

A Skirmish and A Resolution

by Frank Schwanwede

Several weeks ago the Editors and Staff of the Law Record posted a petition objecting to a provision in the Law Record's S.B.A. budget allocation. That provision called for the establishment of an Editorial Board to be selected by the S.B.A., to oversee the operation of the newspaper. We felt that the establishment of such an editorial board was an attempt by the S.B.A. to censor the Law Record in the name of making it "more accountable to the student body."

On October 1 a meeting was held between the Editors and Staff of the Law Record, the President of the S.B.A., and Dean Brody to discuss the problem and work out an acceptable solution. After a lengthy discussion of the issues a consensus was reached, which, it was felt, would both preserve the Law Record's

freedom of expression and insure that all viewpoints within the law school community would be fairly represented.

To accomplish this goal an editorial board will be set up, but it will act only in an advisory capacity, and will not have the power to make decisions regarding the content of the Law Record itself. The Editorial Advisory Board's major function will be to implement, through recommendations to the S.B.A., the editorial guidelines which have been formulated by the Record for its own governance. Under these guidelines the Editors have agreed to publish, in the form of letters to the Editor, replies to Law Record Editorials, to offer to all recognized student organizations the opportunity to have published a column on their activities, and to welcome other signed letters to the Editor. All of these

will be done within space limitations. In addition the Board, composed of members chosen by the S.B.A. and the Law Record, will advise the Record staff, will make recommendations regarding controversial articles, if the Record staff requests them, and will hear grievances from members of the law school community.

We of the Law Record feel that this compromise is a good one, since it promises the Record freedom from censorship and provides for fair treatment of all points of view. We hope that the compromise will result in a better newspaper by increasing the participation of the whole law school community. We wish to thank all those who participated in the discussions. We also thank those who, by signing our petition, expressed their continuing commitment to freedom of expression.

Rutgers Law Record

NOVEMBER
1975

SBA Approves Budget

At a tumultuous meeting on Wednesday, October 22, 1975, the SBA ratified the budget for all student organizations. The body of the SBA rejected the recommendations of the Budget Committee and enacted proposal 6 which was authored by David Martin, Renault Hawkins, and Robert Clarke (all class of 1978). The figures are reprinted here in their entirety. An analysis and editorial on the budget appears on page 2.

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without a newspaper or newspapers without a government—I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

Thomas Jefferson

ORGANIZATION	LAST YEAR'S ALLOCATION	LAST YEAR'S ACT LAYOUT	BALANCE	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
*Legal Aid Clinic	\$----	\$----	\$----	\$ 40.00
*Environmental Law	----	----	----	103.70
*International Law	----	----	----	221.64
*C.C.L.S.	----	----	----	637.14
L.S.C.R.R.C.	564.00	243.30	320.70	618.52
Women's Group	808.40	500.00	308.40	506.85
Moot Court Board	483.30	503.50	- 19.87	655.58
Law Record	841.50	561.60	279.70	495.00
Veteran's Hroup	385.40	76.09	309.31	374.25
A.L.A.L.S.	1,297.20	715.36	581.84	1,300.53
S.B.A.	491.07			1,370.94
The Guild	1,160.90	956.26	204.64	1,409.00
Women's Reporter	1,038.70	1,005.00	33.70	1,224.00
A.B.L.S.	3,430.50	3,719.92	- 289.42	2,950.00
*New Organizations				\$11,903.87

Viewpoint:

Law Record

Budget Slashed

by Stephen F. Smith

For 1975-76, the LAW RECORD requested from the S.B.A. Budget Committee a figure of \$2,430.00, which would have allowed the record to publish monthly. The Budget Committee reduced the allocation to a recommendation of \$910.00—a figure which the LAW RECORD felt it could live with, since there is only \$12,000 in student activity funds to go around, and the recommendation would have allowed the paper to appear every two months or 4 times a year.

Under proposal 6 which has recently been adopted, THE LAW RECORD will receive a scant \$495.00, which is barely enough to produce two issues. (The newspaper costs \$235 an issue for 6 pages. This issue is 8 pages in length). The new budget allocation of the SBA will prevent the LAW RECORD from becoming what it is striving to be—a viable law school newspaper.

This will be the penultimate issue of the LAW RECORD for the academic year 1975-76, unless Proposal 6 is rescinded and more money is allocated to the newspaper.

