



CSU
College of Law Library

Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU

1970s

The Gavel

3-1-1973

1973 Vol. 21 No. 8

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s
How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, "1973 Vol. 21 No. 8" (1973). 1970s. 63.
https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s/63

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the The Gavel at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in 1970s by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.





THE GAVEL

"I fought
the Law
and
the Law won"

--the Bobby Fuller Four

The Student Newspaper of The Cleveland State University College of Law • Cleveland, Ohio

Volume 21 • No. 8 • March 1, 1973

OLECK TO RESIGN

By James G. Joesph

Distinguished Professor Howard L. Oleck has announced his resignation from the Cleveland State University College of Law to become effective in June, 1974. He is leaving the law college after 17 years to join the faculty of Wake Forest Law School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina where he will teach Corporations and Torts.

Prof. Oleck taught at New York Law School from 1947 to 1956 before joining our law school faculty in 1956. During his career at Cleveland-Marshall Law School he has held the positions of Professor, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean and Dean. He was the single most important influence in the development of the Cleveland State Law Review, holding the position of faculty advisor from 1956 until 1972.

After his graduation from New York Law School in 1938, Prof. Oleck practised law in New York City and Great Neck, New York. His legal career was interrupted in 1942 when he entered the U.S. Army. During World War II he served in Europe from 1942 until 1946 when he left the service. In those four years he rose from Private to Major and was decorated with U.S. and foreign medals.

A nationally known writer, Prof. Oleck has authored 32 books, about 300, articles and more than 700 law columns for the Cleveland Plain Dealer. (Complete bibliography available at the Gavel office). Although his works are too numerous to mention, some of his more notable legal publications include: *Creditor's Rights*, 1948; *Damages To Persons And Property*, 1955; *Non-Profit Corporations and Associations*, 1956; *Modern Corporation Law*, 1960; *Cases on Damages*, 1962; *Law For Everyone*, 1971; *Primer on Legal Writing*, 1972.

Being a versatile writer, Prof. Oleck has also authored such non-legal publications as *Heroic Battles of World War II*, 1962; *A Singular Fury*, (law novel) 1969, and about 200 articles and stories on war published in many magazines under various pen names.

Prof. Oleck's legal career has not been confined to the United States but has crossed international and political boundaries. In 1971 he presented speeches and attended conferences at Charles University Law School in Prague, Czechoslovakia and The University of



Distinguished Prof. Howard Oleck Warsaw in Warsaw, Poland. He was consultant to the Philippine Legislative Committee to Draft a Non-Profit Corporation Act and visited law schools in Jerusalem, Moscow, Cairo and Beirut as well as others.

Prof. Oleck has accomplished so much and has been involved in such a wide variety of activities that his resume reads like those of three distinguished scholars combined. Just a few of his awards, accomplishments and offices held are: named to *Who's Who In America*, 1972-73; President, League of Ohio Law Schools, 1963-64; Consultant to U.S. Congressional (Patman) Committee, 1962; Consultant to several A.B.A. Committees; President of *SCRIBES* (Legal Writer's Society) 1972-73; Chairman, A.B.A. Legal Education Standards Committee; interviewed on radio and television programs; many speeches throughout the country; War Dept. Historian and Editor; decorated with U.S. and foreign medals during World War II; and is one of only 8 or 10 Distinguished Professors of Law in the United States.

Prof. Oleck was born in 1911, in New York City. He is married and has two children.

Although he loves Cleveland State University College of Law and is saddened by leaving it, Prof. Oleck is looking forward to his new position at Wake Forest. Over the years he has had offers from many law schools but chose Wake Forest because he likes the mild climate in North Carolina and the grounds and facilities at the University are like a "Shangri La."

Our law school still has many problems, thinks Prof. Oleck, but he predicts that the school will become one of the finest law schools in the country under the guidance of Dean Christensen, of whom he is very fond.

The prestige of our law school will continue to grow, but only because of the efforts of men like Distinguished Professor Howard L. Oleck. He, probably more than any other person to date, brought more prestige and contributed most to the success of The Cleveland State University College of Law.

Although his presence will be sorely missed, we wish Prof. Oleck the best at Wake Forest and are grateful for the influence and effect that his contributions have left upon our law school.

