

UH Law School,

HONOLULU ADVER

Judging Law School

Your editorial (11/14) regarding the departure of Dean David Hood from the University of Hawaii School of Law unfortunately suggested as a reason for his departure the simplistic and emotion-laden rationale of friction between "local" and "Mainland" factions.

As a third-year law student, raised on the Mainland and a resident of Hawaii for several years prior to beginning law school, I don't feel clear membership in either faction and therefore, with perhaps a more objective viewpoint, find your hypothesis of Hood's departure ignores more fundamental reasons which could be gained from a better knowledge of law school history. Far more thought-provoking might be the question:

How satisfactory has been the concept of legal education as developed under Dean David Hood at the UH School of Law?

It is impossible to fully answer this question since no UH law student has yet been tested by the Hawaii Bar nor has any student yet had the opportunity, as a lawyer, to prove his value to the community. Indeed, this question may never be fully answered because there is no control group taking a "traditional" legal education that can be compared with students taking the "innovative" program at the UH.

But an examination of the history of the law school will show a number of controversies concerning both

the adequacy of instruction and the design of program and courses. The result has been a significant change in personnel and courses in only five semesters. Quite obviously to me, this is less than an "excellent organizational job" by any objective standard.

A more subjective judgment, and one difficult to understand from a perspective outside the School of Law, can be made on the deterioration of communica-

letters

tion between the law school administration and the students. There have been many instances in the last 27 months in which many of my classmates have judged the administration to have acted in an arrogant and arbitrary manner. As a result of this, the feeling of strong community between faculty and students that was evident in September 1973 has simply disappeared.

I expected lawyers, and certainly law professors, to be effective and candid communicators. This effective communication has not been extended to my classmates, a representative cross-section of Hawaii's people. My conversations with my classmates support this viewpoint. Who then should bear the responsibility for this lack of effective communication?

ROBERT G. SCHMITT