

DIVERSITY AND THE BAR

A PUBLICATION OF THE OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES, ACCESS AND FAIRNESS PROGRAMS



BY ANTHONY CAPOZZI

Diversity and The State Bar of California: View from the Top

This has been an exciting year for me. I attended a number of diversity bar events and worked with the Access and Fairness Committees and our dedicated, hardworking staff, that keep diversity issues to the forefront.

The State Bar Access and Fairness Committees have the sole charge of increasing diversity in the legal profession on behalf of their respective and combined constituencies. This means increasing the number of diverse attorneys entering the profession, providing employment and career advancement opportunities, and increasing the appointments to the State Bar entities and other positions.

In terms of State Bar appointments, the Board of Governor's Volunteer Involvement Committee is working with our committees to gather information on the composition of all State Bar committees, determine the demographics of the applicant pool, develop ways to increase the diversity of the applicant pool, and work with various State Bar entities regarding the need for and importance of diversity in their memberships.

Diversity matters on a number of levels impacting societal issues, educational benefits, increased opportunities, and the competitive edge, all which combine to highlight the importance of diversity in the legal profession and the benefits to society and our local communities.

Justice O'Connor in *Grutter v. Bollinger* emphasized that diversity in the profession is key in making the profession legitimate in the eyes of the public. She wrote, "In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry, it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity."

Furthermore, diversity in the profession and the judiciary is critical to the community's trust in the justice system and the perception that the system provides equal access to justice for all members of our community through legal representation provided by attorneys with sensitivity to and understanding of client backgrounds and cultures. These two reasons alone provide the State Bar's perspective and the key reason that diversity remains a top priority to the Board of Governors.

In addition, diversity is important in legal academia. Law schools must provide training and educational opportunities for all to succeed. "Access to legal education (and thus the legal profession) must be inclusive of talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity, so that all members of our heterogeneous society may participate in the educational institutions that provide the training and education necessary to succeed in America." (*Grutter*).

Justice O'Connor further recognized "... the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body." She stressed the value of diversity for all students by being exposed to and interacting with students from diverse backgrounds in the formulation of and application of our legal principles. This interaction and exchange of diverse ideas and viewpoints can have a far-reaching and positive impact on their future practice of law.

Businesses also seek diversity in legal representation because their customers demand diversity. The corporate world understands this dynamic; and the law firms that rely on corporate support are responding with increased diversity in hiring.

Where have we been and where are we now? Statistically - we have a long way to go. Comparing 2002 Census figures and results from a 2001 State Bar membership survey:

- **Women** - 50.2% in California (2002 Census) but only 32% of Bar (per 2001 survey)
- **Minorities** - 53.7% of the California population but only 17% of the Bar membership
- **Attorneys with disabilities** - 12.6% in California but only 4% of the Bar membership
- **LGBT Attorneys** - only 2.4% of the Bar membership (no California census figures available)

Law schools have increased their diversity, but not enough to make a dramatic impact. It will take a sustained effort over a long period of time. We need to increase outreach and educational programs to generate greater interest among high school and college students to consider law as a profession. We need to provide workshops, mentoring programs and other support for law students from diverse backgrounds to help them survive law school. We need to provide students with a realistic view of the practice of law and the skills and insight to survive in the profession. We also need to encourage diversity throughout the law schools, not only among the student body, but also within the faculty and administrations, as well as through the curriculum.

In this and other areas, a collaborative approach, with reliance on combined strengths, is being utilized to address common issues and achieve goals in a more effective and efficient manner. Some of our collaborative efforts this past year include:

- Co-sponsoring the *Brown v. Board of Education* symposium in Sacramento CA with the Administrative Office of the Courts
- Attending a meeting of the newly formed Minority Bar Coalition, a group of minority bar associations working collaboratively in the San Francisco/Bay Area, headed by our own EMRC members, Victor Hwang and Katherine C. Zarate, to discuss issues relevant to their members, including ways of encouraging members to apply for State Bar Committees and the Bench.
- Convening the inaugural class of the State Bar of California Access & Fairness Leadership Academy of twelve attorneys from different backgrounds who aspire to become leaders in diverse and under-represented communities. These Academy members met in conjunction with the State Bar's Spring Summit Leadership Forum in San Diego.
- Participating in the joint planning session of the State Bar Access and Fairness Committees and the Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services as they identified challenges in achieving diversity in the legal profession and projects and initiatives to address these challenges. ABA President-elect, Robert Grey, joined the planning sessions and the next day, delivered the keynote speech at the Leadership Forum.
- Attending and making the welcoming remarks to the first ever National South Asian Bar Association Conference in Santa Monica, California with over 300 people attending from around the country.
- Attending the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association 1st Annual Northern California Regional Conference in San Francisco and participating on a panel with Carlos Singh, President of the Hispanic National Bar Association, John Yang, President of NAPABA, and Diane Yu, Chair of the ABA Commission on Women focusing on emerging issues for tomorrow's lawyers (including leadership and diversity issues)
- Joining numerous diversity groups, including the women's section of the Contra Costa Bar, the Fresno County Women Lawyers, and the ABA Commission on Women in the Profession at their meetings and events to promote the State Bar diversity programs and to learn about the work of the various groups.

It has been a fun and enlightening year for me and an honor to have served as President of the State Bar of California. Hopefully, in my brief tenure as President, we have raised awareness and advanced the cause of diversity within the Bar.

Anthony Capozzi, President of The State Bar of California, 2003-2004

what's inside

- 2 MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRS
- 5 2004 STATE BAR SPRING SUMMIT: LEADERSHIP FORUM
- 6 2004 STATE BAR SPRING SUMMIT
- 7 LEADERSHIP FORUM LUNCHEON
- 8 PIPELINE: A PLEDGE TO UPHOLD THE ADA
- 9 DOMESTIC PARTNER RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES ACT OF 2003
- 10 FIRSTS!
- 11 LEADERSHIP ACADEMY ON THE MOVE
- 12 NEWS & EVENTS



MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRS

CWIL



SHARON LYBECK HARTMANN
CHAIR

This has been a creative year for CWIL!

Our brand-new program "So You Want to Teach Law" was a big success. One hundred and forty-seven people came from all over California to hear panelists such as Dean Emerita Susan Prager of UCLA and Dean Emerita Herma Hill Kay, of Boalt, give them detailed, practical advice on how to apply for a teaching position in a law school. Also participating were Professors Alan Hammond of Santa Clara Law School and Bill Araiza of Loyola, both of whom have headed their respective hiring committees for the past three years. The information offered was so good, that as a result, one attendee landed a teaching job within two months of attending! Loyola Law School generously donated its wonderful new Moot Court room with state of the art facilities and also provided a video overflow room for the overflow crowd. Although we charged a registration fee of only \$50 (which included a box lunch), we even made money on it.

