livingston, Arthur Stern, Craig Teschner, Harlan Wittman
Section C: Carmen Fernandez, Lourdes Francisco, Martin Glessen, Laura Simone

Mid-Year Admissions: Eric Meggett, Timothy Speedy

Evening Division
1988:
Section A: Joseph Affinito, Patrick Marthine, Frank O'Reilly
Section B: Noreen Cooney, Greg Lailin, Richard Mackewicz, Ron Terman
Section C: Steven Altman, Luis Caso, Robert Kuritz

Mid-Year Admissions: Brian Keyney, Lawrence Salvato

1985:
Section A: Frank Caratola, Sheri Donavan, Scott Frans, Frances Rhulen
Section B: Laurie Chaskin, Larry Gerbstein, Danny Greenberg
Section C: Robert Grey
Section D: Henry Condell, Thomas Mansfield
Mid-Year Admissions: No Representation

Evening Division
1987:
Kevin McMorow, Robert Heywood, Evelyn Bridges, Joseph D'Urso
1987:
Pat McEntee, Errol Taylor
1986:
Dan Jacobs, George Kuntz

Student Senate:
1986:
Section A: Frank Caratola, Sheri Donavan, Scott Frans, Frances Rhulen
Section B: Noreen Cooney, Greg Lailin, Richard Mackewicz, Ron Terman
Section C: Steven Altman, Luis Caso, Robert Kuritz

Mid-Year Admissions: Brian Keyney, Lawrence Salvato

RUSH:
1986:
Section A: Joseph Affinito, Patrick Marthine, Frank O'Reilly
Section B: Noreen Cooney, Greg Lailin, Richard Mackewicz, Ron Terman
Section C: Steven Altman, Luis Caso, Robert Kuritz

Mid-Year Admissions: Brian Keyney, Lawrence Salvato

NYLS will continue its efforts to provide valuable work experience for interested students.

As well as sponsoring these events, the NYLS Guild will continue its efforts to find progressive summer jobs for interested students through the Guild Match-Up Program and grants from the Law Students Civil Rights Research Council (LSCRR). We also work closely with the City Chapter's Chinatown housing clinic, local candidate electoral committee, and central America task force, all of which can provide valuable work experience for interested students.

The New York Law School Moot Court Board is an Honor Society comprised of students who have excelled in oral advocacy and brief writing. The Board and Association members are chosen from among participants in the two moot court competitions sponsored by the Board: the Charles W. Froessel Competition in the Fall semester and the John W. Harlan competition in the Spring. All full-time non-first year students are eligible to compete in either or both of these competitions.

Those interested in participating in the Fall, 1984 Froessel Competition may pick up fact patterns on September 19, from 4-30-6:00 p.m. in room A-401. This year's Froessel promises to be bigger and better than ever!

New York Law School also will be the host to interscholastic Moot Court competition in the United States, the American Bar Association, and the National Bar Association. Anyone interested in helping administer the Wagner (help is needed) should contact the Wagner Committee through the Moot Court Office at room A-403, or call 431-2887.

Board and Association members also represent the law school in interscholastic competitions throughout the country. Information regarding scheduled competitions for 1984-85 will be available shortly.

Anyone interested in participating in any moot court activity or seeking further information should stop by the office (A-403) or call 431-2175.
ATTENTION: CLASSES OF 1985 & 1986
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1985 Graduates
Walter Meneses
Ingrid Castro
Matthew Cohen
John Edwards
Clover Gordon
Susan Greenwald
Deanna Rodriguez
Debbie Browsky
Glenda Callender
Ingrid Castro
Matthew Cohen
John Edwards
Clover Gordon
Susan Greenwald
Deanna Rodriguez
Debbie Browsky
Yvonne Jacobs
Susan Kass
Patricia A. Speake
Sharon Silver
David Nadel
Robert Grey
Peter Hansson
Steve Harac
Craig Kellerman
Joanne Kaminski
Madeline C. Evans
Alberto Torres

1986 Graduates
Miriam Lopez
Scott Marson
Carol Merokoff
Karamah Khushinn
Lori Nicolle
Anthony Marciano
Noreen Cooney