RUTGERS LAW RECORD

Published by the Students of Rutgers School of Law: Newark
 Editor: Stephen F. Smith (Class of 1976)
 Associate Editor: Ray Brown (Class of 1977)
 Managing Editor: Pat English (Class of 1978)
 Movie Review Editor: Derek Hackett
 Staff: Fred Schwanwede, Mack Rugg, Dean Paranicas, Henry Hocherman, Phil Vinick, Susan Perkins, Mike McDonald, John Porter, Byron Smith, Roger Martindell, Gerald Richman, Mike Balint, Anne Koutz, Harold Hoffman

Editorial

Both the form and the content of the recently passed Student Bar Association Budget should cause concern among the student body. The main problem with this budget is that its allocations were not arrived at through any coherent formula, in contrast to the five budget proposals which preceded it. Those proposals resulted from the conscientious work of the S.B.A. budget committee, which prepared for each proposal specific itemizations and the exact formula from which it derived. The results of this work were printed and copies were put on reserve in the library. Along came proposal number 6, submitted only two days before the S.B.A.'s budget meeting, and unavailable to students until the day of the meeting. It contained several significant departures from the other proposals. At the meeting, several questioners made vain attempts to discover the policies followed in drawing up this budget. The half hour allotted for discussion of this question elapsed with the clear establishment of only three points:

- 1) the authors of proposal 6 used the work of the budget committee as a starting point.
- 2) organizations which did not spend all of their allocations last year were to receive reduced amounts this year.
- 3) established organizations were to receive priority over new ones.

Proposal 6 was then passed with a paltry five minutes of discussion, but not before the SBA passed a petulant motion, later rescinded, to remove completely the Cuban student organization's funding. (Incidentally, this was not the only petulant action taken by the S.B.A.. At the beginning of the meeting, apparently in response to a remark of Dean Simmons' that the SBA is not representative of the student body, the SBA voted to view faculty attendance at the meeting as attempted "intimidation" and "impugnation" of the S.B.A.'s integrity.)

We believe that the process described above amounts to nothing less than a railroading through the S.B.A. of proposal 6. The three vague "policies" mentioned earlier do not even begin to answer serious questions concerning the formulation of this budget. The first begs the question, since we are interested in the differences between proposal 6 and its predecessors, not the similarities. This is because proposals 1-5 were fully explained, whereas proposal 6 was not. The second, if it was a policy, was not followed consistently since, for example, A.L.A.L.S., which last year allowed about 44% of its money to revert, had its allocation raised from \$1,206.12 in proposal 5 to \$1,300.53 in proposal 6. The third concerns itself only with the length of time organizations have existed, rather than the relative merits of their programs.

A further question arises in that proposal 6, which gives A.B.L.S. a \$600. increase in its allocation, was composed by three A.B.L.S. members. At the same time, other less lavishly funded organizations were severely cut. We think this is tantamount to taking from the poor and giving to the rich. Moreover, L.S.C.R.R.C., whose entire budget goes to paying for a trip for two people to New Orleans to attend a conference, had its allocation raised to \$618.52 from \$446.94 in proposal 5. These are by no means the only examples of the questionable judgment displayed by the authors of proposal 6. We invite you to examine the figures and draw your own conclusions.

Proposal 6 may not be the final budget for this year. S.B.A. members are investigating possible procedural irregularities in the passage of proposal 6, and the S.B.A. Budget Committee is looking into possible revisions.

We urge the rescission of proposal 6. * *The \$618.52 is \$100.00 more than the tentative allocation, i.e., the allocation given before any budget-balancing cuts were made.*

SBA BUDGET COMMITTEE BUDGET PROPOSALS

	Last Year's Allocation	'75 - '76 Bud. Request	'75 - '76 Tent. Allo.	Proposal No. 1	Proposal No. 2	Proposal No. 3	Proposal No. 4	Proposal No. 5
Legal Aid Clinic	----	\$ 140.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 30.52	\$ 30.25	\$ 40.00
Environmental Law	----	250.00	170.00	103.70	113.43	116.32	119.95	128.44
International Law	----	950.00	425.00	259.24	276.63	284.62	295.00	238.64
L.S.C.R.R.C.	564.00	697.00	513.94	513.94	513.94	343.32	357.26	446.94
Women's Group	808.40	1,150.00	585.00	356.85	379.03	390.22	406.30	390.64
Moot Court Board	483.63	1,285.00	671.50	409.61	434.03	447.31	465.98	395.58
Law Record	841.30	2,430.00	910.00	555.10	587.03	604.72	630.55	550.24
Veteran's Group	385.40	1,748.00	1,121.50	684.11	722.39	744.31	776.48	774.06
A.L.A.L.S.	1,297.20	3,542.50	1,673.00	1,020.53	1,075.35	1,108.30	1,157.02	1,206.12
S.B.A.	491.07	2,571.25	1,817.50	1,817.50	1,817.50	1,203.67	1,256.72	1,220.94
The Guild	1,160.90	2,955.00	1,900.00	1,159.00	1,220.63	1,258.12	1,313.65	1,302.64
Women's Reporter	1,038.70	4,080.00	2,040.00	1,244.40	1,310.23	1,350.52	1,410.25	1,302.64
C.C.L.S.	----	5,187.25	2,248.70	1,371.70	1,443.79	1,488.26	1,564.25	1,445.52
A.B.L.S.	3,430.50	4,703.00	3,232.80	1,972.00	2,073.62	2,137.76	2,233.28	2,315.56
	\$10,501.10	\$31,689.00	\$17,348.94	\$11,507.69	\$12,007.96	\$11,507.97	\$12,007.84	\$11,757.96