We are grateful to the other Access and Fairness Committees all of which co-sponsored "So You Want to Teach Law" as did California Women Lawyers and the Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles. Attendees were largely women and minorities, who are notably under-represented in the ranks of law professors. The whole event was so satisfactory, and generated so much interest among those who could not attend, that CWIL plans to repeat it during 2005 in Northern

California. We especially thank our 2002-2003 CWIL Chair, Lisa Baird, who remained with the committee during this year as a volunteer solely to head up this event.

We also inaugurated two more new programs this year. Through student request, we created and offered a panel on law student stress. Among the panelists at the University of San Francisco Law School were two third year students who talked about their own stressful experiences and how they handled them, a psychologist from the school's counseling office, Richard Carlton, Deputy Director of the State Bar's Lawyers Assistance Program and State Bar Attorney Cydney Batchelor from the Discipline Office. Richard Carlton pointed out that students need to learn how to handle stress while they are in law school because, if they do not, stress may well lead them into disciplinary trouble once they are admitted to the profession. The panel was very well received, and requests to repeat it were immediate.

Another program inaugurated this year was "The New Face of Sexual Harassment." A panel dealing in part with same-sex sexual harassment and trans-gender harassment in the workplace was piloted in San Francisco, sponsored by CWIL, CSOGID and BASF. Panelists included Denise Eaton-May and Phil Horowitz of the State Bar Employment Law Section and Shannon Minter of the National Center for Lesbian Rights. The panel will be repeated in Southern California in the fall of 2004. Michelle Osborne and Tamara Dahn created this panel and Cynthia Juno will bring it south.

For the fourth year, we also presented six panels of women lawyers in law schools across the state, where the participants described what practice is like for women attorneys today in all areas of the law. This year we decided to concentrate on schools where we had not previously appeared. Among those we reached for the first time were Stanford Law School, San Joaquin Law School in Fresno, West Los Angeles School of Law and Western State Law School in Fullerton. The major questions asked by students this year, as in the past, dealt with quality of life issues and especially time for child rearing. Deana Chuang headed the law school effort this year. *Cont. on page 7*

My year as Chair of the Committee on Legal Professionals with Disabilities is almost over. When I became the Chair, I had the confidence that I could do the job. Disability gives me that confidence because I have learned a lot from my disability, rejection being the foremost in my learning process. However, I had my colleagues – the Committee Members – believing in me, which added tremendously to my confidence. I am grateful for their generous assistance.

A major task was to carry out a Survey of Legal Professionals with Disabilities about their woes and their concerns, and to seek solutions. The survey received recognition in a legal newspaper and was also summarized and published in California Bar Journal. We completed the survey, analyzed the responses, and prepared a draft report for dissemination. The draft report was circulated for public comment and the final report and recommendations will be presented to the Board of Governors to determine the State Bar's role in addressing these issues.

The year also saw a renewal of the Pledge Program – to exhort the legal firms in renewing their pledges they had signed in 1996 to afford equal employment opportunity to legal professionals with disabilities. (See article about the Pledge Project on page 8.) These legal professionals can do the job given reasonable accommodations. We also took a step back from this and initiated a dialog with the State Bar Office of Admission to help make the process of applying for and receiving accommodations during the Bar examination a bit smoother. CLPD is also preparing a final draft of recommendations on the Bar Examiner's proposed rule changes on the accommodation process to the body. The Committee has just initiated the new Discovery Accommodations Project, to obtain reasonable accommodations for attorneys and deponents with disabilities during the deposition process. Many times, attorneys with disabilities, their clients with disabilities, or both have no accommodations provided or are refused accommodations when they appear to give depositions.



CLPD ANIL MEHTA
CHAIR

At the State Bar's Annual Meeting in Monterey, CLPD is presenting two panels: one on employment issues for persons with disabilities and one on access issues for legal professionals with disabilities. The Committee continues to achieve diversity through inclusion of legal professionals with disabilities in every aspect of their profession.

I believe a disability makes things more complicated than need be. From my point of view, especially when you have an apparent disability, a large part of what people see in you is that disability when they look at you. They instantly try to avoid the situation. You need a society that can see beyond that disability and see the person through it. I am an amputee of my left arm upper extremity. I try to help others see through my disability by asking if the person needs someone to do a job single-handedly. It is not a joke about my missing limb; it is to make them see that the term is associated with superior performance. That's what the term "single-handedly" is all about. It is me speaking from inside and revealing my disability in its most splendid able form, and it is the goal of CLPD to help others recognize these positive qualities in all legal professionals with disabilities.



EMRC

BLANCA QUINTERO
CHAIR

EMRC has had a very successful and productive 2003-2004 year. During this past year, we participated in extensive outreach efforts with high schools,

colleges, and law schools throughout California. For example, as part of its high school outreach, EMRC members participated in San Francisco's Embarcadero's YMCA San Francisco Youth & Government program. EMRC also participated in a Career Day at Roul Wallenberg High School in San Francisco, in addition to participating in "Court Day" in San Diego where a classroom of 20-25 students visited a local Superior Court house in San Diego to learn more about the judicial and legal system. In addition to the high school outreach, EMRC participated in various law school outreach efforts aimed toward introducing ethnic minority law students to the State Bar and EMRC. EMRC also introduced itself to many newly admitted attorneys by participating in various swearing-in ceremonies throughout California.

EMRC is closing the 2003-2004 year by presenting two separate MCLE panels for the 2004 Annual Meeting in Monterey, California, titled "Technology: The Law Office of the Future" and "Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Bias by Increasing Diversity: A Guide for Lawyers". Through its MCLE programs, as well as its various outreach efforts, EMRC is striving to encourage the entry and advancement of ethnic minorities in the legal profession.

As a farewell, I would like to thank EMRC members and Rod Fong (EMRC's State Bar liaison) for their time, commitment, and dedication to EMRC. I am personally very proud of the work EMRC has done in the past years, especially during this past 2003-2004 year. There is no question in my mind that EMRC has made a difference, and will continue making a difference in California in recruiting, retaining, and promoting the advancement of ethnic minorities in the legal profession. I wish EMRC continued success in fulfilling its very important charges, and under the leadership of Eric Brooks (Chair-Elect) and Jane Kow (Vice-Chair Elect), I have no doubt that EMRC will reach new heights in the years to come. ¡Adios!

