NEWS RELEASE

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, 156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010

FRANCIS BIDDLE
Chairman
National Committee

ERNEST ANGELL
Chairman
Board of Directors

EDWARD J. ENNIS
OSMOND K. FRAENKEL
General Counsel

JOHN de J. PEMBERTON, JR.
Executive Director

(212) 675-5990

Ramona Ripston, Director of
Press Relations

FOR RELEASE: TUESDAY A.M., SEPTEMBER 5, 1967. - While the Senate Finance Committee is considering a House-passed Social Security bill containing punitive welfare restrictions and welfare groups picket in protest, a major challenge of Alabama's state welfare program discontinuing aid to dependent children based on the mother's sex practices has been brought in the Federal District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. The suit has been filed by the Roger Baldwin Foundation (RBF) of ACLU in cooperation with the Columbia University Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law.

Twenty-eight states, besides Alabama, enforce so-called "substitute father" or "man in the house" type welfare eligibility requirements. Under the Alabama regulation if a mother is allegedly engaged in extra-marital sex practices, her dependent children may be cut off from public aid. In its attack on the Alabama regulation, the Foundation lawyers struck at the travesty to due process when innocent children who are fully eligible recipients of welfare are penalized for their mother's private sex activities -- a matter completely irrelevant to the giving of welfare funds.

Set up in April, the Roger Baldwin Foundation of the American Civil Liberties Union is ACLU's new tax-deductible arm, named after the Union's founder. It engages in legal, research and educational projects to advance civil liberties. The protection of civil liberties in the nation's welfare system is a major area of concern to the Foundation.

The Foundation suit is on behalf of Mrs. Sylvester Smith, a resident of Dallas County, Alabama, and her four minor children. Until October 11, 1966 she received welfare payments for her four needy children under Alabama's Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program. Payments were discontinued when Mrs. Smith refused to disprove an allegation that she has a sexual relationship with Mr. Williams, an old family friend. Mr. Williams does not support the Smith children; he lives with his own wife and nine children. The sole family income of the Smiths is the twenty dollars per week earned by Mrs. Smith as a cook, working daily from 3:30 A.M. until noon. The father of the first three Smith children is dead, and the father of the last child deserted and gives no support.

"While neither the United States nor the Alabama Constitutions appear to require Alabama to grant financial assistance to needy, dependent children, once

(continued)

Alabama undertakes to provide a statutory program of assistance it must do so in conformity with the constitutional mandate of equal protection," declared the brief. Maintaining that the Smith children, who meet the statutory eligibility requirements for ADC, were denied aid "on an arbitrary and irrational ground," the brief asserted that "Alabama cannot pick and choose the mothers and children it will aid in a whimsical or capricious manner."

The Smith children fall within the state's definition of dependent children as those "deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent," the brief noted, contending that the "real basis for the 'substitute father' regulation is its effect on Negro ADC recipients." The RBF brief argued that Alabama welfare administrators knew, prior to promulgating the regulation, that "the class affected would be primarily Negro....In a scientifically selected random sample of Alabama counties, plaintiffs discovered that in July, 1966, 100% of all terminations for reasons of 'substitute fatherhood' were Negro. Statewide, about 95% of terminations have been Negro. When these background and statistical facts are considered together with the vague nature of the regulation (which allows the local welfare worker to invoke it virtually at will), the unconstitutional nature of the regulation is crystal clear."

In addition to invoking the Constitution's equal protection clause, the Baldwin Foundation charged the 'substitute father' regulation violates the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause in several ways. Firstly, the brief said, "the ADC mother and her children are cut off from aid under this regulation without any opportunity whatsoever to have an impartial hearing prior to the termination of aid." Secondly, the regulation is too vague, the RBF brief asserted. "Defining the 'substitute father' solely in terms of a sexual relationship with the mother, the regulation instructs the welfare worker to institute a termination of benefits whenever there 'appears' to be such a man. On the basis of what evidence does he so 'appear?' That is not stated. It is up to each worker. It is true that the sexual relations are supposed to be 'frequent.' But what is 'frequent?' One of the defendants' agents thinks once each week; another thinks once each three months; for yet another, one sexual act each six months is sufficient."

