

Cleveland State University

EngagedScholarship@CSU

---

Trade School News

School Publications

---

1-17-1972

## 1972/01/17 Trade School News

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law

Follow this and additional works at: [https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications\\_tradeschoolnews](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_tradeschoolnews)

**How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!**

---

### Recommended Citation

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, "1972/01/17 Trade School News" (1972). *Trade School News*. 8. [https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications\\_tradeschoolnews/8](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_tradeschoolnews/8)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the School Publications at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Trade School News by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact [library.es@csuohio.edu](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).





# TRADE SCHOOL NEWS

"There is always room at the top."

--Daniel Webster

"See what a rent the envious Casca made."

--Shakespeare (Orange Julius)

CRY "HAVOC!" AND LET SLIP THE DOGS OF WAR, DEPT.  
AN EDITORIAL REPORTAGE OF THE JAN. 14  
FACULTY MEETING

by Terry Saron and Richard Sutter

(Messrs. Saron and Sutter attended the meeting as representatives of the T.S. News and SBA, respectively).

In a bloodless, but brutal coup, engineered by a faction of individuals who have shockingly revealed themselves to be grasping, small-minded, and ruthless, the leadership of the law school was usurped and a junta installed to supplant what once was the office of dean. The only powers left to the dean are his ability to draw pay and his naked title. The coup was accomplished by an 11 to 10 vote which carried the motion introduced by Edward Chitlik for the "creation of a law faculty steering committee."

Those voting in favor of the motion were: Browne, Chitlik, Dyke, Flaherty, Garee, Moody, Murad, Ruben, Sheard, Simmons, Sonenfield; those voting against were: Aldrich, Auerbach, Buckley, Cohen, Coshien, Leiser, Oleck, Sierk, Tabac, Werber; not present: Emerson. The creation of a "law faculty steering committee" was an unprecedented move, the utility of which, with a faculty numbering only 23, is most doubtful, and the motivations behind it even more so. The dean's posture regarding faculty moonlighting, his opposing the construction of certain professors' contracts which would grant them tenure by operation of law, his aloofness during the AALS convention at which potential faculty members were interviewed, various personality clashes, were all contributing factors. Whatever the real reasons behind it, it is painfully clear that no consideration whatsoever was given to the future of CSU Law College or its students. The reputation and academic potentialities of this school may have been permanently damaged thereby.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE MOTION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY ON  
January 14, 1972 by Edward Chitlik

## MOTION FOR THE CREATION OF A LAW FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

It is moved that there be created a law faculty Steering Committee of five members, elected by the faculty, to serve for the calendar year 1972 with the following powers, functions and duties:

- 1) To schedule regular meetings of the law school faculty and establish the agenda therefor; to call special meetings of the faculty at the request of the dean or of any three members of the faculty,
- 2) To select the membership of all faculty committees after consultation with the dean and individual members of the faculty with respect to preferences,
- 3) To represent and be spokesman for the faculty in matters of institutional and educational policy, subject to the approval of the faculty,
- 4) To perform those functions for the law school faculty which the University Faculty Academic Steering Committee performs for the University Council.

Those who spoke in favor of the motion claimed that it was merely a way of "helping" the dean in the administration of the school. Those opposed pointed out that should it pass, the dean would be hamstrung, paralysed from

(continued on page 2)



CRY HAVOC (continued from first page)

taking any affirmative action. As an example of the acute lack of proportion that such a motion indicated, steering committees are almost exclusively used at the University level to permit a beleaguered President to coordinate the affairs of several colleges simultaneously along with their respective faculties. CSU, it was further mentioned, has a combined faculty of over 450, as compared to 23 at the law school.

An episode that stamped the character of the entire proceedings: After Chitlik's motion was seconded (on que) by Samuel Sonenfield, discussion followed. During the "discussion," virulence of feeling and speech among individuals well adept at the art of wielding words as lethal weapons made the very air taste bitter with vitriol. Stephen Werber moved that the question be called by roll-call vote. Seconded. Discussion. Alan Ruben railed against the motion, shouting his indignation at such an "obvious and transparent attempt to intimidate" certain individuals and prevent them from voting according to conscience. It wasn't, Chitlik chimed in, as if anyone was even considering having a vote by secret ballot--just a plain open show of hands. No sweat. The motion was defeated. Ruben thereafter moved that a closed vote be taken. He was finally convinced by one of his cohorts (Flaherty) to withdraw his motion.

The meeting appeared to be all but choreographed--with Chitlik, Sonenfield and Ruben as dancemasters. Statements were actually read which all too obviously were prepared in advance. It was evident that the move to take over the reins of the ol' trade school had been some time in the planning. Equally obvious was Dean Christenson's lack of political acumen in so grievously underestimating his opponents on the faculty. The now infamous motion passed. Cries of "Why don't you finish it off?!" rang up. They did. The Law Faculty Steering Committee was nominated, and voted into office. Its members; Chitlik, Ruben, Sheard, Sierk, Sonenfield. Meeting adjourned.

ALL HAIL THE PRIOR INEPT ADMINISTRATION!  
WILSON G. STAPLETON, WHERE  
ARE YOU WHEN WE NEED YOU?