CSL

The plight of senior lawyers, that is, attorneys who are 55 years of age or older, is a situation that will eventually affect all attorneys, if they are fortunate to continue practicing law. The various issues that arise from aging manifest in countless ways, from perception to performance. As an attorney ages, she or he may (erroneously) be perceived as less effective, particularly by potential employers. Additionally, difficulty relating to clients, keeping up with changes in the law or new methods of practicing, as well as the mechanical aspects of simply closing a practice (or valuing it in order to sell), may take many attorneys by surprise.

The Committee on Senior Lawyers is dedicated to finding ways to address these issues and to fulfill its charge to the Board of Governors by researching and making recommendations to the Board. This year, the committee designed educational programs to broaden attorneys' practices that address issues facing senior clients, such as providing some solutions to predatory loans, preparing them for the new wave of clients with estate planning problems, including Advance Health Care Directives and advising them of changes in the laws regarding Medi-Cal. We have been exploring new ways to practice elder law, such as the issues of death and dying and the collaborative ways other professionals are included in the treatment of the elder client. Also, technology and preparing a practice for sale or closure are being addressed in a comprehensive way. Additionally, these programs are being shared with local bar associations as a means of recruiting new members to their Elder Law or Senior Lawyers Sections.

VIRGINIA S. MUELLER
CHAIR



From these programs, this committee will be able to develop a bank of resources which will be prepared for posting on the State Bar's website. This member benefit will then be available to all California attorneys.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to be the Chair of this committee for this year, as well as a member for the past four years. I thank my fellow members for their contributions and dedication to the committee.

Get Involved with the State Bar!

You, too, can join in on the excitement by volunteering for one of the Access & Fairness Committees or any of the State Bar committees, commissions, or sections.

The State Bar is committed to ensuring that all attorneys in California have equal access to the legal profession. One of the key tenets of the State Bar's Mission Statement is to "assure the full and equal opportunity of all persons for entry and advancement in the legal profession." Consistent with this mission, the State Bar encourages every member to become involved in activities and committees aimed at achieving a diversified membership. The best way to become involved is to become a member of one of the Access & Fairness Committees described throughout this Newsletter. Committee members served for a three year term and meet four to six times a years.

The application process begins on December 1, 2004 and ends February 1, 2005. Information about each committee, qualifications necessary for service and the application form can be found on the State bar's website: www.calbar.ca.gov.

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRS

During my tenure as Chair of the State Bar Committee on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination (CSOGID), I have had the distinct pleasure of working with many interesting and talented people, each of whom has taught me a great deal about both sexual orientation and gender identity bias issues. Indeed, although I am a gay man who has worked and lived in the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community my entire adult life, I have learned through this experience that I have much to learn about the unique issues facing our diverse community.

Among the most significant subjects that have contributed to my personal growth is the subject of – to use an old and broadly defined term – transsexualism. While I have been a longtime advocate of the rights of transgender people, and have worked diligently to understand the concerns of this community and to empathize with the oppression and discrimination that transgender people experience, I am consistently reminded that I still have much to learn. CSOGID has been a great resource for this education – for me and countless other attorneys within this state – through panels presented at the State Bar Annual Meeting and through State Bar publications, etc. Recognizing, however, that there are still countless legal professionals within this state who have no concept of what it means to be transgender (let alone understand the concerns or challenges of such individuals), I want to take this opportunity to share some of the most basic information about transgender people that must be understood if one is to open one's heart and mind to this community.

Given the name of my committee, I suppose that I should begin with the concept of “gender identity.” Broadly stated, “gender identity” is how we see ourselves. It refers to a person's internal, deeply felt sense of one's own gender. While most of us see ourselves as either male or female, some people feel that they are a combination of both, while others identify as neither gender. Indeed, some people have complex identities that may be considered fluid and/or change over time. In contrast, “gender expression” is often used to describe how people present themselves outwardly. If you think about it, everyone projects their gender in their own way. Often a person projects as either male or female by conforming to “socially acceptable” gender stereotypes in dress and appearance. Others are “gender non-conforming” such that they do not conform to any “conventional” gender stereotypes; but, in doing so, they too are expressing their gender in their own way.

Transgender people are those whose gender identity does not match the gender they were born with (or, if they are intersexed at birth – as occurs in one of every 2,000 newborns – persons whose gender identity does not match the gender that was assigned to them at birth, whether surgically or simply by arbitrary election). While such individuals deal with the disparity they feel in many different ways, many elect to change their gender expression to match their gender identity. By doing so, they elect to “self-identify” their gender, rather than project the gender that was imposed upon them at birth. These individuals often elect to simply dress and present themselves in a manner consistent with their gender identity, while others choose from a plethora of medical options that assist in reassigning one's physical body to conform with one's gender identity. It is important to note, however, that physical “gender reassignment” is not a

CSOGID



JEFFREY W. ERDMAN
CHAIR

requirement for a person to change their gender expression, and that not all transgender people elect to pursue such options. The bottom line is that transgender people should be accepted based on their self-identification rather than arbitrary guidelines created by society.

Of course, the variety with which individuals may self-identify inevitably leads to a diversity within the transgender community. Many transgender people do not even consider themselves “transgender” as I have broadly used the term here. Some employ one of any number of other terms that have been used over the years to describe or define this aspect of our community while some choose to avoid labels altogether. The same could be said about such individual's sexual orientation. As with non-transgender persons, transgender individuals may be straight, gay, lesbian, bisexual or none of the above. It may seem obvious when stated plainly, but one's sexual orientation is a distinctly different matter than one's gender; the gender of those to whom we are physically or emotionally attracted to has no relationship to our own gender.

I was reminded of this fact at the June meeting of CSOGID in San Diego, California. At the meeting, while making my usual rant about the lack of diversity within the State Bar's committees and sections (see my article in the last issue), I ignorantly noted that there were no “heterosexual” people on CSOGID and insisted that we would do better to make our own committee more inclusive while also pressuring others to do the same. It was quickly pointed out to me that we in fact had “heterosexual” members on our committee. Indeed, we did have heterosexual members – transgender members who identified as heterosexual because they were attracted to persons with genders opposite to their own gender identity. I was red with shame – my own ignorance (and perhaps even some latent bias) had gotten the best of me. None of us is perfect. But we must work every day at opening our own minds and rooting out the ignorance and bias we all carry with us. We must reject at every turn the efforts made by our parents, by our schools, and by society in general to dictate the way we should perceive and judge others. If we cannot do it ourselves in our everyday lives, we cannot expect the legal profession as a whole to do it.

CSOGID will continue its work to raise the consciousness of the legal profession – to educate the profession about the diversity of people who make up the legal community and the issues and challenges that they face every day. We hope that, in your own way, you too seek to raise the collective consciousness of the profession by taking time to learn more about your vast community and by exposing more of your own uniqueness along the way.