The regulation further violates due process by requiring the mother to disprove the alleged relationship which "might" exist. "How does the mother successfully disprove a negative fact?" the brief asked.

(continued)

Welfare eligibility in ADC cases depends on administrative baring of the "most intimate details of any relationship a mother might have with members of the opposite sex." This violates the right to privacy, the Foundation brief stated. "How much more onerous, how much more violative of the most intimate privacies when an administratively created eligibility condition for a program to save children from starvation requires the applicant herself to come forward, bare the intimacies of her bedroom, and strip herself of all dignity."

The civil liberties group also maintained that the 'substitute father' regulation contravenes the requirements of the Federal Social Security Act, which prohibits (1) discrimination in an ADC program on the basis of illegitimacy; (2) denial of benefits on the ground that the children are not living in a "suitable home" (judged by the mother's moral behavior); (3) assumption of an income that is not in fact being received by the recipient mother and her children; (4) a state agency from redefining "unemployed parent" so as to deprive the term of its natural and common sense meaning.

The Baldwin Foundation's brief was prepared by attorneys at Columbia University's Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, Brian Glick, Howard Thorkelson, Jonathan Weiss, Stephen Wizner and Edward V. Sparer, With ACLU cooperating attorneys Charles S. Conley and Alvin J. Bronstein, and with Baldwin Foundation director W. Martin Garbus.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL: Ramona Ripston (212) 675-5990
(after hours) (201) 865-6881

PRESS RELEASE #305

NEWS RELEASE

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, 156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010

FRANCIS BIDDLE
Chairman
National Committee

ERNEST ANGELL
Chairman
Board of Directors

EDWARD J. ENNIS
OSMOND K. FRAENKEL
General Counsel

JOHN de J. PEMBERTON, JR.
Executive Director

(212) 675-5990

Ramona Ripston, *Director of Press Relations*

FOR RELEASE: FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1968. - The American Civil Liberties Union has asked the commanding officer of Camp Pendelton, a California Marine Corps base, to set aside the court-martial convictions of two Negro Marines who have been sentenced to ten year and six year prison terms for criticizing the war in Vietnam, and advocating a black separatist policy as an answer to racial injustice in America.

"The central feature of these convictions," said Melvin L. Wulf, ACLU Legal Director, in a letter to Major General Lewis J. Fields, "is that the defendants were convicted not for doing something, but only for saying something....Neither the defendants nor any of their fellow Marines whose loyalty, morale and discipline they were charged with imparing, refused to obey any order or, specifically, refused to obey orders to go to Vietnam."

In his letter Mr. Wulf urged Commanding General Fields to "set the convictions aside or, at the very least...reduce the extraordinary sentences imposed on these two men to the time they have already served."

Both men have been charged under Article 134, of the Uniform Code of Military Justice with violating Sec. 2387 of the Federal Criminal Code which makes it criminal to "advise, counsel, urge, cause and attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty and refusal of duty by members of the armed forces with intent to interfere with, impair, and influence loyalty, morale and discipline."

Private First Class George Daniels was convicted of eight specifications of the charge and sentenced to ten years imprisonment. Lance Corporal William L. Harvey was convicted of four charges of the lesser offense of "making disloyal statements" and was sentenced to six years imprisonment.

Representative statements made by the two, which were the basis of the charges against them were: "Vietnam [is] a white man's war and that therefore black men should not fight there; ...black and white races should be separated by force because they could not get along; that [a] black man should not fight in Vietnam because [after the war he] would have to come back and fight the white man in the United States."