MOOT COURT SPRING COMPETITION

Carl F. Noll

Do you think that all of your learning should take place in a classroom? Do you think that one student can have no meaningful effect on the image of this law school? Do you think that a truly dedicated law student has no time for outside activities? If you do, don't waste your time reading the rest of this article - believe me, you won't be interested.

However, if you would answer "no" to the above questions, and if you are willing to work to help yourself and your school, read on! The Moot Court Team is offering you an opportunity that you should find interesting as well as rewarding.

The present members of the Moot Court Board have a goal - to build a Moot Court program that will consistently produce winning teams in the National Moot Court Competitions. We think that this is the fastest way to gain favorable, national recognition for our law school and its students. If you agree and are willing to work toward this goal, we need you! We need you because we realize that there are many very skillful advocates in this school who are not presently a part of the Moot Court program; and if our goal of a winning National Team is to be achieved, we need the best advocates our school can provide. Therefore, we have decided to open the spring intrascholastic competition to all 2nd year day and 2nd and 3rd year evening students. To get involved, all you have to do is pick up a copy of the problem and prepare a brief and argument for the position assigned to you. The problem, which involves the legality of a search and seizure and the admissibility of evidence obtained thereby, is available in Mr. Greenwood's office on the 12th floor of University Tower. All of the rules and deadlines are included with the problem.

Elimination rounds will begin in the middle of April and will culminate in the Moot Court Night arguments on May 12, 1973. The panel of judges for that evening will include Judge Frank Celebrezze of the Ohio Supreme Court. The full panel of judges will be announced at a later date.

All of the advocates for next year's interscholastic competitions (about 12 students) will be chosen from among those who compete in this Spring's intrascholastic program. However, there is much more to the Moot Court program than preparing for and competing in these inter and intra scholastic competitions. If the Moot Court Team is to achieve its goal of consistently producing winning National Teams, there must be a sound Brief Writing - Oral Advocacy program at this school; and the

development of such a program is a primary Moot Court objective. The present Team members are deeply involved in assisting the professors and students in the Brief Writing courses this quarter. In the future, we will need more students to help and involvement will be needed throughout the year.

Since you have read this far, something that has been said about the Moot Court program must have interested you. Now that you are interested, get up off your---, get up to Mr. Greenwood's office, get a copy of the problem, and get to work!

FACULTY CANDIDATES

Two faculty candidates ran the gamut of all day interviewing at CSU Law School last week. I was impressed by both of them and felt that they would make valuable additions to the faculty.

Randall Chastain is currently completing a one year visiting assistant professorship at the University of Oregon Law School, where he teaches Property and is advisor to the Moot Court Program. He is a graduate of Yale Law School and has served as law clerk to Judge Boyle in the tenth circuit.

Mr. Chastain said that he would be interested in teaching property here or any other course assigned to him, except federal taxation.

Gale Siegel (yes, a WOMAN candidate was invited here this year!) received her J.D. degree from Southern Methodist University School of Law, graduating in the top 10 per cent of her class. She was a Reginald Heber Smith fellow from 1969-1971. For the past three years Ms. Siegel has been an instructor in law at Case-Western Reserve University Law School and the assistant director of that school's clinical legal education program.

Ms. Siegel should be well known to the legal community and the public at large by now. She is the attorney of record in the case of *Doe v. Bolton*, attacking the constitutionality of the Georgia statute dealing with the right to abortion.

She has expressed interests in teaching civil procedure, contracts, clinical education and juvenile law.

CORRECTION

In the February 14, 1973 edition of *The Gavel* (Vol. 21 No. 7) the article *Action Against Strongsville Board of Education* contained the statement that Arthur Cain, Strongsville School Board member, was a chairman of the American Independent Party and a member of the John Birch Society. Although Mr. Cain is a chairman of the American Independent Party, he has informed *The Gavel* that he is not now and never has been a member of the John Birch Society. As the articles author and *The Gavel* editor, I wish to apologize to Mr. Cain.

L. Anderson

LEGAL SERVICES UNDER ATTACK

by Terry Gilbert

Ever since the Legal Service programs came into being in the mid-1960's with the advent of the anti-poverty program, it has faced a struggle for survival. Yet today the fight for its existence is far greater than ever before, and if serious steps are not taken, the already desperate status of poor people in this country is going to be further depressed. Today the struggle involves not only what administrative albatrosses must be imposed or what excellent program must be saved. It involves survival of the concept of "legal services", i.e., legal aid which seeks to provide not only competent representation and access to the courts, but also seeks to give assistance in obtaining some minimal increase in power within our society. Indeed, the struggle for control over legal services necessarily includes a struggle for control of the courts.