2004 State Bar Spring Summit: Leadership Forum

On Saturday, June 5, 2004, the State Bar of California held its Spring Summit (formerly called Midyear Meeting), in San Diego, focusing on the theme of “Leadership & Diversity: Changing Rules for Being Leaders in the 21st Century.” Led by the Chair of the Leadership Forum Planning Committee and Board of Governors Member Demetrius Shelton, the daylong conference was presented to over 200 lawyers and guests. After being welcomed by Anthony Capozzi, President of The State Bar of California and Thomas Warwick, President, San Diego County Bar Association and Former Member, State Bar Board of Governors, the program began in earnest with the plenary: Leadership & Diversity “Changing Rules for Being Effective Leaders in the 21st Century”. The speakers were Stewart Kwoh, Executive Director of the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, and Manuel Pastor, Professor of Latin American and Latino Studies and Director of the Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, University of California at Santa Cruz. These co-authors discussed the need for leaders to be aware of diverse cultures in order to be effective. (see the plenary review by Shivani Bommakanty on 6)

The plenary was followed by a panel consisting of Charles Bird, Former Chair of the State Bar Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation; Pauline Gee, Former Member, State Bar, Board of Governors; Carol Lam, United States Attorney, Southern District of California; Raymond Marshall, Former President, The State Bar of California; and Hon. Cruz Reynoso, Former Associate Justice, California Supreme Court, which talked about “What It Takes To Become a Leader” After a panel presentation, the audience had the opportunity to break into smaller discussion groups.



Stewart Kwoh

The Keynote Speaker at lunch was Robert Grey, Jr., President-Elect of the American Bar Association. Said David Marcus, current Board of Governor member, “To me the high point of the conference was Robert Grey’s lunch speech. I found it inspirational, and his concrete examples of the courage and principle exhibited by Oliver Hill and Lewis Powell demonstrated leadership... “Mr. Grey gave a powerful talk, relating his personal story and mentorship towards becoming an attorney and the president-elect of the



Attendees engaging in small group discussions. President-elect John van de Kamp and Board of Governor James Heiting

ABA, demonstrating leadership as a core value, not merely ambition. Another attendee observed, “Dynamic—rekindled my drive in a huge way!”

Lunch was followed by programs given by Michael Roosevelt, education specialist for the Education Department of the Administrative Office of the Courts, as well as current community and legal notables, such as Carlos Singh, the President of the Hispanic National Bar Association and an Assistant United States Attorney in San Jose, Bonnie Dumanis, District Attorney, San Diego County, Martha Africa, a legal recruiter with Major, Hagen & Africa, and Professor Roy L. Brooks, the Warren Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of San Diego School of Law. Other programs included bar leadership, paths towards careers involving the courts, academia, community leadership, law firms, and non-traditional settings.



Community Leaders panel, Judge Erica Yew and Professor Tom Nazario

Based on the comments by many of the attendees, the Leadership Forum was a worthwhile conference with valuable information. The Leadership

Forum will be presented again as a Spring Summit theme in 2007.



CYLA Board members Maralee McDonald, Daniel Alexander, and Feb Cabrasawan enjoying the afternoon dessert break

California: a harbinger for the issues on racial policy for the nation

Stewart Kwoh and Manuel Pastor, among the authors of *Searching For the Uncommon Common Ground*¹, presented the plenary entitled “Changing Rules for Being Effective Leaders in the 21st Century” at the 2004 State Bar Spring Summit Leadership Forum held on June 5, 2004 in San Diego, California. Manuel Pastor is a Professor of Latin American and Latino Studies and the Director of the Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Stewart Kwoh is the President and Executive Director of the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California.

Pastor and Kwoh observed that race in America is typically viewed through the black-white paradigm. In *Searching For the Uncommon Common Ground*, the authors argued that, although this is a significant dimension of race in America, it is limited, since Hispanics and Asian Americans, among others, are a growing and increasingly vital part of the racial fabric of America whose needs and issues are relevant to America’s policy on race. To be effective, social policies must now adopt a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural perspective.

Race is not a static issue, due to changing demographics of America. Today, just over 70 percent of Americans are white, down from well over 80 percent in 1970. African Americans have been the largest minority in the past. However, the 2001 census indicates that Hispanics are equally the largest minority, while Asians are the fastest growing share of the U.S. population. It is projected that by 2050, the United States will be nearly a “majority-minority” country, and the Latino population will exceed all of the other minority populations combined. Can race then be understood through the black-white experience? Is there a developing ethnic mix that requires a new analytical framework? These answers may emerge from our study of how California is grappling with these issues today.

California may very well serve as a laboratory for national policy on race as it is currently a rough parallel of the projected changes in the U.S. population. The authors pointed out that in the past decade, the state has witnessed perhaps the most racially charged event of the recent past when riots broke out due to the outrage from the not-guilty verdict in the trial of the police officers accused for of beating Rodney King. Although it was portrayed in the media as a “black-white” phenomenon, Latinos were apparently the most numerous among those arrested and Latino neighborhoods were the most damaged. The driving factor behind these riots was poverty. Viewing issues of social unrest or poverty from a black-white perspective would be incomplete since this perspective would omit issues of Latino poverty characterized by the working poor as opposed to poverty due to joblessness suffered by African-American population.

The black-white perspective will also omit the Asian-American experience –even though these populations are doing relatively well economically, they suffer from disadvantages suffered due to racial profiling and being viewed as “foreigners.” California was also home to the El Monte sweatshop that was involved in locking up Thai women for 7 years. Now California is leading the country in anti-sweatshop laws.

BY SHIVANI BOMMAKANTY



California has also been witness to racially charged trials, anti-immigrant political campaigns, statewide ballot measures that successfully ended affirmative action and most forms of bilingual education, among countless other racially divisive tensions. Interestingly, the most significant dynamic may be that California has a much larger share of minority youth than the old. The racial age gap has led to the reluctance of older whites to invest in the social infrastructure needed by minority youth. In particular, spending on minority children’s education has lagged. The resulting damage from lack of attention paid to minority youth needs is not limited to their communities. It also will affect the older white population, since these minority youth will be the source of tax revenue needed to support the baby boomers in their retirement. Thus, it becomes vital to connect the old and young and educate them on how restrictions on minority progress hurt not only the minority population but the larger American population as a whole as future American economy depends on the opportunities made available to all Americans.