"If the statements had any effect," continues Mr. Wulf in his letter, "and

(more)

the casual relationship is ambiguous at best, it was to suggest to a handful of men to request Mast (a session held by an officer to hear complaints and impose discipline) to discuss a number of issues including Vietnam." What they have done are not criminal offenses and raise the question of "whether members of the armed forces are to be severely punished for speaking among themselves about religious (both men are followers of the Black Muslim faith) and political subjects which may be unorthodox -- particularly within the Marine Corps."

Mr. Wulf urged General Fields to review these cases with "special care. They involve not only the First Amendment in general but, in particular, they involve the right of citizens of the United States to discuss and criticize government policy freely without fear that they will consequently be put into prison. The entire history and tradition of our country grows directly from that freedom."

P.F.C. Daniels and Corp Harvey are both imprisoned at the U.S. Naval Disciplinary Barracks, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. If General Fields approves the convictions, the men will be transferred to a federal penitentiary.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL: Ramona Ripston (212) 675-5990

PRESS RELEASE #347

NEWS RELEASE

The Roger Baldwin Foundation of the
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, 156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010

Telephone: (212) 242-0418

Director-Counsel
Martin Garbus

FOR RELEASE: WEDNESDAY A.M., JUNE 26, 1968

(ADVANCE) NEW YORK, N.Y., JUNE 25. - In a statement on campus demonstrations, the American Civil Liberties Union today criticized students, faculties, and administrations alike.

The Union declared that "the time is overdue for a review of the structure and internal relations of the university on every campus," and called on universities to involve all concerned groups in the development and execution of academic policy at every level.

The statement was released by the Union's Academic Freedom Committee after an exhaustive survey of recent campus disruptions throughout the country.

At many institutions, it pointed out, "there have been grave violations of the principles of sound academic governance by administrations which have denied students reasonable participation in matters of university policy in which their interests have been clearly involved." The statement also criticized "faculties which have been indifferent to the needs and aspirations of students, and...students who by various actions have interfered with the processes of teaching, learning, and the right to free speech."

While condemning the nature of some demonstrations as out of proportion to student grievances and "as categorically in violation of basic principles of academic freedom," the civil liberties group declared that in most cases "students have a prima facie justification for their concern, if not for their manner of expressing it." As examples the Union cited "protests against compulsory ROTC (Tuskegee), the suspension of politically active students (Stanford), the neglect of Negro students (Northwestern), alleged mistreatment of controversial faculty members (Roosevelt), the use of slum parkland for a university facility and the university's ties with defense-related research (Columbia).

"The internal condition pointed to by the frequency and intensity of these disturbances," the statement added, "can best be represented as a progressive neglect of certain principles (full and open communication between all elements within the university...and a rigorous priority of academic and human considerations over financial and organizational ones) together with a change in the nature of the student body and its relations with faculty and administration, a change of which the latter groups have hardly been aware."

Passive faculties, it said, have permitted most of the power in universities to be assumed by the administrations, and they in turn have exercised power "in an essentially managerial way, with little regard for the characteristic intellectual and social realities of academic life....Activist students have played a useful role in helping to draw attention to the imbalance of power within the university, as well as to the increasing identification of the university with a social order of which it should properly be the critic and conscience. At the same time it seems short-sighted, in the attempt to modify this social order, to seek to destroy the only institution capable of playing such a role effectively."

The statement also noted that when universities call police on to the campus such invitation "endangers the autonomy of the institution." The ACLU recommended that police not be summoned to campuses until after all other means of dealing with demonstrations have been exhausted "and then preferably under strict procedural rules laid down and agreed to by administration, faculty, and students." "In view of the brutality of some police actions the formulation of such rules appears to be a matter of urgent priority," the statement added.

The full text of the statement follows.

FOR FURTHER INFCRMATION CALL:

Alan Reitman (212) 675-5990
(after hours) (201) 731-3542

or Judith Follmann (212) 675-5990

PRESS RELEASE #349

represent a small minority among the students and would not be likely to succeed in large-scale actions on campuses where there was a manifest unity of interest among faculty, students and administration.

