

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
FOR
SEXUAL CIVIL LIBERTIES

Co-Chairmen:
Prof. Walter E. Barnett
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Arthur C. Warner
Princeton, New Jersey

18 OBER ROAD
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540
(609) WA4-1950

618½ E. Lomita Ave.
Glendale, Cal. 91205
February 16, 1973

Dear Craig,

[REDACTED]

I met with the Dean of Loyola, Leo J. O'Brien. I discussed your case with him and gave him a copy of the decision from Ohio (I didn't give him your name without knowing your feelings on that subject first.) He told me that he strongly feels that I will probably have to have at least 1 round with the Bar Examiners in California; my outspoken positions and involvements have probably brought me to their attention. He feels that they are aware of the Gay Law Students Association and have probably tried to investigate us already through the local police department. He would not be suprised if they even have or will try to infiltrate the organization. (I hope he is just paranoid). He told me that whatever happens that he and Loyola will back me all the way.

He is sympathetic to the problem of gay law students being admitted to the bar and feels that ultimately the Bar Examiners will lose the battle. He also felt that it was a good idea for us to take the initiative to get support for our position as soon as possible.

He said that there is no regular ongoing group or committee of Law School Deans. There is the Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar. But membership in that Section is not only Deans but many, many others. That while the Deans have a voice and some influence in that section they by no means are in control or power. He said that the deans have called special meetings for particular purposes at the last 2 A.B.A. meetings but that it would be difficult to call a special meeting just for this resolution.

He felt that ultimately the best thing would be to get the A.B.A. itself to take a position on the matter of sexual orientation and admissions to the bar. However, because the stakes are very high and we cannot afford to lose the battle, we must be very careful in our strategy. He felt that if we approached the Section on Legal Education directly that such a resolution would fail.

Therefore this is what he suggests. We should start 2 projects (or maybe 3) concurrently. We should work on getting the resolution passed by the Section on Individual Rights (and maybe the Law Student Division too). We should probably do that now so that we can get an affirmative vote by the section in August. At the same time, we should approach the Association of American Law Schools and get them to adopt it. The Association is made up of 150 accredited law schools across the country. It will be having a meeting in December in New Orleans. Each school sends 1 delegate and 1 alternate. We should get 10 to 20 law schools across the country to sponsor our resolution before that body. I'm sure that we could get 5-6 schools in California to do so, 2-3 in Chicago, some in New York, Penn. N.J., Ohio, Mich. etc. We probably should have 2 spokesmen for the resolution. We should have Dean Kirby and a Loyola Representative.

Dean O'Brien is stepping down from his throne in June and we will have a new Dean, Fred Lower. He is more conservative but will not oppose us. In June an Associate Dean will be appointed at the school, Jerry Uelman. He will be an eloquent and positive spokesman for us because he firmly believes in fair and equal treatment for gays and he is now the Faculty Advisor for the Gay Law Students Association. I think that it would be wise to have Ohio State and Loyola (L.A.) be the primary sponsors with supplemental sponsorship from as many other schools as possible. The Committee can be beneficial in that respect. Members can meet with Deans of Law schools in various states to get support prior to the New Orleans meeting.

As far as the wording of the resolution O'Brien felt that the wording should be as general and the least objectionable as possible. We want to establish a precedent and not to be too demanding. I feel that we should stick strictly to the matter of sexual orientation and bar admissions. I do not think that we should even get into private sexual conduct. If the A.B.A. takes a position on private sexual conduct in August that should suffice in that respect. Let's just hit the law schools and the Individual Rights with the sexual orientation problem in admissions to the bar. The wording is something that we can work out in the near future.

After getting approval of the resolution by the Individual Rights (hopefully by August) and the Association of American Law Schools in December, then we can approach the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar at the mid-year meeting (for a vote at that time) in February 1974. If they pass it, it will go to the A.B.A. House of Delegates for a vote in August, 1974. That seems like a long way off but I feel that this is the most logical and the best way for passage.

Please let me know just what happened with your Dean and what suggestions he had. We can then work the exact procedure we will follow. After deciding on procedure, we can then draw up a resolution and distribute it to a few people for criticism. We can then draft the final resolution and then start the procedure for adoption of it.

By the way, Morey Rosenberg of Columbia Law School is the Chairman of the Association of American Law Schools. We should contact him and get the exact dates of the meeting and find out the procedure for getting a resolution before that body. I think that I will ask Walter Barnett to write him and request that information since Walter has connections with that school.