Manuel Pastor emphasized the importance of keeping social policies that assist immigrants and the poor. He related the policies that benefited his father such as the GI bill, federally sponsored loans for veterans that made it possible for his father to purchase a home. He credited the community college system that was willing to take his father even though he lacked strong English skills and typical educational credentials so that he had an opportunity to enhance his skills to earn a better wage. He also described how he was indebted to an affirmative action program that allowed him to attend the University of California. He reminded us that we have an obligation to keep access to education opportunities for everyone.

Stewart Kwoh pointed out that Asian Americans are always viewed as newcomers despite first immigrating to the U.S. in the 19th century. He related a personal story of, while answering a white waitress that he was third generation Asian American, being interrupted and asked, “how do you like your new country?” He also advocated intergroup relations and focus on inter-ethnic issues in grappling with socio-economic issues. He emphasized that leadership today means a renewed commitment to racial equality, to explore whether there is genuine equal opportunity, to continually improve skills, and gain a multi-ethnic, multi-group, and multi-sector perspective.

The plenary highlighted the need for California bar leaders from all organizations to understand the changing demographics of California. It also guided leaders to approach current social/justice issues from a multi-ethnic, multi-racial, multi-cultural perspective and emphasized our role in safeguarding social policies that provide opportunities for everyone to succeed.

Reference (or footnote) on page 11

Robert J. Grey, Jr. Addresses the 2004 Leadership Forum Luncheon

Robert J. Grey Jr., President-Elect of the American Bar Association and partner in the Richmond, VA, office of Hunton & Williams gave an inspirational and moving luncheon keynote speech. Mr. Grey will be the second person of color to head the association, following Dennis Archer. Grey made ABA history in 1998 when he became the first African-American chairman of the association's policy-making House of Delegates - the second highest ranking office in the association.

Mr. Grey addressed the 200 attendees with his observations about leadership and how community leaders set the standard and influence the behavior of its citizens. He spoke of the need for attorneys to be involved in legal services and pro bono as ways to be in the forefront regarding issues of social justice. On a personal note, he also recalled how, as a young lawyer, he was summoned to the great Virginia Jurist Oliver Hill's home, and when he arrived, the aging, nearly blind judge commanded Mr. Grey to "read to me!"

Robert J. Grey Jr.



Mr. Grey, who was inspired to become an attorney at a young age by people such as Lawrence Douglas Wilder –the nation's first elected African American governor– will continue to emphasize diversity in the ABA (black members were banned until 1943). The appreciative audience gave Mr. Grey a well-deserved standing ovation for his inspirational remarks.

CWIL *Continues from page 2*

Our new Vice-Chair Pearl Mann continued our statewide program of Elimination of Bias programs in non-metropolitan areas. And we have also designed a splendid program for the annual meeting under the capable leadership of Pam Wagner, our Chair Elect. It deals with the Bay Area Glass Ceiling Initiative and gives an updated report on its status.

We couldn't be so hardworking and productive without the efforts of each of our 15 members scattered statewide in all the areas of legal practice, in law school and in the judiciary. I thank each of them for their remarkable individual efforts this past year and for the great pleasure of knowing them in all of their diversity and incredible level of accomplishment. How they do it, I don't know, but it has been a joy for me to be among them. This is my last column as chair and I thank the State Bar and each CWIL member for the extraordinary experience of working with them for the past four years.

FIRST ACCESS & FAIRNESS JOINT PLANNING SESSION

On Friday, June 4, 2004, the five Access & Fairness Committees, along with the State Bar's Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, met to propose ideas to increase diversity in the State Bar's membership and governance processes. Shelley Stump, the consultant who has guided the Administrative Office of the Courts and the State Bar through their strategic planning, led the productive session. President Tony Capozzi and President-elect John Van de Kamp also participated, as did Robert Grey, Jr., ABA President Elect.



Each discussion group was comprised of a cross-section of each of the Access and Fairness Committees and SCDLS. Every small group had a member of the Committee on Legal Professionals with Disabilities, Committee on Senior Lawyers, Committee on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination, and Ethnic Minority Relations Committee,



as well as SCDLS. Where possible, Mr. Capozzi, Mr. Van de Kamp and Mr. Grey joined the sessions. Each of the groups were led by Leadership Academy Scholars as part of their Leadership Training curriculum. (See accompanying article.)



In exploring the various methods of diversifying the bar membership and its governance, the committees answered three questions: 1. What are the current projects; 2. What issues or obstacles exist, and 3. What role can the State Bar play in mitigating these obstacles? The responses and recommendations have been compiled and a report will be issued at the end of the year. This report will play a role in the developing workplans for all of the committees. A follow-up joint planning meeting has been scheduled for April 30, 2005, in San Francisco. In addition to the members of the State Bar Committees, we will be inviting all Stakeholders and interested parties and organizations to attend to provide input on key strategies and programs that can be undertaken to measure diversity in the legal profession. For more information and to be placed on the mailing list, contact <program.development@calbar.ca.gov> or Rod Fong at (415) 538-2143.

Pipeline into the Profession Plugging the Leaks

RECRUITMENT - LAW SCHOOL ADMISSIONS - RETENTION - GRADUATION - BAR ADMISSIONS - EMPLOYMENT - PARTICIPATION - CAREER SATISFACTION



A PLEDGE TO UPHOLD THE ADA

BY ANIL MEHTA, CHAIR OF CLPD

In the year 1996, over 100 law firms, big and small, joined hands pledging to take actions to provide employment opportunities to legal professionals with disabilities. The legal community took this action at the urging of The State Bar of California Board of

Governors in direct response to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits private employers, state and local governments, employment agencies and labor unions from discriminating against qualified individuals with disabilities in job application procedures, hiring, firing, advancement, compensation, job training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment. The ADA covers employers with 15 or more employees, including state and local governments. It also applies to employment agencies and to labor organizations.

Despite recent expansions to the Americans with Disabilities Act, fewer California attorneys reported a physical disability in 2001 than they did a decade ago according to a State Bar Survey conducted by Richard Hertz Consulting, a professional polling firm. Lawyers with disabilities made up 4 percent of the Bar in 2001, while in 1991, they comprised 6 percent of the Bar's membership. Although learning disabilities were not included in the poll, one might conclude that revealing a disability could jeopardize employment opportunities for legal professionals with disabilities.

An individual with a disability is a person who:

- Has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities;
- Has a record of such an impairment; or
- Is regarded as having such impairment.

A legal professional with a disability could still be a qualified employee for a legal position as long as s/he can perform the essential functions of the job in question with or without reasonable accommodation. Such accommodation may include, but is not limited to:

- Making existing facilities used by employees readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.
- Job restructuring, modifying work schedules, reassignment to a vacant position.
- Acquiring or modifying equipment or devices, adjusting or modifying examinations, training materials, or policies, and providing qualified readers or interpreters.

