

1-27-1976

## Caveat, January 27, 1976

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

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Caveat, January 27, 1976" (1976). *Caveat*. Paper 61.  
<http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caveat/61>

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. XI No.15

Golden Gate University School of Law

January 27, 1976

## SBA PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

I'd like to take this opportunity to set the record straight as to my role and the role of the SBA in the recently announced tuition increase. As many of you may know, I'm not in the habit of replying to SBA critics, but I feel that an exception is in order.

Members of the SBA Board of Governors were informed of my suspicions of an impending tuition increase early last fall. Through numerous conversations I felt that it had become evident that an increase in tuition was likely and it was important that the student representatives be so informed. At the same time, the SBA was appointing students to the Student-Faculty Committees including the Budget Committee. Early last fall that committee began analyzing the law school budget. The members of the Budget committee communicated regularly with the SBA Board of Governors, and by early Nov., the financial requirements of the law school were clear. At that time and at my urging, the SBA treasurer (an ex-officio member of the Budget Committee) published an article in the Caveat warning of the tuition increase. No student response to that article was received.

The Dean requested and received approval for the tuition increase at the December 2, 1975 meeting of the FSC. All student members were present and the elected representatives of the 1st year class were also present. That meeting also approved the concept of unequal tuition increase. The vote was about 17-3. I can't speak for all of the student representatives, but I favored the staggered tuition. The percentage increase and the absolute dollar increase placed upon the first year students is still substantially less than that borne by the present third and second year classes. I will continue to support the tuition increase and the staggered allocation thereof.

In conclusion, I'd like to urge any student, particularly the first year students, many of whom I do not know personally, to talk to me or leave a note for me in the SBA box in the Faculty Center, if you have any more questions about the tuition increase or any other law school matters.

## SBA FORUM TO BE HELD ON FEE INCREASE

The SBA is discussing a proposal to raise the SBA dues paid by each student to \$4 per student. The present charge is \$2 per student.

The reason for this increase would be to more adequately fund the various student organizations in the law school. Each group submits a budget to the SBA and is allocated as much money as possible. However, the number of organizations and their activities have grown to the point where the money to be allocated is not enough.

A forum will be held Feb. 3, 12 noon in Room 207 for all students to discuss this issue. A resolution will then be on the ballot in the general election to be held on February 18, 19, and 20.

## REGISTRATION REQUIRED OF ALL STUDENTS

The Registrar would like to remind all students, even second semester first year students that they must register at the start of each semester. Any student who has not yet registered should see Carol in the Dean's office immediately.

## PLACEMENT CENTER ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Tuesday, January 27

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS. Ray Leonardini, Division of Consumer Services, will discuss San Francisco internships (non-paid) available now with the Public Utilities Commission and consumer groups, for 2d and 3d year students; Summer opportunities for 1st and 2d year students. 12 noon to 1:30 p.m. Room 207.

### Wednesday, February 4

HOW TO CONTACT LAW FIRMS AND AGENCIES: THE PERSONAL INTERVIEW PROCESS. A panel presentation by 5 GGU law school alums covering effective ways to contact firms/agencies, and how to interview -- preparation, the interview itself, closing and follow-thru. 12 noon to 1:30 p.m., Room 207.

WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL TO SPONSOR  
GREAT DECISIONS STUDY PROGRAM  
BEGINNING IN FEBRUARY

The World Affairs Council of Northern California will sponsor the "Great Decisions '76" discussion program for each of the counties of Northern California as part of a nation-wide program offered by the Foreign Policy Assoc.

The eight week citizen program beginning February 8 will focus attention and provide background facts on eight key foreign policy issues currently being debated by the nation's leaders. The topics will be: "Arabs vs. Israelis: What Price Lasting Peace in the Middle East?"; "Our Mediterranean Commitments: What Priorities? What Prospects?"; "Latin America and the U.S.: A New Relationship to fit New Realities?"; "Asia After the Vietnam War: What Role for the U.S.?"; "India: Can Poverty Be Overcome and Democracy Revive?"; "Rethinking U.S. Foreign Policy: How Should Our Power Be Used?".

Each of the eight issues will be examined in a special radio series prepared by the World Affairs Council to be broadcast on KQED/FM (88.5 on your dial) on eight consecutive Saturdays beginning February 7 from 7-8 p.m. The program will be rebroadcast from 2:30 - 3:30 p.m. on Tuesdays beginning Feb. 10. Series moderator will be Dr. Marshall Windmiller, Professor of International Relations, San Francisco State University.

Interested persons are urged to set up informal discussion groups of five to 15 people to meet once a week in private homes to discuss "Great Decisions". Special background study materials may be obtained from the World Affairs Council. At the end of each discussion, individuals may register their opinions through "Great Decisions" opinion ballots. A summary of ballot results will then be forwarded to Congress and to the State Department.