The manner in which demonstrations have been conducted, at least in some notorious cases, must be condemned as disproportionate to the grievances of the students and as categorically in violation of basic principles of academic freedom. The fact that significant reforms may be won by violent action does not justify the resort to violence, even if such action seems plausible to some in a society marked by violence both internally and in its external actions, and even if an apparent justification after the fact seems to be provided by a violent response, for example a police action. The so-called "politics of confrontation" invites, and is intended to invite, such a response, but in so far as it seeks its ends by means which infringe on the liberties of others it is out of keeping with the principles by which and the purposes for which the university exists.

It must be admitted that an examination of the conditions which have triggered demonstrations shows that in a majority of cases students have had a prima facie justification for their concern, if not for their manner of expressing it. They have protested against compulsory ROTC (Tuskegee), the suspension of politically active students (Stanford), the neglect of Negro students (Northwestern), alleged mistreatment of controversial faculty members (Roosevelt), the use of slum parkland for a university facility and the university's ties with defense-related research (Columbia). The list could be prolonged. These causes are of unequal weight and have sometimes been used, even by students without political or ideological commitments, as excuses for the expression of more fundamental hostilities, reflecting among other things a widespread frustration and disillusionment with the foreign and domestic policies of the present government. But the fact that local pretexts have been so easily come by is no more to be overlooked than the problems of war and race which have set the stage for so many of these episodes.

The internal condition pointed to by the frequency and intensity of these disturbances can best be represented as a progressive neglect of certain principles (full and open communication between all elements within the university - trustees, president, administration, faculty, and students - and a rigorous priority of academic and human considerations over financial and organizational ones) together with a change in the nature of the student body and its relations with faculty and administration, a change of which the latter groups have hardly been aware. Three aspects of this change, familiar enough in isolation but rarely considered together, are the demographic shift to a younger population, the extension of the period of formal training and therefore of dependence, and the lowering of the age of social maturity. The passivity of many faculties has allowed most of the power in the university to pass into the hands of the administration, and the administration has been only too ready to accept this power and to exercise it in an essentially managerial way, with little regard for the characteristic intellectual and social realities of academic life. It is a significant fact that many university administrators are as much at home on the boards of large corporations and in the upper echelons of the bureaucracy as they are on their own campuses. Activist students have played a useful role in helping to draw attention to the imbalance of power within the university, as well as to the increasing identification of the university with a social order of which it should properly be the critic and conscience. At the same time it seems short-sighted, in the attempt to modify this social order, to seek to destroy the only institution capable of playing such a role effectively.

The American Civil Liberties Union, attaching great importance as it does to the preservation of a strong and viable university system as one of the underlying conditions for civil liberties in general, is concerned that the meaning of these events should not be lost sight of through concentration of attention on their more dramatic features. The Union's interest in the principles of academic governance and organization is of long standing. But the time is overdue for a review of the

structure and internal relations of the university on every campus, in order to secure the full involvement and cooperation of all concerned groups in the formulation and execution of academic policy at all levels.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

FEATURE PRESS SERVICE

156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010

BULLETIN #2295

April 3, 1967

ACLU AFFILIATE AIDS HOLLYWOOD TEEN-AGERS HARASSED BY POLICE ON SUNSET STRIP

With Los Angeles city and county police escalating their conflict with youngsters crowding into the streets of West Hollywood and the Sunset Strip, the ACLU of Southern California has repeatedly come to the defense of individuals' constitutional rights. Recognizing the magnitude of the problem, it has opened on Sunset Strip another of its Police Malpractice Complaint Centers.

A public statement by the affiliate last November set forth the factors at issue, from the civil liberties viewpoint. Recognizing the very real problems the young people have presented to law-enforcement officials by reason of their sheer numbers in the area, as well as the teen-agers' legitimate complaints that curfew regulations have been unequally and unfairly applied, the civil-liberties group urged better communications among all parties concerned, a re-examination of the curfew ordinances and their enforcement, self-restraint by police in their dealings with juveniles, and an impartial and open study of the problem under the Los Angeles Human Relations Commissions.