However, an employer is not required to make a reasonable accommodation to the known disability of a qualified applicant or employee if doing so would impose an "undue hardship" on the operation of the employer's business, which is defined as an action requiring significant difficulty or expense when considered in light of factors such as an employer's size, financial resources, and the nature and structure of its operation. Disputes arise when there is a disagreement over the purported cost of accommodations. Nor is an employer required to lower quality or production standards to make an accommodation. However, when a potential employer is considering a legal professional with a disability for hire, such a subjective measurement may not provide sufficient standards for a person to feel fairly judged.

Title I of the ADA also covers medical examinations and inquiries:

Employers may not ask job applicants about the existence, nature, or severity of a disability, but they may be asked about their ability to perform specific job functions. A job offer may be conditioned on the results of a medical examination, but only if the examination is job related, consistent with the employer's business and required for all entering employees in similar jobs.

Employees and applicants currently engaging in the illegal use of drugs are not covered by the ADA when an employer acts on the basis of such use. Tests for illegal drugs are not subject to the ADA's restrictions on medical examinations. Employers may hold illegal drug users and alcoholics to the same performance standards as other employees.

Finally, it is also unlawful to retaliate against an individual for opposing employment practices that discriminate based on disability or for filing a discrimination charge, testifying, or participating in any way in an investigation, proceeding, or litigation under the ADA.

The Committee on Legal Professionals with Disabilities has decided to approach the original signatories in an effort to gauge the results of that pledge in 1996. Recently, the CLPD hired the Richard Hertz Consulting firm to poll the Bar members with disabilities on the number and types of disabilities, problems encountered in being employed in the legal profession. The raw data generated by that firm are being analyzed for presentation in a final report. The Pledge project and the latest survey results may pinpoint the obstacles faced by the legal professionals with disabilities.

PLEDGE RENEWALS

- Law Offices of Marc D. Adelman, San Diego
- Alschuler Grossman Stein & Kahan, Santa Monica
- Arnold & Porter, Los Angeles
- Law Offices of Joseph J. Bell, Attorney at Law, Grass Valley
- Bingham McCutchen, San Francisco
- Law Offices of Douglas Jon Black, Counselor at Law, Redondo Beach
- Brooks & Raub, Palo Alto
- California Center for Law and the Deaf, San Leandro
- Downey Brand, Sacramento
- Farella, Braun & Martel, San Francisco
- Folger Levin & Kahn, San Francisco
- Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, San Francisco
- Law Offices of Annette L. Goudy, Santa Ana
- Gray, Cary, Ware & Freidenrich, East Palo Alto
- Haas & Najarian, San Francisco
- Irell & Manella, Los Angeles
- Law & Mediation Offices of Gail Kaplan & Associates, Los Angeles
- Keesal Young & Logan, Long Beach
- Kecker & Van Nest, San Francisco
- Lakin Spears, Palo Alto
- Latham & Watkins, Washington D.C.
- McKenna Long & Aldridge, Los Angeles
- Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp, Los Angeles
- Morrison & Foerster, San Francisco
- Munger, Tolles & Olson, Los Angeles
- Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, Los Angeles
- Popelka & Allard, San Jose
- Protection & Advocacy, Inc., Sacramento
- Santa Clara County, Office of the County Counsel, San Jose
- School and College Legal Services of California, Santa Rosa
- Stolpman Krissman Elber & Silver, Long Beach
- Tomlinson Zisko, Palo Alto

To sign onto the Pledge Program, go to:
<<http://www.calbar.org/2ent/3gps/3clpd4.htm>>

Domestic Partner Rights and Responsibilities Act of 2003



By Jon W. Davidson, Senior Counsel
Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

On September 19, 2003, Governor Gray Davis signed the California Domestic Partner Rights and Responsibilities Act of 2003 (AB 205 (Goldberg)). While California created a system of registration of domestic partnerships in 1999 (AB 26 (Migden)), AB 205 greatly will expand the rights and duties of registered domestic partners when its substantive provisions go into effect on January 1, 2005. Dramatic changes will occur not only in family law; there also will be revisions in the rules governing probate, torts, property, crimes, civil rights, employment, evidence, and many other areas of the law.

Domestic partners are “two adults who have chosen to share one another’s lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring.” Cal. Fam. Code § 297(a). A domestic partnership is established in California when both persons file a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with the Secretary of State and they: (1) have a common residence; (2) are not married or related by blood in a way that would prevent them from marrying one another; (3) are at least 18; and (4) either are members of the same sex or one or both of them is over 62 and eligible for Social Security. Id. § 297(b).

Under the law currently in effect, domestic partners have approximately 20 rights, including similar rights as those provided legal spouses under California law with regard to: hospital visitation; medical decision-making; conservatorship proceedings; the ability to sue for wrongful death and intentional infliction of emotional distress; the ability to follow the procedures for stepparent adoption; automatic appointment as administrator of a partner’s estate; and partial intestate inheritance.

Effective this coming January, however, AB 205 broadly provides that, with a few express exceptions (such as joint filing of income taxes), “Registered domestic partners shall have the same rights, protections, and benefits, and shall be subject to the same responsibilities, obligations, and duties under the law, whether they derive from policies, statutes, administrative regulations, court rules, government policies, common law, or any other provisions or sources of law, as are granted to and imposed upon spouses. (new Fam. Code § 297.5(a).) Similar provisions require parallel treatment of former registered domestic partners and former spouses, and of surviving registered domestic partners and widows or widowers. (Id. §§ 297.5(b)-(c).) Likewise, “[t]he rights and obligations of registered domestic partners with respect to a child of either of them shall be the same as those of spouses.” (Id. § 297.5(d).)

What this means is that, effective January 1, 2005, registered domestic partners will be required to be treated the same way that California law provides for spouses with regard to hundreds of provisions of law, including:

- The ability to file for dissolution of the relationship in Family Court and to have the same procedures apply, to access mediation services, to be protected by a fiduciary duty to one another, to obtain spousal support, and to have the rules of community property and division of property govern assets acquired by the partners;
- Joint obligation for community debts, but protection against assignment of a partner’s wages and homestead protections after a partner’s death;
- Presumptions of parenthood regarding children born during the partnership or through alternative insemination, and judicial determination of custody and support of children born during the partnership;

- Application of the confidential spousal communications privilege and the privilege not to testify or to be called as a witness against a spouse;
- Coverage of partners in laws governing conflicts of interest by certain government officials based on personal relationships with parties, and exclusion of gifts from partners from limitations on judges’ receipt of gifts;
- Rights to sue for loss of consortium, for damages for attempted murder of a partner, and for violation of the right of publicity of a deceased partner, to appear on behalf of a partner in small claims court, and to defend a partner’s rights in certain civil actions;
- Rights to control disposition of remains, authorize autopsy, make anatomical gifts, and authorize exhumation;
- The ability to avoid probate of jointly-owned property, protections against disinheritance by a partner, and provisions for handling inheritance after the simultaneous death of partners;
- Rights to use any necessary force to protect a partner from wrongful injury, to sue a person who provided illegal drugs to a partner, to obtain overnight visitation with partners who are in prison, and to obtain notice that a partner who is a parolee or probationer has certain medical conditions; and
- Coverage under laws prohibiting discrimination based on being or not being in the legal relationship.

