

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
2 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

3 ----o0o----

4  
5 DAVID ADELSON, et al.,  
6 Plaintiffs,

7 -vs-

NO. 814461-0

8 PACIFICA FOUNDATION, a  
9 California Nonprofit Corporation,  
et al.,

10 Defendants.  
11 -----/

12  
13  
14  
15 DEPOSITION OF MARY BERG

16  
17  
18 Taken before PATRICIA TABOR

19 CSR No. 5739

20 Friday, November 17, 2000

21  
22  
23 DIABLO VALLEY REPORTING SERVICES  
24 Certified Shorthand Reporters  
2121 N. California Boulevard, Suite 310  
25 Walnut Creek, California 94596  
(925) 930-7388



1 the deposition procedure and things like that.

2 I'll repeat them to make sure you understand  
3 them.

4 A. Okay.

5 Q. I represent Pacifica Foundation and some  
6 of the foundation directors in this lawsuit  
7 brought by a number of people, Mr. Adelson, and  
8 you were also one of the named plaintiffs.

9 I'm going to ask you a series of questions and  
10 request you give me your best recollection. I  
11 don't want you to guess or speculate.

12 If you don't understand a question that I ask  
13 or you're confused, ask me to clarify and I'll do  
14 my best.

15 If you could let me finish my question before  
16 you start your answer, it will make the record  
17 look a little clearer.

18 If you can avoid using "uh-huh," "huh-uh" and  
19 nods of the head, that will make the court  
20 reporter's life much easier.

21 If you need to a break, bathroom break, coffee  
22 break, let us know.

23 Similarly, Trish, if you get tired, you let me  
24 know, too.

25 At the conclusion of the deposition, the court

1 Q. Did you have any conversations with  
2 Mr. Bramson regarding any of the subjects that we  
3 discussed earlier that were the complaints you  
4 have about Pacifica?

5 A. Over what time period?

6 Q. Well, how many conversations have you had  
7 over the last five years with this fellow about  
8 these subjects?

9 A. He was a fellow L.A.B. member, and we had  
10 quite a few conversations.

11 We had lots of conversations, and many times  
12 they would be on this subject, that's why I asked  
13 over what time frame.

14 Q. Let me try to narrow it then.

15 Since 19 -- let's talk about 1997.

16 1997 was the year that some changes were made  
17 to Pacifica Foundation's national bylaws that have  
18 become an issue in this case.

19 Did you have any conversations with Mr. Bramson  
20 regarding those changes?

21 A. I'm sure I did. He was coming to L.A.B.  
22 meetings, and we were talking. I'm sure I did.

23 Q. As you sit here today, do you recall any?

24 A. I recall that we had many conversations.  
25 I have talked with him a fair amount of the time,

1 including in 1997. I can't recall specific  
2 conversations, but...

3 Q. Have you had conversations with him  
4 subsequently regarding the issues of this lawsuit?

5 A. It's hard for me to answer that.

6 I might answer that I have not had  
7 conversations with him, I would say, this year at  
8 all.

9 Q. How about 1999?

10 A. In 1999, I think we had -- oh, we had  
11 some, but after -- I saw less of him after -- in  
12 the last half of the year, I saw less of him for  
13 sure.

14 Q. Does he not attend L.A.B. meetings, or is  
15 it that you don't attend L.A.B. meetings?

16 Strike that.

17 Why haven't you seen him at the end of 1999 and  
18 the year 2000?

19 A. I think he attended meetings less, and I  
20 think he may have had personal reasons as well.

21 I have no idea why. I don't think he boycotted  
22 them.

23 Q. In your conversations with Mr. Bramson  
24 regarding the issue of centralization of control  
25 and imposing programming on the local stations,

1 have you had conversations with him about that  
2 subject?