In December, the Executive Director of the Southern California affiliate, Mr. Eason Monroe, was arrested following a protest demonstration of youngsters on the Sunset Strip where he had been present as an observer. He was charged with failure to identify himself to, and interfering with, a police officer. The "failure-to-identify" ordinance has been declared unconstitutional by rulings of both a municipal court and the Superior Court Appellate Department, but Monroe's case is being delayed pending the outcome of an appeal of these rulings by the Pasadena city attorney. At the request of Monroe's lawyers, the court issued a formal order -- the first of its kind in Los Angeles county -- barring police officers from commenting upon the case. The order does not prevent newspapers from seeking and publishing information from other sources.

In the same month, the Southern California ACLU announced that its cooperating counsel will defend all juveniles and adults arrested under L.A. city and county curfew and loitering ordinances in connection with the police actions on the Sunset Strip. Complaints of police brutality will be investigated and, where substantiated, will be the subject of court actions. This across-the-board defense of arrestees requesting ACLU assistance is similar to the affiliate's response at the time of the trials of those arrested in the August 1965 Watts riots. It was estimated that as many as 100 people might need such assistance.

In January, 50 adults arrested for loitering at the time of the youths' demonstrations in the previous two months were discharged when a Beverly Hills municipal court agreed with ACLU attorneys that the Los Angeles loitering ordinance was unconstitutionally vague.

Next, the ACLU affiliate opened its fifth Police Malpractice Complaint Center -- the first one not in a minority-slum area -- in an office in the very center of the area where young people have been demonstrating in protest of police harassment. Don White, president of the local group, stated "It is rather common knowledge that unnecessary force has been used to disperse ... demonstrations....It is also pretty clear that law enforcement officers are being discriminatory in their stopping, questioning, and arresting....The need for organized efforts to press complaints concerning unlawful activities by the police ... has been amply demonstrated during the past few months."

DRIVE FOR D.C. HOME RULE MOVES AHEAD

President Johnson recently promised to abolish by executive order the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. The move would be a long step toward home rule.

In a special message to Congress Feb. 27 Johnson said he would adopt the strategy and most of the proposals suggested to him by the National Capital Area CLU. The affiliate urged the President to use his powers under the Reorganization Act of 1949 to replace the commissioners with a mayor and city council. The present three-member Commission is appointed by the President. The new officials, the CLU said, should be "nominated" by a ballot of District citizens, then appointed by the President. (The President does not have the power to bestow the franchise directly.) Johnson's plan differs from the CLU's in that he would not use the nomination system.

The President would set up the structure of an independent city government as an "interim" step. Although he would continue to appoint D.C. officials, his plan includes a provision that would require top city officials to be residents of the city. Another provision would require selection of the nine city councilmen by wards, which would guarantee Negro representation on the Council.

In the same message Johnson urged Congress to restore the franchise to the city. Home rule measures have repeatedly died in the House District Committee. Although the President's executive order, too, could be overruled by Congress, it would bypass the District Committee and probably would pass on the floor vote.

In another home rule move NCACLU has bypassed the Committee by taking its case to Federal District Court. The suit asks that the Board of Commissioners be enjoined from exercising its powers and that the franchise be returned to the city.

As an essential right, the franchise is reserved by the people under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, NCACLU contends. Disfranchisement violates the 15th Amendment as well because it discriminates against Negroes.

INCREASE IS NOTED IN ATTEMPTS TO BLOCK PUBLICATION THROUGH COURT INJUNCTIONS

Not content with seeking damages for libel or invasion of privacy, an increasing number of self-styled "injured" parties have tried to muffle communications media from issuing the objectionable material. The technique used is the seeking of injunctions halting dissemination of the material in question, according to a report published in December, 1966 by the Freedom of Information Center at the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri at Columbia.