Attacks on legal services are not new. However, the intensity has increased substantially within the last 6 to 8 months. Vice-President Agnew attacked legal services in the September issue of the ABA journal and since then has made numerous speeches decrying "ideological vigilantes" who neither owe allegiance to their clients, nor serve their needs. He has singled out law reform efforts of legal services attorneys, particularly those focusing on problems (such as prison reform, school issues, women's rights, anti-war movement, free speech issues) which do not fit into the welfare, housing, consumer, and divorce mold. And it is likely that he will soon attack most of the efforts in this area as well.

Far more significant are the actions taken by the new Acting Director of OEO, Howard Phillips, a former organizer for the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and one of the most reactionary of the Nixon people. Phillips has begun a series of steps which are effectively dismantling the program and are specifically designed to root out those programs and attorneys who are involved in active, aggressive "law reform" representation. First, he is seeking to eliminate the state and national back-up centers (Those centers have been told that they will be unable to carry on legislative activity and representation of national groups such as the National Welfare Rights Organization). Secondly, Phillips has created a position paper written by Martin Boarman (a non-lawyer) which sets out the rationale for the action he is taking. The paper argues that it is impossible and probably unconstitutional for the federal government to fund a program which seeks to give one segment of society—the poor—both litigational and legislative assistance denied other segments of society. The paper also advocates the position that law reform seeks to redistribute the wealth of society and increase the bargaining power of the poor. Look out ITT!

If Phillips can't control the personnel, he is doing a number on the budgets of legal service programs. On January 31, 1973, he sent several telegrams to regional offices which required the offices to take certain steps relating to grant proposals. The offices were informed that no grants could be funded beyond June 30, 1973. All new grants would be refunded for a thirty-day period, and only with the

approval of the director of the OEO. Obviously an office cannot function with funding assured for only one month or even for three months. It cannot hire, plan for the future, or even carry on present litigation. It certainly cannot accept any new cases, no matter how pressing the needs of the client.

What the new budget proposals have created is a "Catch-22": the more competent the center, the less chance of re-funding; the more hurdles placed in the way of operating the program, the less able it is to justify its existence on the basis of past performance.

In addition to the budgetary restrictions, numerous personnel changes have been made in Washington. The acting director, Ted Tetzlaff, was fired two weeks ago. He was replaced by a former New England Life Insurance executive, Lawrence McCarty. Another staff appointee is a former Catholic University Law School professor, who is concerned about legal services handling divorce cases, since divorce undermines the role of the family. None of the appointees support an aggressive legal services program, even in theory.

The Nixon Administration has consistently indicated that it will introduce a bill creating an independent corporation to run legal services which will place power to appoint the board with the president, and thus reduce the role of legal services. It is also rumored that legal services may be transferred to the state level and become part of the revenue-sharing program.

To respond to the present crisis, efforts are being made by liberal congress-people to hold numerous hearings on legal services forcing Phillips and others to contend with adverse reaction and press. In addition, a number of lawsuits are being planned, seeking to enjoin Phillips from terminating funding.

What is happening is clear. The efforts to stop legal services are an effort to control the courts. The administration cannot get at the courts as easily as it thought—the Nixon court continues to act contrary to Administration view point—but it can take steps to assure that there are fewer activists bringing suits to the courts which raise issues contrary to the Administration point of view. They know that the emasculation of aggressive legal services will have a great effect on efforts of activist groups of the poor to organize. They also know that many of the attorneys have won important battles affecting the power relationships between the poor and other segments of society, as well as adding new weapons to the struggle for social justice.

At a time when law schools are producing multitudes of activist graduates, who scorn elite law firm positions and seek instead to direct their skills to more social concerns, we can't afford to let this energy be wasted. Legal service programs have provided jobs and encouragement for young attorneys who need an alternative to the present stuffiness of the legal profession. It will be no joke when law graduates will have no place to use their skills, except for perhaps a rare opening in a local law firm, or prosecutor's office.

THE OHIO PLAN OR THE FINAL SOLUTION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN OHIO

by Jerome Emoff and Paul Hudson

Now the sneaking serpent walks
In mild humility,
And the just man rages in the wilds
Where lions roam.