For further details on how you can organize individual "Great Decisions" study groups, please contact Gerda Stroh at the World Affairs Council, 406 Sutter St. San Francisco, 94108, 982-2541.

LECTURE SERIES BY EARL WARREN INSTITUTE

Senior members of the Brown Administration, the State Legislature, the California Judiciary and University faculty will address critical political issues facing the state in a series of public forums on the theme "California at the Crossroads" to be presented on the Berkeley campus in coming months. Programs currently scheduled include: California: Jobs and the Economy, noted below; The Future of Coastal Zone Regulation in California (February 19); Urgent Matters Facing the California Supreme Court (March 10); The Effects of the 1975 Political Reform Act (March 17); The Continental Shelf Oil Controversy (April 15); and a critical overview of California, 1976 (April 28). The forums will be held on weekday evenings, commencing at 8:00 p.m. will be open to the general public, admission free, and will be sponsored by the Earl Warren Legal Institute and the Institute of Governmental Studies, in cooperation with the Campus Committee for Arts and Lectures.

"California: Jobs and the Economy" will be the subject on Thursday evening, January 29th. The featured speaker will be Martin Glick, Director of the California Department of Employment Development. Mr. Glick recently called for \$20 billion federally financed "National Work Plan", which he predicted could reduce unemployment nationwide to about 3%. Unemployment in California is presently at a 10% level, two percentage points above the national average. The proposed plan would establish a Public Works program for core city housing, transportation and energy production. Its proponents claim that the \$20 billion a year cost would be offset by an estimated \$12 billion saving in welfare, food stamps, unemployment insurance and government medical programs for a net annual cost of \$8 billion.

As state employment development director, Mr. Glick is the senior member of the Brown Administration concerned with employment policy. Mr. Glick is a former director of California Rural Legal Assistance, a federally funded poverty law program with an outstanding record of litigation victories upholding the legal rights of the rural poor. Prior to joining the administration he was Associate Professor of Law at Stanford Law School and Special Counsel to the Secretary of the California Health and Welfare Agency.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SURVEY

The Curriculum Committee is currently entertaining proposals for advanced elective courses to be offered in the future, and would like to know what you, as a student, want to see included in the curriculum.

The Curriculum Committee's deadline for new proposals is February 3, 1976, so please return these questionnaires immediately to the Curriculum Committee boxes in the hall or in the Dean's office.

---

NEW COURSES:

First Choice:

Second Choice:

Third Choice:

Fourth Choice:

Fifth Choice:

OTHERS/COMMENTS:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Bernie Segal: Why?

is Bernie Segal being fired again?  
Why is the tenure committee so unresponsive to the wishes and needs of the students?  
Why should good evaluations, by both his most recent pleadings and practice and evidence classes be ignored by the committee?  
Why have no faculty members come to visit Bernie's classes within the past year to observe his teaching abilities, when his tenure was to be raised this year?  
Why are contributions to the school such as coaching the mock trial competition, working with students on individual projects, always offering a supportive hand not considered in evaluating one's worth as a teacher?  
Why is diversity among the faculty a quality not to be sought after in a law school?  
Why are the concepts of due process, equal protection, voter representation and open disclosure being ignored in a law school?  
Why must Bernie continue to be put through this non-productive ordeal?

We, the undersigned, who stand to directly benefit from his abilities in the classroom are concerned about losing him as a teacher and we want to know why.

Natalie Podell	Dean Thaler
San Barnam	Valerie Ranche
Christine Balthazar	Randy Berning
Priscilla Camp	Elaine Ackerman
Dan Brewer	Sid Hymes
Ruth Hedden	Josanna Berkow
Don Cohen	Jann Gurvich
Holly Bauman	Evelyn Stevenson
Tiffany Rystrom	David Fischer
Arlen Armstrong	Arthur Reed

\*\*\*\*\*

Once again the Law School is faced with the termination of one of its most dynamic professors.

Although not officially announced, the Faculty evaluations committee has voted against retaining Bernard L. Segal, as a tenured, full professor.

Last year the committee's recommendation was not effected when it became known that evaluation statistics had been misrepresented and, furthermore, student members of the committee acknowledged that they voted on the basis of their personal dislike for Segal rather than on professional competence.

Student members have again indicated that personality appraisals dictated their votes. This, they indicated, occurred even though 65% of the student evaluations gave the professor (continued on next column)

fours and fives on the five point rating scale.

One wonders why the vote has not been officially released as of yet. One can only surmise that the law school administration is attempting to avoid the stiff opposition that resulted last year.

Students, many of whom consider Segal the most professional faculty member (and who are members of all years, both day and night) have expressed surprise, disappointment and anger at the Committee's action. Many wonder who the student members are really representing and if they are fulfilling their obligation to their fellow students.