"WHAT'S IN IT FOR ME?"  
PLENTY!

By Allen Goldner,  
Law Review Staff Editor

How the internal politics of this law school may be affected by the recent actions of a majority of its faculty is of only slight concern to me. What I am vitally concerned with is how this action will affect the quality of my legal education (and the likelihood that members of the legal community might employ me, a CSU graduate).

Casting aside the faculty-administration politics in which this school is presently embroiled, Craig Christensen, in his 4½ month tenure as Dean has:

- (1) increased the student scholarship fund by about 33% (a minimum of \$10,000);
- (2) successfully procured from the C.L. E.P.R. Foundation funding for the creation of a clinical-educational program;
- (3) instituted a law school minority recruitment program;
- (4) lined up potential faculty members, whose credentials are outstanding and who would therefore greatly enhance the quality of our legal education; and
- (5) generally instilled the feeling that the level of legal education and the reputation of this school is on the rise.

This is not to say that all the decisions coming from his office have been favorably accepted. They have not. The fact remains that the Dean's influence has been by and large a positive one. That this positive influence be permitted to continue is of vital concern to us, as students.

Craig Christensen, as expected, has submitted his resignation to CSU President Harold Enarson following the actions taken at the faculty meeting of Jan. 14. Christensen's resignation will become effective, if not revoked, at the end of this calendar year.

The chances of another man with Christensen's credentials acceding to the office of dean--amid a cutthroat faculty who will stop at nothing to hinder one's every move should it not inure to their benefit--are so remote as to be negligible. Likewise, the chances of hiring any of those prospective faculty-interviewees at the recent AALS Convention.

Though some of those involved with the "Chitlik Resolution" were inalterably self-motivated, other supporters of the faculty steering committee acted out of a sense of frustration at lacking a meaningful voice in the so-called "participatory democracy" of the law school. As Christensen himself said in an interview less than five months ago (see "Christensen Named Dean," T.S. News Gala Summer Issue), students and faculty alike are tired of administrative abuses and the "closed club" atmosphere that was the hallmark of the "prior inept administration." He violated Rule I of any Small Group Psychology Seminar; make the members feel that they are part of the decision-making process. Failing this, resentment, distrust, and finally, faculty censure were the

(continued on Page 3)



ALL HAIL PIA  
(continued from page 2)

result. He should have known that substituting a "new club" would hardly make things better than they were at the hands of the old one.

We heartily encourage Dean C. to stay and fight for the leadership of the school. The actions of last Friday were deplorable, to be sure. Hopefully, through hard-learned experience, Christensen will be able to win his colleagues back, and prevent any future insurrection triggered by poor communication.

---

**ATTENTION STUDENTS!!**

YOU ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND A  
TOWN HALL MEETING AT 2:30 P.M.,  
MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1972, IN ROOM  
102. YOUR ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL  
CAREERS ARE AT STAKE!

---

See  
it was like this when  
we waltz into this place  
a couple of Papiash cats  
is doing an Aztec two-step  
And I says  
Dad let's cut  
but then this dame  
comes up behind me see  
and says  
You and me could really exist  
Wow I says  
Only next day  
she has bad teeth  
and really hates  
poetry  
  
Lawrence Ferlinghetti

---

STAFF: Bruce Elfvin, Issue Editor-in-  
chief; Terry Saron, Richard Sutter,  
Associate Editors--PIA, heh-heh, we  
really didn't mean all those rotten,  
nasty things we said about you, even  
if they were true...give us a break!

---

Le mariage, Agnès, n'est pas un badinage.

**THE DEAN WHO HAD FIVE HEADS**  
**A CAUTIONARY FABLE**

By Richard Sutter and Terry Saron

Once upon a time there was a Dean with five heads, ten arms, ten legs, and a new suit that didn't match at the seams. Before it acceded to office, as every good Dean must, it had five distinct personalities. Sometimes, it would be a Civil Procedure professor and would drive a great, big black car back and forth from home to work. Once in a while it would be a Property Professor and act like it had a rag up its ass and never smile. At still other times, it was a Corporations Prof that toyed incessantly with a shiny gold watch fob (when it wasn't being a Tax or Constitutional Law Professor). Every now and then, all five of its personalities would express an off-handed interest in the future of the school that it (they) was (were) teaching at. They would often beguile students with fantastic tales of conquest and competence.

One day, these five personalities merged together--and out came Dean Chitrubshearsierkfield. The lines were drawn, the die cast, and the work cut out for the Dean: its task was to destroy the law school under the guise of improving inter-faculty communication. Foolish and slothful students who said they didn't give a F--K what the Dean said or did were shocked to find that in future years, lo and behold, their diplomas weren't worth THE PAPER THEY WERE WRITTEN ON!

MORAL: wise up, you big dummies! A law school without active leadership is no law school at all.

It is high time for the students of GSU Law College to unite and shout down the existence of any bogus "new regime." If there were problems with Dean Christensen, they should have been resolved in a mature and ethical manner. For my part, Dean Chitrubshearsierkfield, you have polarized and demoralized this school and are sending it to oblivion. Think not of you petty squabbles, but instead think what the result of your disgraceful conduct will be if you do not recant.