Blake's vision is not so remote, for Governor Gilligan, disguised as a mild-mannered Democrat, has very trickily shown himself to be a horse of a different color. We have before us the Ohio Plan.

An overriding issue which must be considered along with the Ohio Plan is Governor Gilligan's proposed 1973-1975 budget which calls for a three percent increase in higher education spending over the next two years. State universities will be permitted to increase student fees three percent per year over the same period. This proposed budget would not even allow existing programs to be maintained at their present levels, since the cost of living increases more than three percent per year. Thus, inflation would claim more than the proposed increase.

Currently, the fee ceiling at state universities for under-graduates is \$630. Gilligan's budget would raise the ceiling to \$648 for 1974 and \$666 for 1975. As it stands now, student fees in Ohio state schools rank among the highest in the nation, while Ohio ranks 47th in support of higher education.

With this in mind, Governor Gilligan is still attempting to implement his plan to have students reimburse the state for the full cost of their education after graduation. The proposal has been modified to include only students of medicine, dentistry, optometry, veterinary medicine and law. Gilligan has decided not to include this controversial student subsidy proposal with the budget, but rather he will submit it as a separate piece of legislation.

Harold L. Enarson, past president of Cleveland State University and current president of Ohio State University, has indicated that the Board of Regents has made a conservative recommendation of a six and one-half percent increase in state support per student. Governor Gilligan would appear to be attempting to make up the three percent deficiency by requiring professional students to reimburse the state for their education. This is the Ohio Plan. Enarson has said that Governor Gilligan's budget, in conjunction with the Ohio Plan, will constitute a moratorium on progress for state schools.

There can be no doubt that funds are available in Ohio for support of higher education. The state's revenues have increased approximately 40 per cent with the advent of the state income tax and revenue sharing to almost \$10 billion. This would indicate that the Ohio Plan is unnecessary.

The Ohio Plan requires that students, in addition to tuition payments, will repay the state subsidy at the rate of 2 per cent per year beginning one year after they have completed their studies. The total subsidy debt for three years for law students would amount to \$6,300.00, and the total subsidy debt for medical, dental, optometry and veterinary students would be \$22,400.00. These debts will be in addition to regular tuition payments and to any other debts which a student might incur during his or her professional schooling.

The rationale offered by the Governor for such a program is that professionals as a group in Ohio earn a median income of \$15,000 per year, and, therefore, taxpayers should not have to support this group. Also, the Governor has indicated that private institutions should not have financial difficulties because of state subsidies to public institutions of higher education. The Governor's interest in private schools is better understood in light of the fact that he is a product of a private education and his children attend private institutions. In answer to the Governor's first rationale, it is simplistic to think that the taxpayers will not be paying for professional education. Only the form of payment will change. Rather than taxes for professional education, Ohio residents will be faced with higher fees for medical and legal services.

The Ohio Plan has insidious implications. Students from lower and middle income families will be discouraged from attempting professional graduate education. There will be an ever greater shortage of professional services as a result of reduced enrollment, and this shortage will cause professional costs to continue to rise, since the number of professionals will not keep pace with the public demand. Graduating professionals, faced with an educational debt, will be less likely to offer their services to clients or patients who are indigent, and, therefore, the poor will suffer. The quality of professional graduate education will decline.

There are two broad social effects which should also be noted. This plan constitutes a return to an elitist education for the professions. Only the children of wealthy professionals already in practice will be able to afford attendance at a state school, thereby creating an elite corps of professionals with allegiance to only one sector of the society. Also, the Ohio Plan establishes a trend of decreasing state support for public higher education, and higher education is a concept which should not be abandoned. This is in line with the general cut-back in social services that is seen in other areas. After all, we should "ask what we can do for ourselves." The Ohio Plan and Governor Gilligan's proposed budget should not be acceptable to the people of Ohio.

Let us not bellow in the wilderness where we cannot be heard.

NOTICE:
THE NEXT
ISSUE OF
THE GAVEL
WILL APPEAR
WHEN SPRING
QUARTER BEGINS.

CSU LAW REVIEW

WINTER 1973:

KENT STATE TRAGEDY

by L. Anderson

The forthcoming winter issue of CSU Law Review presents a radical change in form and content from the past Law Reviews of this school. There are no student articles in this issue. Short, concise articles, which were so characteristic of prior editions of our Law Review, have been replaced with those more expanded in length and development but fewer in number. And the subject areas covered do not really fit into the old tradition of offering the most useful legal information to the Ohio practitioner. Rather, the symposium topic for the issue is **Kent State: Legal Background and Implications**. Even the cover on this winter issue of CSU Law Review is unfamiliar. The gold background-plain border has been discarded for an artist's interpretation of Lady Justice.

