Felicitations!

Consistent with our earlier phone conversation, may I provide you with the following information and request your urgent assistance in a critical, constitutional confrontation.

In spite of virtually unanimous world condemnation, the Republic of the Union of South Africa persists, even to this moment, to perpetrate cultural genocide and individual human rights atrocities against non-white South Africans thru a system of codified racism called apartheid.

No element of apartheid is more functionally important, more vigorously enforced, and more vehemently hated than the Pass Law, an identification law which requires that all non-whites, on demand, provide government identification accounting of one's presence to the police or face instant jail.

The same kind of identification law exists at this moment in the State of California.

California's identification or "Pass Law" is called Section 647(e) of the penal code.

This California statute and its inherent abuses are presently under attack in the U.S. Federal courts in a case titled Edward C. Lawson vs. William Kolander, et al. (No. 77-0213-N). This Federal court action pursuant to USC Title 42, Sec. 1983 contends that 647(e) violates fourth, fifth and fourteenth amendments' constitutional guarantees.

The case at bench is an ideal example of the inherent abuses of 647(e). The Plaintiff, a black resident of the city of San Francisco with no previous arrest record, beginning in early 1975 occasionally made business trips to the city of San Diego, over a period of 16 months. The Plaintiff was detained and/or arrested on no less than 15 documented occasions in metropolitan San Diego, pursuant to California's identification law 647(e).

California appeal courts have twice construed, restricted and found constitutional California's identification law 647(e), on its face, in People of the State of California vs. Chester W. Weger, 59 Cal. Rptr. 661, in 1967, and People of the State of California vs. Arnold J. Solomon, 108 Cal. Rptr. 867, in 1973.

In stark contrast, the Federal courts have found this kind of statute unconstitutional, on its face, in Margaret Pappachristou vs. The City of Jacksonville (Fla.), 405 U.S. 156, in 1972, and Leon Newsome vs. Benjamin J. Malcolm, 492 F.2d 1166, in 1974.

The U.S. Ninth Circuit of Appeal unanimously ruled a Henderson Nevada Ordinance, which is word for word identical to California's identification law 647(e), unconstitutional on its face, in Lloyd Charles Powell vs. W. T. Stone, 507 F.2d 93, in 1974.

In that, the selectively enforced California identification law touches the day to day lives of substantial numbers of the black, the brown and the young throughout San Diego County, who by virtue of class, education or economics are voiceless and without any legal remedy.

In that, the constitutional questions raised in the Federal court action deal with fundamental and far-reaching questions of constitutional law and will ultimately be appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

In that, the simple facts of life, of tacit judicial politics, recognize that the presence of documented, diverse and substantial interest in a potentially landmark decision, commands greater, more meticulous and equitable judicial scrutiny of the case before the bench.

We are therefore, herein, respectfully requesting that individuals and institutions such as yourself (with vested interest and expertise in the subject at bench), file supporting opinions in the form of Amicus Curia Briefs before the appropriate court.

The specific timetable and mechanic of filing supporting Amicus Curia Briefs in this matter are available on request.