Sid Hymes  
3rd year

\*\*\*\*\*

(Ed's Note : We welcome comments from the evaluation committee in response to these students' protests to the non-retention of Bernie Segal. Please submit materials by Thursday, noon.)

\*\*\*\*\*

INTRAMURAL CO-ED SPORTS

Volleyball and basketball (maybe)  
Thursday 1/29 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. at Sutter St.  
YMCA (Mason and Sutter) "Out of the Library  
and onto the Court" Flakers v. Knix 9 NYS  
2d 3 (1973).

Weather Permitting - Volleyball and  
Softball- Sunday Feb.1, 1976 at Golden  
Gate Park - Look for Notices.

Anyone interested in starting a  
volleyball team(s) contact Rita Whalen  
(2d year day)

If anyone knows of access to free  
facilities for sports contact Rita Whalen.

## CONSPIRACY CORNER

By Mark Derzon

On December 8, 1972, 43 persons were killed when United Airlines flight 553 originating from Washington D.C. crashed while attempting a landing at Midway Field in Chicago. Among those killed in the crash was Dorothy Hunt, CIA agent, Watergate payoff woman, and wife of Watergate spy E. Howard Hunt.

Just one week before the crash the Hunts were threatening to "blow the White House out of the water" if they didn't get their way. She claimed to have the data necessary to impeach Nixon. (See memo of James McCord to the Ervin Committee, May 7, 1973.) Mrs. Hunt had been granted immunity by the Watergate Grand Jury in November, 1972, and was to have testified shortly after her death.

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) in their final report stated that it was pilot error that caused the crash. They reached this conclusion without the tapes of the flight recorder, a supposedly indestructible piece of equipment on every plane that mysteriously stopped working minutes before the crash. The air data computer, the runway visual recorder, the outer marker, and the captain's altimeter also malfunctioned. Aviation experts who analyzed the evidence have questioned the plausibility of the NTSB's conclusion.

Note this chronology of events:

1. December 9, one day after the crash, White house aide Egil Krogh, also involved in the Ellsberg burglary caper, was appointed Undersecretary of Transportation, supervising the NTSB and the FAA, the two agencies supposedly going to investigate the crash of 553.

2. December 19, 1972, eleven days after the crash, White House deputy assistant to Nixon, Alexander P. Butterfield, is appointed the new head of the FAA.

3. Five weeks after the crash, Dwight Chapin, Nixon's appointment secretary, leaves the White House to become a top executive with United Airlines at their Chicago home office.

The FBI admits to having 50 agents in the crash zone. Normally when a plane crashes the local authorities are the first to investigate. Then if foul play is suspected the next day the FBI arrive. In this case, according to witnesses living in the crash zone, The FBI got there even before the fire department. The fire department is less than a mile from the crash scene. The Chicago FBI offices are 14 miles from the crash. Granted Chicago has a good freeway system, but not that good. The FBI was there waiting for the plane to crash.

The Chairman of the NTSB, John Reed, on June 13, 1973 told the House Government Activities Subcommittee that never in living memory had the FBI acted as they did in the 553 crash. Reed said 50 agents came into the crash zone shortly after the crash. One FBI agent proceeded into Midway Control Tower and took over the tape relating to flight 553 without asking permission.

On August 29, 1973, when the NTSB's final report was adopted listing pilot error as the cause of the crash, their Chairman, John Reed refused to sign the report because of the bizarre behavior of the FBI.

Who was responsible for the Crash? It's impossible to determine. The plane was owned by United. United's largest stockholder is the Chase Manhattan Bank which is owned by Rockefeller. The FBI was certainly involved in the cover-up. Nixon, through his appointees, was a part of the cover-up.

In previous columns I've stated that various people such as Nixon, Rockefeller, the FBI, and the CIA are actually bitter rivals, and so it's logical to ask why they would join together in this conspiracy. In this respect the coverup of the plane crash is analagous to the coverup of the Kennedy assassination. When the truth comes out everyone involved in this massive power struggle loses, and the only ones who gain are 200 million Americans who would like an end to secrecy, coverups, and lies by their government.

## SBA ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN FEBRUARY

Elections for Student Bar Association offices will be held February 18 & 19, 1976. The offices which are available include President, Vice-President (Day), Vice-President (Night), Secretary, Treasurer, ABA/LSD Representative, and Second & Third Year Representatives, (Day and Night), and Fourth Year Representatives (Night).

A special election issue of the CAVEAT will be published on February 17th. Candidate statements should be submitted by February 12th.

Nomination for candidates is accomplished by submitting a petition signed by ten students. Petitions must be submitted to the SBA box in Faculty Center by February 6th, 1976.

Candidates may campaign February 6th - February 17th.

Views expressed in CAVEAT do not necessarily reflect the views of the law school or university. Submit all materials by Thursday noon to be published in the following week's edition.

Editor: Dianne L. Niethamer  
Conspiracy Corner: Mark Derzon  
Sports: Rita Whalen