Post Office Box 909
Chicago, Illinois 60690
November 5, 1970

Dear Arthur,

Got your letter about the committee's revised orientation (more panoramically sexual civil libertarian) last night and the copies of correspondence with Playboy Foundation. I will respond later on the subjects involving Frank Kameny to which you referred in your letter and contemporaneous telephone call.

I can only conclude that Playboy heard about the committee not through the Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (as they say) but through my memorandum to Mattachine Midwest legal panel members and other cooperating attorneys, a copy of which was previously sent you. I reach this cond usion because no mention of the committee under its new name has yet appeared in the MM Newsletter, and least of all has your address appeared therein, whereas both were the principal subject of my recent memorandum. One of its recipients must have forwarded it to Playboy or perhaps has a continuing relationship with Playboy and advised them of it.

Your reply to Playboy's inquiry was well done, I thought. And, as I said, I certainly find no fault with the committee's entering heterosexual cases involving the right of sexual privacy, especially where the entry is merely as amicus curiae, because, as you said, the issues therein involved are intimately associated with the issues which the committee was originally established to deal with, i.e., homosexual privacy. I would find fault with a bald assertion that the committee is set up to deal with the whole range of sexual civil liberties issues, as its name at first blush would imply, but you, of course, make no such assertion; instead, you rightly (in your letter to Playboy) delineate precisely what civil liberties issues are of concern to the committee and distinguish them from others which might fall under the same rubric but with which the committee is not concerning itself either because they are being adequately dealt with by others or because they are deemed premature or insignificant at this time. In short, while it may be advisable on several grounds to represent the committee as theoretically and to some extent actually involved on a broader scale than merely homosexually with civil liberties problems of sex, yet I insist that we ourselves must never delude ourselves into thinking that we are anything but primarily advocates of homosexuals' rights ultimately. To do otherwise, I submit, is to miss the

twin points (a) that honesty requires such a clear-eyed view of our mission, and (b) that ultimately the most difficult problem which we will attack will be the specifically homosexual problem, to which allied cases such as the New Jersey fornication case are merely leading. I am sure upon but a brief consideration you can agree with the foregoing, and I think you admirably expressed some of these distinctions in your letter to Playboy.

I intend to make available to Bill Brackett the correspondence with Playboy as well as your letter to me about the role of the committee, assuming, of course, that you have no objection. I would also like to be permitted to refer to the fact of the committee's intervening in the NEW Jersey case, to the composition of the committee's membership, to its revised role, and to its contacts with Playboy in such fashion as I deem judicious, which might include mention to the MM Legal Committee (i.e., Jim Bradford), in the MM Newsletter, to Brackett et al. (lawyers), and to NACHO personalities. Knowing that you may have doubts about the wisdom of communicating all detail about all these matters to all the aforementioned recipients, I will do nothing until I have your permission as to any or all of them. Even after securing such permission, however, I would be discreet in communicating any such intelligence.

So far as your letter inquiry about supposed changes in Selective Service or Department of Defense standards of military suitability with regard to homosexual registrants is concerned, I have very serious doubts about the accuracy of your information, especially since the whole area has been characterized by an abundance of unfounded or at least unconfirmable rumors in the past. Nevertheless, I will ask Kameny about it, but I will also consult a couple of eminent authorities here in Chicago from whom I think I can learn the facts in shorter order. I will let you know what I find out.

I greatly appreciate our continuing contact and hope to do my part to maintain it. As soon as I learn anything about Supreme Court action in the Buchanan case, I will let you know, and I trust you will reciprocate.

Sincerely,

Bill Kelley

P.S.: I almost forgot: (1) Foster Gunnison informs me that on November 10 there will be a Boston CRH conference for all Boston homophile groups plus clergy from elsewhere at the Old West Church, 131 Cambridge St., Boston 02114 (telephone for info, 267-4105), at which Laud and Troy Perry will speak and which Gunnison, Jack Campbell, and Hartford's Canon Jones will attend. Thought you might be interested. (2) I do think that, if you are so inclined, you should stress to Jack Campbell when you see him that, despite the absence of organizational tie at this point, the NCSCL intends to do everything it can to maintain its responsiveness to NACHO and the homophile movement.