The young man to be held responsible for either creating a new and promising reputation for a "practitioner's law review" or for destroying its respectable if not grandiose present reputation and alienating a sizeable readership of practitioners is the issue's Editor-in-Chief, Peter Zawaly. Early last year Peter met with opposition from the Law Review Board, and advisors, when he put in his bid for the Kent State tragedy as his symposium topic. His proposals for change in the format met with predictions that they would never be accomplished and if they were, quick changes would destroy the CSU Law Review.

To everyone's surprise, including his own, Zawaly has put together an issue which features articles by non-student guest authors and only notes and case comments by student contributors. Some of the symposium articles of interest are *Legal Background and Aftermath of the Kent State Tragedy* by David Engdahl, the Director of Law Revision Center at the University litigation. Steven Sindell, counsel for the parents of Alison Krause, one of the four students shot and killed at Kent State, has written an article arguing against the defense of sovereign immunity in wrongful death actions. And Robert Howarth, special counsel to the State Attorney General, wrote an article in support of sovereign immunity as a defense. Perhaps the contribution of John P. Adams constitutes the greatest departure from traditional law review content. Mr. Adams is not a lawyer; he sits on the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church and is the Director of its Department of Law, Justice and Community Relations. His article is entitled *Kent State: Justice and Morality*.

A timely and important article on a non-symposium topic is Howard Besser's survey of recent developments in litigation in the area of the 1964 Civil Rights Act-Title VII.

All of us anxiously await the appearance of this "new law review."

MAKE YOUR OWN PEACE

-from American Friends Service Committee

A million dollar campaign to more than double its aid to civilian war sufferers in Vietnam and its work for a lasting peace in Indochina was announced by the American Friends Service Committee.

Designated the "North-South Vietnam Fund for War Relief and Peace Action," the campaign opened January 21.

A major early phase of the campaign is directed to the university communities across the nation, according to Wallace Collett, board chairman of the AFSC.

"University young people," said Collett, "and the faculties are deeply concerned over the ramifications of this war. The theme of the campaign is 'Make Your Own Peace.'"

"We have found," Collett added, "that many young people are seeking a way to do something on their own volition that can make a difference. Their support of AFSC's programs has been identified by many of them as one way to make a difference to the thousands of victims of this war."

The AFSC will more than double its efforts in the year ahead to respond to the accumulated misery of the Indochinese people.

"It is equally important," said Collett, "that Americans keep well-informed about the role of the United States in Vietnam. Many of the involvements of our country in Vietnam have taken place with the American people unaware of the seeping and tragic nature of those involvements."

The AFSC operates a prosthetics and rehabilitation center at Quang

Ngai, north of Saigon, which fits maimed civilian victims of the war with artificial arms and legs. Medical and surgical supplies have been provided to North and South Vietnam by AFSC over a period of several years, and the AFSC's spokesmen have been prominent in efforts to convince the United States to get out of Vietnam, conferring in Hanoi, Paris, Saigon, and Washington, D.C. with representatives of all warring factions.

AFSC's peace action role in the United States has dated from 1954 when the Board of Directors warned against U.S. involvement in Vietnam at the time of the Geneva agreement. Since then it has carried out unceasing peace education and action efforts that have included teach-ins, draft and military counselling, the 1969 "March Against Death" in Washington, D.C., and the development of printed and audio-visual material revealing the facts about the war and U.S. involvement often buried under the propaganda of the governments involved.

Funds raised for the million-dollar campaign will go to support the initiation of new AFSC war relief programs in all parts of Vietnam and for domestic and international work for peace in Indochina.

Founded in 1917, the AFSC is dedicated to the search for nonviolent solutions to human problems. With projects in 18 countries in addition to the United States, it has a worldwide staff of men and women of many races, religions, and nationalities.

CRIMINAL CLINICAL PROGRAM

WHAT IS IT? Learning the practice of law by representing real clients in real cases. Two quarters of learning how to and actually trying criminal misdemeanor cases in Cleveland Municipal Court and integrated classwork in small group sessions related to the clinical practice.