3 A. The issues of accountability and control  
4 would be more what we talked about.

5 On the L.A.B., we were not talking about  
6 programming so much.

7 Q. In terms of accounting and control, you  
8 mean accountability of the national board?

9 A. Or the lack of it, the lack of  
10 accountability.

11 Q. Your discussions with Mr. Bramson, did  
12 they suggest to you that he tended to agree with  
13 the opinions you articulated earlier today  
14 regarding lack of accountability?

15 A. At the time I felt we were agreed.

16 Q. What time was that that you're referring  
17 to?

18 A. Well, the later we get, less  
19 conversations.

20 So I suppose -- I suppose in '97 I did see him  
21 a fair amount, and we were talking a fair amount.

22 Q. Did he agree with you on the issue of  
23 freedom of speech or lack thereof?

24 A. That had not been -- had not come to the  
25 forefront as much in 1997 as it did later.

1 Q. How about fiscal irresponsibility; did  
2 you discuss those issues with Mr. Bramson?

3 A. I don't think that issue had become --  
4 that was a later issue.

5 Q. How about the issue of misleading donors  
6 into making donations, did you discuss that with  
7 Mr. Bramson?

8 A. No, I don't think so, not at that time.

9 Again, that only is in connection with the  
10 misuse of funds that I feel has happened, and the  
11 funds, the things that were most egregious  
12 happened after that.

13 Q. In this lawsuit, Mr. Bramson was  
14 originally a defendant; did you know that?

15 A. Well, I heard all that the other day, if  
16 not before.

17 Q. Did you authorize Mr. Bramson to be sued  
18 in this proceeding?

19 A. Did I personally authorize him to be  
20 sued?

21 Q. Right.

22 A. I'm not quite sure what is meant by that.

23 If I'm a plaintiff -- I don't quite know what's  
24 meant by that. He's on the suit.

25 Q. You're a plaintiff; right?

1 A. I'm a plaintiff.

2 Q. You sued some defendants?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did you know you were suing Mr. Bramson?

5 A. Uh, yes.

6 Q. Did you authorize that; it was okay with  
7 you?

8 A. I didn't object.

9 I can answer it the other way around. I don't  
10 know how I could have authorized it. I'm not sure  
11 what that means.

12 Q. At some point in time, Mr. Bramson was no  
13 longer a defendant because in an amended complaint  
14 his name was left off.

15 Did you know that occurred?

16 A. Yes, I did.

17 Q. Did you authorize him to be removed as a  
18 defendant in the lawsuit?

19 Let's skip the word "authorize."

20 A. I'm not sure what is meant by that.

21 Q. Did you know he was going to be dropped  
22 as a defendant?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Why did you allow him to be dropped as a  
25 defendant?



1 A. Why did I not object, is that what you're  
2 asking?

3 Q. Why did you not object?

4 A. Because I felt that he had done things,  
5 that he had made some moves that seemed -- he had  
6 made some very what I would call courageous moves  
7 in trying to uphold some of the things that I  
8 believe in as well.

9 Since he had done this, I didn't object to his  
10 being dropped.

11 Q. In essence, he had come around and  
12 supported the position of the plaintiffs in this  
13 litigation?

14 MR. PYLE: Is that a question?

15 MR. RAPAPORT: Yes.

16 MR. PYLE: Do you agree with that?

17 THE WITNESS: Well, whether he supported the  
18 plaintiffs, there are several -- he supported the  
19 position --

20 MR. RAPAPORT: Q. That's what happened; did he  
21 become supportive of the plaintiffs' position in  
22 this litigation?

23 A. He supported the general objections of  
24 which this lawsuit is one. There are others. He  
25 supported the objection to the moves Pacifica has

1 been making.

2 Q. Which moves?

3 A. That I had mentioned before in the  
4 direction of lack of diversity, driving away  
5 diversity, lack of accountability, fiscal  
6 irresponsibility, violation of the mission.

7 All of these things are felt by many, and he  
8 evidenced support for the same outrage that many  
9 of us had felt.

10 Q. So there was no point in having him as a  
11 defendant since he actually supported what the  
12 plaintiffs wanted?

