

The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

Rosengart v. Laird

405 U.S. 908 (1972)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University
James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University in St. Louis
Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University





Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20530

CHAMBERS OF

THE CHIEF JUSTICE

February 18, 1972

Re: No. 71-298 - Rosengart v. Laird

Dear Byron:

Please join me in your dissent.

Regards,

WBS

Mr. Justice White

cc: The Conference

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

1st DRAFT

From: White, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OLIVER A. ROSENGART *v.* MELVIN R. ~~REGISLATED~~ *v.* ~~REGISLATED~~
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 71-298. Decided January —, 1972

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, dissenting.

The Court vacates the judgment of the Court of Appeals and directs that the Court of Appeals consider the views of the United States presented in this case. Finding the suggestions of the United States unacceptable, I dissent from today's judgment.

In its memorandum filed October 13, 1971, in response to the petition for certiorari, the United States asserted that in passing on petitioner's conscientious objector's claim the Army considered petitioner's opposition to war to be sincere and rejected the claim solely because petitioner's views did not qualify as religious under the standards of *Welsh v. United States*, 398 U. S. 333 (1970). It was therefore error, the United States urged, for the Court of Appeals to have put aside the *Welsh* issue and to have affirmed the denial of habeas corpus on insincerity grounds after making an "independent search of the administrative record" to discover a basis in fact for such a judgment.

These assertions were incredible. The Army Review Board, in its final order entered on September 10, 1970, denying the conscientious objector claim, unanimously found that "1LT Rosengart's purported conscientious objector beliefs are not truly held; and that any objection to war in any form he might sincerely hold is based solely on philosophical and sociological experiences." The plain meaning of this order is that the Board both found that petitioner was not sincere and determined

or distributed without the specific authorization of the Hoover Institution Archives.

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Stanford, California 94305-6010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

To: The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Brennan
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Blackmun
Mr. Justice Powell
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE FURTHER REPRODUCED
OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT THE SPECIFIC AUTHORITY
OF THE HOOVER INSTITUTION ARCHIVES.

2nd DRAFT

From: White, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Circulated:

OLIVER A. ROSENGART v. MELVIN R. LAIRD
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 71-298. Decided January —, 1972

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, with whom MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST concurs, dissenting.

The Court vacates the judgment of the Court of Appeals and directs that the Court of Appeals consider the views of the United States presented in this case. Finding the suggestions of the United States unacceptable, I dissent from today's judgment.

In its memorandum filed October 13, 1971, in response to the petition for certiorari, the United States asserted that in passing on petitioner's conscientious objector's claim the Army considered petitioner's opposition to war to be sincere and rejected the claim solely because petitioner's views did not qualify as religious under the standards of *Welsh v. United States*, 398 U. S. 333 (1970). It was therefore error, the United States urged, for the Court of Appeals to have put aside the *Welsh* issue and to have affirmed the denial of habeas corpus on insincerity grounds after making an "independent search of the administrative record" to discover a basis in fact for such a judgment.

These assertions were incredible. The Army Review Board, in its final order entered on September 10, 1970, denying the conscientious objector claim, unanimously found that "ILT Rosengart's purported conscientious objector beliefs are not truly held; and that any objection to war in any form he might sincerely hold is based solely on philosophical and sociological experiences." The plain meaning of this order is that the Board both found that petitioner was not sincere and determined

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Sanford, California 94305-6000



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

To: The Chief Justice

Mr. Justice Douglas
Mr. Justice Stewart
Mr. Justice Black
Mr. Justice Harlan
Mr. Justice White
Mr. Justice Marshall
Mr. Justice Rehnquist

...
or distributed without the specific authority
of the Hoover Institution Archives.

3rd DRAFT

From: White, J.

Circulated:

OLIVER A. ROSENGART v. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL.

Recirculated: 2/5-

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 71-298. Decided January —, 1972

MR. JUSTICE WHITE, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST concur, dissenting.

The Court vacates the judgment of the Court of Appeals and directs that the Court of Appeals consider the views of the United States presented in this case. Finding the suggestions of the United States unacceptable, I dissent from today's judgment.

In its memorandum filed October 13, 1971, in response to the petition for certiorari, the United States asserted that in passing on petitioner's conscientious objector's claim the Army considered petitioner's opposition to war to be sincere and rejected the claim solely because petitioner's views did not qualify as religious under the standards of *Welsh v. United States*, 398 U. S. 333 (1970). It was therefore error, the United States urged, for the Court of Appeals to have put aside the *Welsh* issue and to have affirmed the denial of habeas corpus on insincerity grounds after making an "independent search of the administrative record" to discover a basis in fact for such a judgment.

These assertions were incredible. The Army Review Board, in its final order entered on September 10, 1970, denying the conscientious objector claim, unanimously found that "ILT Rosengart's purported conscientious objector beliefs are not truly held; and that any objection to war in any form he might sincerely hold is based solely on philosophical and sociological experiences." The plain meaning of this order is that the Board both found that petitioner was not sincere and determined

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Sanford, California 94305-6000



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

January 28, 1972

Re: No. 71-298 - Rosengart v. Laird

Dear Byron:

Please join me in your proposed
dissent in this case.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice White

Copies to the Conference

...reproduced may not be further reproduced
or distributed without the specific authori-
zation of the Hoover Institution Archives.

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Stanford, California 94305-6010



NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY
BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)