APPLY NOW. Students interested in participating in the Criminal Clinical Practice Program should apply now by completing a special application form available in UT 1203. There are no specific deadlines for applying, but qualified students will generally be given consideration on a first come first served basis. Selection of participating students will be based upon career plans and demonstrated interest and ability to successfully complete the clinical program of study. Selections will be made by the Program's Director and Assistant Director.

WHEN, HOW LONG, HOW MUCH CREDIT? The program begins each quarter with 12 students. Each student must remain in the program for two quarters, and an additional 12 will begin in each succeeding quarter. Eighteen hours credit, graded on a pass-fail basis, will be given for successful completion of the two-quarter program.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE? Any student - day or evening - who will have successfully completed a minimum of 84 quarter credit hours by the beginning of his second quarter in the Clinic is eligible to apply. The reason for this limitation is that completion of 84 hours, or two-thirds of the hours required for graduation, is a prerequisite for Legal Intern certification under Ohio Supreme Court Rules; clinical participants must qualify as Interns to practice in court during the second clinical quarter. Generally, this means the program is limited to seniors, although some third-quarter juniors may also qualify.

PREREQUISITES. Students must have successfully completed both Criminal Law and Evidence to participate in the Clinic. (The final half of Evidence may be taken during the first clinical quarter.) Legal Interviewing and Counseling (to be given for the first time next year) and Criminal Procedure are suggested preparatory courses, but are not prerequisites.

THE CLINIC, OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT, AND OTHER COURSES. During their first quarter in the Clinic, all students will be expected to devote an amount of time equal to about half of a normal full-time quarter's work load. Thus, in the first clinical quarter, each student must carry a reduced load of regular curricular courses: for a day student, generally not more than six to eight hours of other courses; for an evening student, not more than three for four additional hours. During the second clinical quarter, participation in the program is full-time and exclusive; students will not be permitted to enroll in any other courses. Students will also be discouraged from engaging in outside employment during the period of clinical participation. During the second clinical quarter, full-time outside employment will be impossible, and part-time jobs will be permitted only in exceptional cases.

FINANCIAL AID IN LIEU OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT. In order to encourage part-time evening students to participate in the Clinical Program, The Cleveland-Marshall Alumni Association has made funds available for a special financial aid program. Under its terms, students who must work full-time to support their legal education, but who can arrange leaves of absence for the second clinical quarter, are eligible to apply for stipends to replace lost income. Some funds are also available for day students who must work part-time to support their legal education (particularly in Work-Study), but who would have to give up such employment during the second clinical quarter. Additional information and application forms are available in the Administrative Office or the Financial Aid Office.



MAKE YOUR OWN PEACE

The signing of a ceasefire does not end our work for peace in Vietnam. You can take positive action, within the realm of your own conscience, to alleviate suffering our country has caused and to prevent its recurrence.

The American Friends Service Committee is substantially expanding its strong, well-established programs of peace action and aid to North and South Vietnam. This is action of extraordinary scope for this Quaker organization which has worked impartially for peace since World War I.

AFSC aid in the Vietnam War began in 1965 with medical assistance to civilians. The Service Committee has supplied penicillin for war sufferers in NLF controlled areas and delivered four installments of surgical supplies to North Vietnam.

In South Vietnam, the AFSC has provided medical care for inmates of the Quang Ngai Province prison, developed a program for refugee children and conducted a widely recognized prosthetics and rehabilitation program for war injured civilians.

In the area of peace action, the American Friends Service Committee has been calling for peace in South Vietnam since 1954. Currently, the AFSC continues to press for release of more than 200,000 civilian political prisoners in Thieu's jails. It is challenging new and disguised forms of intervention such as replacement of soldiers with 10,000 U.S. civilian advisors. It is also supporting a campaign to stop further development and production of anti-personnel weapons.

AFSC programs are working today. We have budgeted over \$1,000,000 for peace action and war relief this year. We now want to increase this by at least another \$1,000,000. If you want to help make peace in this way, send the coupon.

ACT: NORTH/SOUTH VIETNAM FUND
FOR WAR RELIEF AND PEACE ACTION

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE
A Quaker Organization, 160 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, PA 19102

☐ I enclose \$_____ to be used in your program of peace action and war relief in North and South Vietnam.
☐ I want to help the campaign in my area. Please send information.

Name _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____

2-02-00-128 Contributions are deductible for Federal income tax purposes.