13 A. Among others, yes.

14 Q. Is that true of Aaron Kriegel; that he  
15 was dropped from the lawsuit for the reason that  
16 he supported the plaintiffs' position in this  
17 case?

18 MR. PYLE: I'll object to what you're assuming.

19 You're assuming that's why he was dropped from  
20 the lawsuit, and that hasn't been established.

21 I'll object to that.

22 MR. RAPAPORT: I'll step back.

23 Q. Aaron Kriegel was originally a defendant;  
24 right?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. He was dropped; right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Why?

4 A. In statements that he made that I had  
5 heard about, he seemed to have begun to have a  
6 growing disagreement with the direction Pacifica  
7 was taking. And, to that extent, I didn't object  
8 to his being taken off the lawsuit if he was not  
9 in pursuit of the things to which I object.

10 If he's not trying to further those aims, then  
11 I have no objection if he is not on the lawsuit.

12 Q. Sure.

13 In essence, he was supportive of the very  
14 issues that we discussed that the plaintiffs  
15 objected to about Pacifica Foundation?

16 A. Yeah, he began to object to the policies  
17 of Pacifica as he became acquainted with them.

18 Q. In essence, his views became aligned with  
19 the plaintiffs in this lawsuit?

20 A. Among others.

21 Q. Is it true that Mr. Rob Robinson's views  
22 became aligned with those of the plaintiffs in  
23 this lawsuit?

24 A. They appeared to be, yes.

25 Q. Is that why he was dropped as a defendant

1 in this lawsuit?

2 A. Yes, again, many conversations were held  
3 with him, not by plaintiffs necessarily, but by  
4 others. Those were communicated to me, so that  
5 was my belief.

6 Q. Are there others on the board that you  
7 believe share the views of Bramson, Kriegel and  
8 Robinson that are aligned with the plaintiffs in  
9 this lawsuit regarding improprieties by Pacifica  
10 Foundation and the other directors?

11 A. People presently on the board you mean,  
12 whether they are named as defendants or not?

13 Q. Correct, like Mr. Moran.

14 A. I think so.

15 Q. How about Ms. Cagan?

16 A. To my knowledge, as far as I know, yes.

17 Q. Any others?

18 A. Beth Lyons I believe.

19 Again, I have not talked with these people.  
20 This is just what I understand from what I have  
21 read or been told.

22 Q. Who has told you about the views of  
23 Mr. Moran; that he is aligned with the viewpoint  
24 of the plaintiffs in this lawsuit?

25 A. Well, Mr. Moran has come before the staff

1 many times and has talked and -- I have known  
2 Mr. Moran for quite a long time now, since maybe  
3 1996.

4 Q. By the way, how old a man is Mr. Moran?

5 A. That I couldn't tell.

6 Q. Does he look Hunter's age, or is he a  
7 little longer in the tooth like myself?

8 A. You're asking the worst person. He's  
9 older than he was.

10 Q. We're all are.

11 MR. PYLE: And he's getting older every day.

12 THE WITNESS: He is. I'm not going to take  
13 that back for anything.

14 He's -- I don't know -- he's not really young,  
15 and he's not really old. So he's somewhere in the  
16 middle.

17 I don't want to say what the middle is. I have  
18 a vested interest in what the middle is.

19 MR. RAPAPORT: Q. Fair enough. I'll withdraw  
20 the question.

21 A. Thank you.

22 Q. You said Mr. Moran has came before the  
23 staff and made statements that suggested to you  
24 his viewpoints were aligned with the plaintiffs?

25 A. There were motions he tried to put

1 through at the board meeting regarding fiscal  
2 matters.

3 He was supportive of opening the books, which  
4 have been very closed and so forth.

5 I can't recall all of the things. I can't  
6 recall all of the motions that he tried to put  
7 forth, but I was aware of them.