Studying effects upon cinema and TV, as well as the printed media, the report by Research Assistant Robert G. Kingsley reviewed a number of cases in recent years. One of these was the attack by the University of Notre Dame upon the movie-producers and book-publishers of a comedy entitled "John Goldfarb, Please Come Home." The clowning in the plot included a party attended by an imaginary Notre Dame football team. Charging that this illegally appropriated the "name, symbols, football team,... reputation ..." of the college, Notre Dame authorities prevailed upon the New York Supreme Court to enjoin temporarily the showing of the film or publication of the book. However, a five-member appellate bench hearing unanimously reversed both bans, saying that they would have "outlaw(ed) large areas heretofore deemed permissible subject matter for...the arts....Whether 'John Goldfarb, Please Come Home' is... penetrating satire or blundering buffoonery is not for us to decide."

In different legal actions, two movie directors sought to enjoin certain TV broadcasters from chopping up their films when televised, through frequent interruptions for "commercials." Otto Preminger failed to have the TV showing of "Anatomy of a Murder" stopped, the court ruling that minor cuts in TV movies and commercial breaks were in accordance with established television-industry practice and, therefore, acceptable. In the second case, the NBC network, in the face of a court injunction that the film not be so interrupted as to have its character damaged, squeezed 33 commercials into a TV presentation of the movie, "A Place in the Sun." The film was directed by George Stevens. NBC was then ordered to show cause why it should not be held in contempt of court, but the outcome was a ruling by the judge that the network had not knowingly destroyed the dramatic quality of the film. Granting that the many commercials weakened its artistry, the judge wound up by evaluating "A Place in the Sun" as so "dramatic... exciting ... interesting ... that it prevailed over the commercial interruptions."

When Hollywood actress Hedy Lamarr attempted to block by injunction the distribution of her ghost-written autobiography, "Ecstasy and Me," she failed although the court agreed that it was "filthy."

Among other instances, the report cited Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's threatened court injunction to halt publication of the much-publicized William Manchester account of the Kennedy assassination as "one more indication of the increasing trend of individuals to protect their privacy and reputation by appealing for prior restraint through the courts. These are usually wealthy or well-known individuals who are not primarily interested in seeking compensatory damages from the suits traditionally filed following publication."

ILLINOIS ACLU WINS OMNIBUS DUE PROCESS CASE

A suspect who collected three bullets during arrest, 179 parking tickets while recovering in jail and a Traffic Court sentence of $1,050 or seven months, won his freedom when the Illinois Division of the American Civil Liberties Union decided to press the issue.

During Robert Love's arrest a fight broke out. The police won with the help of three bullets. Love's truck was parked outside his residence at the time. Love was in custody 120 days, first in the Chicago City Jail hospital, then in a cell awaiting trial. Each day of the 120 days, sometimes twice a day, the police ticketed the truck.

After the 120 days Love was released from jail. He then was re-arrested for 189 alleged traffic violations. He was charged with violating the traffic laws 179 times while he was in jail and on 10 other occasions. The prosecutor asked the Traffic Court to convict Love for all 189 tickets so that others would not think that they, too, could get away with 189 tickets.

Instead, on Love's guilty plea, the judge fined him $105 for each of the ten tickets he received while not in jail. Love was forced to choose the alternative sentence of seven months.

Love was not represented by counsel until after the trial, when the Illinois CLU got wind of the case. Three weeks later Cooperating Attorney William Stevens moved for a new trial. The judge immediately lowered the sentence to the time Love already had served.

1931 ANTI-WAR POEM UNDER ATTACK IN ARIZONA

A 1931 anti-war poem by E.E. Cummings recently was the subject of two hearings by the Arizona State University Discipline Board and was considered as the subject of a prosecution under the state's obscenity and "flag defamation" laws.

The poem, "I sing of Olaf glad and big," speaks kindly of a conscientious objector and unkindly of patriotic attempts to break his resistance. For distributing it three students were charged by the University with "conducting oneself in a manner that might discredit the university."