The Gavel



Cleveland State University

College of Law

VOLUME 21

No. 8

March 1, 1973

Room 919

University Tower

Lila Anderson, Editor-in-Chief
James Joseph, Executive Editor

Cleveland, Ohio 44115
687-2340

STAFF

Burr Anderson, William Curphey, R. Musat
Phyllis Marcus, Carl Noll, Barbara Stern
Special Assistant to Editors: K. Brocco
Faculty Advisor: T. Buckley

The views expressed herein are those of the newspaper or its by-lined reporters. Unless specifically stated, they do not reflect the views of anyone else.



May I assume, Mr. Strunk, that we are the FIRST firm with which you've interviewed a second time?

(by Guest Cartoonist Gerry Patronite)

SBA SLOW TO OPPOSE OHIO PLAN

by Paul Hudson

Ordinarily the antics of the Student Bar Association need not be of great concern to most law students. Oh, of course there are various issues which affect the internal workings of the Law School and may be of some interest to a few law students, but, by and large, students may go about their daily business of getting a legal education without the activities of the SBA affecting them in any significantly.

By an extraordinary turn of events, however, all law students are faced with a triple threat to their future legal educations in 1973.

First, law students face the almost certain probability of drastic reduction in all forms of financial aid (scholarships, loans, work study) due to cut-backs by the federal and state governments.

Second, Governor Gilligan has proposed to the Ohio Legislature a budget for higher education calling for an effective reduction in funds to state institutions coupled with a tuition increase and a "moratorium" on all new construction. If enacted, this budget could cause a 20 to 30 per cent increase in a law student's tuition and fees. It would also mean a freeze on faculty salaries for at least two years and probably an indefinite postponement in construction of a new Law School building.

Third, the Governor has announced that, beginning in the fall of 1973, he wants all Law students to pledge repayment of the state "subsidy" to the tune of \$2,100 per year of legal education, in addition to tuition payments. This plan would skyrocket the cost of a legal education by well over 300 per cent in one year's time.

Students might wonder how the Student Bar Association has reacted to this ominous turn of events.

The SBA, under the leadership of President Stephen Walker, has apparently decided the matter is of little concern to students and does not wish to take a stand on these issues, nor lend its support to student organizations at C.S.U. and other state universities engaged in active opposition to the Governor's proposals.

President Walker recently refused to attend a meeting at Cleveland State called by State Representative Patrick Sweeney and attended by the student body presidents of CSU, Kent State and Ohio U., to discuss the consequences of the Governor's proposals for the state universities in

this area and to seek student support. When a *Cleveland Press* reporter sought to interview President Walker concerning law student opinion of the Ohio Plan for a feature story in the *Press*, he was abruptly informed by Mr. Walker that since reporters always "distort the truth and misquote people" he would not comment on law student opinion and did not wish to be quoted on the matter. Apparently, Mr. Walker was too preoccupied writing sophomoric diatribes against the Dean to heed an urgent call by the Ohio Confederation of Student Governments, the American Association of University Professors, and the Ohio Education Association for all student government presidents to attend a conference in Columbus on February 3 and 10. The purpose of the conference was for student leaders to learn the details of the Governor's proposals and plan various forms of student action.

AKRON BAR SCHOLARSHIPS

The Akron Bar Association is happy to advise that scholarship funds have been established for the purpose of providing funds to law school students from Summit County in need of financial assistance to continue their education.

Scholarships available for the 1973-74 school year are as follows: Grant Memorial Scholarship - \$300 - available to second year law students, Cunningham Scholarship - one or more totaling \$500, Schwab Scholarship - one or more totaling \$500, Foundation Scholarship - equaling \$500.

Applicants must be in the upper half of their class and are required to indicate a need by completing a financial assistance application. The amount of such awards may be directed to the recipient with a required accounting of what they were expended for, or they may be directed to the Dean of the school as tuition.

The Akron Bar Association Foundation will meet in late August to act on the recommendations of the Scholarship Committee on recipients for these scholarships.

All interested students are urged to write promptly, but in no event later than May 1, 1973, to the Akron Bar Association, 407 Ohio Building, Akron, Ohio 44308, for application forms and further information.



THE GAVEL

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW
1240 Ontario Street • Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Cleveland, Ohio
Permit No. 2466

Return Requested

Please report any changes of address. Bulk mailings are not forwarded.