8 He discussed them with the staff, and he would  
9 come to L.A.B. meetings and discuss them there,  
10 too, and to public meetings.

11 Q. Do you remember anything he said in any  
12 L.A.B. or public meetings besides advising you of  
13 the motions he put forth regarding fiscal meetings  
14 that suggested to you that he was aligned with the  
15 plaintiffs' viewpoint regarding this lawsuit?

16 A. Well, the motions he tried to put forth  
17 would have themselves -- he acted and spoke in  
18 opposition to the trend that Pacifica is taking.

19 I think I can put it that way.

20 Aligned with the lawsuit, I don't think I can  
21 answer necessarily what about the lawsuit, but he  
22 takes, as I have heard, a general direction that's  
23 aligned with what I think, and is opposed to what  
24 Pacifica is doing and the direction, the middle  
25 road direction it's going.

1 Q. Is it Ms. Cagan?

2 A. Cagan, Leslie Cagan.

3 Q. Miss Cagan, have you ever heard her say  
4 anything that has confirmed your view that her  
5 opinions were more closely aligned with those that  
6 you expressed earlier on as to what was wrong with  
7 Pacifica?

8 A. Again, I didn't talk with her personally  
9 now, but Tomas Moran I do.

10 Q. Let me ask you a different question since  
11 you didn't talk to her.

12 What is it that makes you believe that  
13 Ms. Cagan's opinions are more closely aligned with  
14 those of the plaintiffs in the lawsuit than, let's  
15 say, Dr. Berry?

16 A. Things --

17 MR. PYLE: Boy, that's a softball if ever I  
18 heard one.

19 THE WITNESS: Things that I've heard.

20 I will not make a wise-ass answer. No, I will  
21 not.

22 Things I've read that she has said.

23 MR. RAPAPORT: Q. Like what?

24 A. Things, comments that she's made at board  
25 meetings that were reported to me or that I've

1 read in transcripts when they were available, and  
2 various things I've read that she said.

3 I guess that's what I mean or reports from  
4 others, which is the same thing.

5 Q. Let me ask about the reports from others.

6 A. That's what I read.

7 Q. You read reports from others regarding  
8 Ms. Cagan's viewpoint?

9 A. Yes, people who talked with her at board  
10 meetings and so forth.

11 Q. Who made those reports?

12 A. I'm on various E-mail lists, and I see  
13 them there.

14 I don't remember -- people who went to the  
15 board meetings, and that's different for different  
16 board meetings. I don't recall which person went  
17 to which meeting in Washington.

18 I was not able to go to any, so I simply rely  
19 on what those that did go come back to say or what  
20 they write about.

21 Q. Do you recall any person talking to you  
22 and saying, "I talked to Leslie Cagan, and she  
23 said," and then they gave you information that led  
24 you to believe that her interests were more  
25 aligned with those of the plaintiffs in this



1 lawsuit than, let's say, Dr. Berry's?

2 A. I don't recall specifically any, I don't.

3 Q. Do you recall any statements by  
4 Mr. Robinson that -- strike that.

5 MR. RAPAPORT: Off the record.

6 (Break taken, 11:44 - 11:53.)

7 MR. RAPAPORT: Q. Mr. Bramson helped the  
8 plaintiffs in this lawsuit by providing a  
9 declaration; didn't he?

10 Are you aware of that?

11 A. He made a declaration, and I presume it  
12 helps.

13 Q. He hoped it helped -- let me strike that.  
14 Have you talked to him about providing  
15 assistance to the plaintiffs in this litigation?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Are you aware of anybody, aside from your  
18 attorney, who might have done so?

19 A. No.

20 Q. During the time you were a member of the  
21 KPFA L.A.B., can you describe to me how candidates  
22 for the national board were selected by the  
23 L.A.B.?

24 A. I'm remembering over the time.

25 Q. Let say 1994 to 1997.