

A final word -- about the original formation of NCSCCL. In establishing The Committee, Dr. Warner sought the counsel of Dr. Evelyn Hooker, who agreed to assist on one condition: that The Committee in perpetuity commit itself to the understanding that there are no "gay" issues, there are no "straight" issues, there are only sexual issues. The wisdom of this is evident in the eight cases we have won before state tribunals. The folly of the other approach is indicated, for example, by the loss by mainline gay activists in their Doe vs. Commonwealth (Virginia) appeal to the United States Supreme Court, which they lost. Regretably, following

Supreme Court legal tradition, it is unlikely that a gay sodomy decriminalization case can be presented to the Supreme Court within the next 20 years, because the Supreme Court usually refuses to hear like-cases withⁱⁿ 20 years under the rubric "we've decided that issue already".

I have been attacked for my relationship with such an evil man as Dr. Warner and such an evil organization as the National Committee for Sexual Civil Liberties, a subsidiary of AAPP, of which I am Vice President. The attacks by Ojibway are continuing into 1983.

Who is this evil Dr. Warner? His report to the Board for our 1982 Midwinter meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, is attached, as is the report by Dr. Dynes for the Academic and Scholarship subsidiary of AAPP. Dr. Dynes, a professor of art history at Hunter College in New York City, is editor of "Gay Books Bulletin", the only scholarly publication on the subject.

The Committee (NCSCL) seeks out the finest minds and the most friendly and cooperative individuals it can; The Committee has only one purpose: TO HOLD ANNUAL MEETINGS! In Michigan only Daniel Sivil is a member -- Joe Delisa recently resigned for personal reasons. Invited to our Annual Meeting in Philadelphia in 1982 were David Piontkowsky, Robert Lundy and Mike Walsh (only Lundy did not attend) and one other person who must remain nameless. He must remain nameless because he has made a several-year commitment to be in a delicate employment situation for us, so that we will have inside information which will be of inestimatable value in future court cases.

Sure, The Committee is "elitist", but not without cause. And within itself it is "elitist" -- for example, one lengthy morning session is always reserved "For Attorneys Only", which any of us may attend, but at which only attorneys may speak; the purpose, of course, is to allow the finest gay legal minds in the country to thrash out, in a professional environment, complicated legal strategies. Of course, after the meeting, we can freely ask questions of our fellow members.

Better understanding of the organization is obtained if one refers to it as a "quality organization" rather than an "elitist organiza-

tion". With the Board of AAPP handling all of the corporate minutiae, The Committee is freed to be productive -- that is the key to its success, which includes, for example, winning eight of the nine cases in the states where sodomy was decriminalized judicially, and initiating the Cuban refugee program through our Committee's contacts in Havana and in Washington. Clearly, such matters require great delicacy -- which is why we stress quality minds, friendship, lifetime commitments -- and which is why we have such a limited membership and spend over a year in investigating proposed members. Our success over the last 14 years attests to that!

How elitist? Within the last few years, our invited guests have included Steven Endean, Executive Director of GRNL, whose Board Co-Chair Jerry Weller of Portland, Oregon, is a member of our Committee; Larry Bush, of Washington, D.C., the pre-eminent gay political writer in the country: notice the last name; Rep. David Clarenbach, of Madison, Wisconsin; etc. etc. Leonard Matlovich has committed himself for three annual appearances free for our Committee for the rest of his life in appreciation for our work on his behalf.

Is it any wonder that I am proud of The Committee and feel that I need justify myself to noone for my membership thereon?

Also attached is an envelop. It contains a letter written by Ojibway as Dr. Warner was addressing an A.S.P. meeting on 7-13-80. The signature "A Member" is, of course, Ojibway. Is it any wonder Ojibway is considered an annoying lightweight, and is tolerated benignly by some local and most all national leaders?