Arizona CLU Cooperating Attorneys Sandor Shuch and Pasquale Cheche pointed out at the university hearings that adequate defense was impossible because the charge was too vague. An English professor testified the poem was in the tradition of poetic protest. No disciplinary action was taken.

Copies of the poem were turned over to a county attorney. But the prosecutor decided not to act. "If we take them to court and lose," he reportedly said, "they'll never finish laughing."

DEPORTATION OF ALIEN HOMOSEXUAL FOUGHT

Attempting to prevent the deportation of an alien homosexual, the American Civil Liberties Union and its affiliated New York Civil Liberties Union have submitted a friend of the court brief to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Union is supporting a Canadian who has been a permanent resident of the United States for 12 years. Before and after entering the country, the petitioner engaged in acts of consensual homosexuality. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 permits summary deportation of individuals "with psychopathic personality." And the Immigration and Naturalization Service says homosexual activity establishes such affliction. The Service therefore ordered the appellant to leave the country.

The Union's brief asks the Court to insist that the government "define with reasonable clarity the nature of proscribed substantive conduct." According to the brief, if the term "psychopathic personality" is construed to cover all homosexual activities, as the government alleges Congress intended, "it is so vague as to give little or no guidance as to the scope of its proscription and, therefore, any punishment meted out. . .thereunder deprives [the petitioner] of his liberty without affording him the constitutionally required warning that his conduct was proscribed."

The brief notes, ". . .neither the courts nor the medical profession have construed the term 'psychopathic personality' to include consensual homosexual conduct." Therefore, the Union contends, "for Congress to ascribe an unexpected meaning to a phrase which had never before borne such meaning is an exercise in legislative cryptography. . . ."

The vagueness of the standard is responsible also for an abridgment of the petitioner's Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination, the brief says. In applying for citizenship in 1963 the petitioner revealed information that led to the discovery of his homosexual activities. Had he been able to know that the information would incriminate him, he could have exercised his right to refrain from divulging it.

The Union asks the Court to consider in addition "the application of deportation statutes to conduct which does not endanger the public safety." The brief contends, "Where conduct, like that in which petitioner was engaged, is private and consensual, without any act of aggression towards the community, no interest of the state is threatened."

ACLU Board Member David Carliner, Cooperating Attorney Burt Neuborne, NYCLU General Counsel Nanette Dembitz and NYCLU Staff Counsel Alan H. Levine prepared the brief.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FEATURE PRESS SERVICE
156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010

NEW YORK N.Y.

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 3109

Managing Editor
Herald
114 N. 4th Street
Yakima, WA 98901

EDIT WC

L437

NEWS RELEASE

FROM: American Civil Liberties Union
of Washington
2120 Smith Tower
Seattle, Washington 98104 (MAin 4-2180)

FOR RELEASE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1964

The American Civil Liberties Union of Washington today announced its support of the Indians of Washington State in their "Campaign of Awareness" which, after two days of meetings in Olympia, will culminate in an audience with Governor Rosellini at 11 o'clock Tuesday morning.

After meeting with Bruce Wilkie, Secretary of the Makah tribal council, and executive secretary of the National Indian Youth Council, President Leonard W. Schroeter declared ACLU's intention to join the Indians in their discussions in Olympia, which will examine the problems arising from the State's attempts to interpose its fishing regulations over those granted the tribes by Federal Treaty.

Schroeter stated that the area of Indian rights has too long been clouded by misinformation, misunderstanding and indifference. He pointed out that many truly concerned groups and individuals have been unaware of the issues and history surrounding relations between Indian tribes and State and Federal governments.

The ACLU further voiced its concern in the basic area of Indian Treaty Rights and the principle of consent to state jurisdiction which basically affect the civil liberties of Indians in America.

ACLU representatives will confer with the Indian leaders on Monday and ACLU members will join with the full Indian gathering, and other interested people, on the steps of the State Temple of Justice, Tuesday, when the delegation meets Governor Rosellini.