These examples are merely illustrative. The guiding principle will be that, when considering the rights or responsibilities of registered domestic partners under California law, the same procedures and the same substantive rules and principles that apply to spouses govern. As a result, court rules and numerous forms that use gendered terms or that limit their application to spouses or marriages are in the process of being revised to reflect changes in the statute.

The delay in implementation of these changes in California law was intended to give those currently in registered domestic partnerships time to terminate their present registration or to enter agreements modifying the property rules as between them that otherwise will govern, should they not want to become subject to these new legal principles. The delay also was intended to allow government officials and the courts time to become educated about these changes and to begin modifying rules, regulations, and forms in order to comply with the new law.

While this will require considerable effort, the Legislature found, in passing AB 205, that this was important to “help California move closer to fulfilling the promises of the inalienable rights, liberty, and equality” contained in the California Constitution “by providing all caring and committed couples, regardless of their gender or sexual orientation, the opportunity to obtain essential rights, obligations and benefits and to assume corresponding responsibilities, obligations and duties and to further the state’s interest in promoting stable and lasting family relationships, and protecting Californians from the economic and social consequences of abandonment, separation, the death of loved ones, and other life crises.” AB 205, § 1(a).

(Note: Readers should also be aware of the passage of recent legislation, including AB 2208, [Kehoe], requiring insurers and HMO’s only to offer policies that treat domestic partners equally with spouses, and AB 2580 [Goldberg], waiting to be signed by the governor and which will clarify issues related to the retroactivity and equivalence of prenuptial agreements, among other provisions.)

FIRSTS!



We are recognizing some historical “firsts” in the legal profession involving individuals and organizations in recognition of the diversity in California. We invite you to share the “firsts” that are happening in your community.

Judge Thang Nguyen Barrett

Judge Thang Nguyen Barrett immigrated to the United States in 1977 at the age of 17. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from American University in 1985, and his Juris Doctor degree from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 1988. Following a brief stint working for the Superior Court in San Francisco, Judge Barrett joined the Office of the District Attorney in 1989 where he was Santa Clara County’s first Vietnamese American deputy district attorney. In 1997, Judge Barrett was appointed to the bench by Governor Pete Wilson and became the first Vietnamese American in California to sit on the Municipal Court. Following court unification in 1998, he became California’s first Vietnamese American superior court judge. In 2000, Judge Barrett was selected by the New Horizon publication as one of 25 Vietnamese Americans in the United States “... who have made significant contributions to the Vietnamese community and to the fabric of American society in the past 25 years.”

Why did you want to be a judge?

As an immigrant, I am constantly in awe of our American ideals of democracy and justice. These ideals are not merely concepts on paper. They are rooted in the American culture and observed daily, especially in the courts. My deep respect for our judicial system and my desire to make a direct contribution to it motivated me to seek an appointment to the bench. It became more personally inspiring and humbling that I was appointed to sit in a county in which reside many immigrants, including Vietnamese Americans.

What advice would you give to young attorneys?

To have a fulfilling career, you have to love what you do. It is easy to love what you do when you do what you love, so follow your passion. As trite as such advice may sound, this life philosophy has always guided me and served me well.

It is also critical that you have faith in yourself and your abilities. When other people underestimate you, you can actually use that to your advantage. The same cannot be said when you underestimate yourself.

Always act responsibly and with integrity. Toughness and compassion are not mutually exclusive. Neither are aggressiveness and fair play. Treat everyone with courtesy. Earn the respect of your adversaries and care about your clients. Be proud of your profession. Give back to your community and profession through volunteer and charitable work. If you look at the truly successful lawyers or the legends of the legal profession, they all have these qualities.

LAWYERS IN THE NEWS



TEVEIA BARNES of San Francisco received one of the five Margaret Brent Women Lawyers of Achievement Awards from the ABA Commission on Women in the Profession for creating Lawyers for One America, where she serves as president and executive director. The group was created in response to former President Bill Clinton’s call to action to lawyers to diversify their ranks and increase the amount of pro bono services to underserved communities, especially programs providing assistance aimed at ensuring economic self-sufficiency. The award noted her organizational skills, commitment and passion to mobilize a disparate group of lawyers into a cohesive force. The Margaret Brent Awards, named for the first woman lawyer in America, honors outstanding women lawyers who have achieved professional excellence in their area of specialty and have actively paved the way to success for others. Past recipients include U.S. Supreme Court justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Sandra Day O’Connor.



NAVNEET S. CHUGH, former President of the South Asian Bar Association of Southern California and managing partner of The Chugh Firm in Cerritos, received the Annual Bar Leader of the Year Award from the ABA General Practice and Small Firm Section. The award recognizes the contributions of a bar leader who is or has been an officer of a general practice, solo and small firm entity, and who has made a difference through his leadership.

ROBERT RAVEN, past president of the American Bar Association, the State Bar of California, and the Bar Association of San Francisco, died in July at the age of 80. Once called “a revolutionary in pinstripes,” Raven stood out as a bar leader and modern-day founder of Morrison & Foerster, who fought for greater access to justice for the poor throughout his career. Raven was one of three partners who engineered a major firm restructuring in the 1960s, paving the way for the hiring of women and leading to the firm’s expansion. Colleague Peter Pfister wrote “There is in that man a strength — a combination of respect for the legal profession, respect for people, commitment to the client and the process, absolute ethics and principle.”



DIANE ABRAHAM, of EMRC, was appointed by President Robert Grey to the American Bar Association’s President’s Council on Diversity. The council’s mission is to increase ethnic and racial diversity within the legal profession. On the council, Diane will assist members in their work with various programs and entities—both within the ABA and outside—that help to increase opportunities and retention for people of color from law school to the bench.



QUYEN TU, a third year student at McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento was selected as the president of the National Asian Pacific American Law Students Association. NAPALSA is hosting a national conference in Dallas in November, including the Thomas Tang Moot Court Competition.



BONNIE HOUGH, the Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services’ vice-chair and senior attorney for the Administrative Office of the Courts’ Center for Families, Children & the Courts will receive the Fay Stender Award at the California Women Lawyers Dinner during the State Bar’s Annual Meeting in Monterey. The annual award is given to a feminist attorney who, like Fay Stender, is committed to the representation of women, disadvantaged groups and unpopular causes, and whose courage, zest for life and demonstrated ability to effect change as a single individual make her a role model for women attorneys.

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY ON THE MOVE



Academy Scholars: Cynthia Juno, Luan Tran, Joannie Chang, Heidi Li, Angela Houlemard, Joel Villasenor, Kristen Jackson, Eric Brooks, Renee Carter, Carter Stewart, Ashleigh Aitkens, Board of Governor Demetrius Shelton (missing York Chang)



Joannie Chang, Robert Grey and Luan Tran

The State Bar of California's Access & Fairness Leadership Academy was created last year to foster the development of leaders within the legal profession to serve the growing diverse communities of California. In April, twelve attorneys were selected as Scholars. The leadership training spans one year and consists of four workshops.

The first workshop took place at the Spring Summit. The day began as the Scholars met each other for the first time. After pairing up, they interviewed and introduced their partner to the rest of the group. The Scholars were immediately thrown into a leadership role by facilitating the break-out groups during the Joint Planning Session. The scholars were required to elicit information from each of the participants, keep the discussion focused and on time, and in some cases, record the major points on a flip chart. After this session, the Scholars met to debrief the experience and to discuss some of the challenges in diversifying the profession.

The next day, the Scholars attended the Leadership Forum, a day long conference on attorneys as leaders. The Scholars participated in many engaging discussions on leadership skills and roles attorneys can play as leaders in the diverse communities throughout the state. Scholars also had the opportunity to meet many influential leaders, such as Robert Grey, President-Elect of the ABA, Tony Capozzi, State Bar President, members of the Board of Governors panelists, and the over 200 conference attendees.

On the last day, the Scholars engaged in an intriguing discussion with Judge Erica Yew and Professor Tom Nazario on making and maintaining networks and connections. Board of Governor Demetrius Shelton joined the discussion in progress. The workshop ended with an interactive exercise on learning styles requiring each Scholar to tie a bowline. The Scholars were given a length of sash cord and required to tie a common knot known as a "bowline." The instructions were presented in various formats, verbal, technical text, text with graphics, collaborative, and plain English text. In the first two stages, no one was able to tie the bowline. But at each subsequent stage, Scholars would figure it out. Most of the Scholars benefited from the graphics and the collaborative stage, where those who tied the knot taught those who did not. The lesson learned was simply that everyone learns differently.

California: a harbinger for the issues on racial policy for the nation *Continues from page 6*

Searching For the Uncommon Common Ground was commissioned by the American Assembly as part of its series entitled "Uniting America: Toward Common Purpose", a project designed to help reverse some of the most difficult and divisive forces in our society. The American Assembly, a national, educational institution that seeks to provide information, stimulate discussion and evoke independent conclusions on matter of vital public interest, was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. Each year it holds at least two nonpartisan meetings that give rise to authoritative books that illuminate issues of United States policy. Blackwell, Angela G., Kwoh, Stewart, Pastor, Manuel, *Searching for the Uncommon Common Ground* New Dimensions on Race in America (2002) W.W. Norton & Company, New York

CONTRIBUTIONS

production

Patricia Lee, Director
Rod Fong, Program Developer
Rodney Low, Program Developer

Office of Legal Services, Access & Fairness Programs

The State Bar of California

180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 538-2328
Fax: (415) 538-2552

Betty.Barker@calbar.ca.gov

design

Cultural ID

Tel: (415) 317-2186
www.culturalid.com

Publication of this issue was made possible through voluntary donations; no mandatory dues paid to the State Bar were used to publish this newsletter.

Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors. They have not been adopted or endorsed by the State Bar Board of Governors and do not necessarily constitute the official position of the State Bar of California.

Copyright © 2004. The State Bar of California. All rights reserved.



NEWS AND EVENTS

La Raza Lawyers Association of Santa Clara

7th Annual Scholarship Dinner
Friday, September 24th, 2004 5:30pm
The Marriott Hotel, Downtown San Jose
Contact: Andrew Gonzales at (408) 420-1241

Bay Area Minority Bar Coalition

Unity Reception
Wednesday, October 20, 2004
Hanson, Bridgett Law Firm, San Francisco
Contact: Vernon Goins III at vgoins@thebusinesslawyers.com

Asian Pacific Bar Association of the Silicon Valley

Annual Fundraising Dinner
Saturday, October 15, 2004 6-9 pm,
Fung Lum Restaurant, Campbell
Contact: Scott Chang at scott.chang@sbcglobal.net
or (650) 947-9906

South Asian Bar Association of Southern California

Public Interest Foundation Casino Night Fundraiser
Saturday, October 23, 2004, 7:30pm
Gotham Hall, Santa Monica
Contact: Karun Naga at knaga@jonesday.com or
visit www.sabasc.org/foundation

The State Bar Annual Meeting

October 7-11, 2004
Monterey

California Minority Counsel Program

15th Annual Business Development Conference
Tuesday, November 9, 2004
Argent Hotel, San Francisco
Contact: CMCP at cmcp@sfbar.org or 415-782-8990

National Asian Pacific American Bar Association

Annual Convention
November 11-13, 2004
Fairmont Hotel, Dallas, Tx
Contact: Patty Markley at 972-789-5530 or 1-866-6NAPABA

Asian Pacific American Bar Association of Los Angeles County

7th Annual Installation Dinner
Thursday, November 18, 2004, 6:00 p.m.
Stadium Club, Dodger Stadium
Keynote Speaker: Connie Rice
Contact: Paul J. Estuar at paul@litt-assoc.com or 213-386-3114 x201

Charles Houston Bar Association

Annual Gala Dinner Dance
Saturday, December 4, 2004
Oakland Airport Hilton
Contact: Kimberlei Evans at 415-289-7004 or evans@lbbslaw.com

Bay Area Asian Pacific American Law Students Association

5th Annual Conference
Saturday, February 5, 2005
Santa Clara University School of Law
Contact: Angela Ompoc at aompoc@scu.edu

COMMITTEE INFORMATION ONLINE

To access the Access & Fairness Committee information on the State Bar website, go to www.calbar.ca.gov. Click on "Attorney Resources," then "Committees and Commissions" and finally on "Standing Committees" for a list of committees. Select the committee of your choice. For assistance, contact the Office of Legal Services, Access & Fairness Programs at programdevelopment@calbar.ca.gov or (415) 538-2328.