

“We
have the
right to sit
here!”

DRAFT



The History UnErased Academic Inquiry Series

- teaches students about the vital role LGBTQ people and social movements have played in the development of our nation and the world;
- aligns with national, state, and Common Core standards;
- provides research-based content, pedagogy, and outcomes;
- offers suggestions for technology integration.



This resource was created by History UnErased, Inc., in partnership with the New York City Department of Education, with generous funding by the New York City Council. It has been reviewed by the LGBT-Inclusive Curriculum Committee of the Office of Counseling Support Programs.

The History UnErased Academic Inquiry Series is made possible through a collaboration with the *Making Gay History* podcast (makinggayhistory.com).

Title: "We Have the Right to Sit Here!" CIVIC Inquiry Kit: Student Edition

Authors: Debra Fowler, Miriam Morgenstern

History UnErased
P.O. Box 8421
Lowell, MA 01853
UnErased.org

Copyright © 2018 History UnErased.
All rights reserved.

Design: RichKrahamDesign.com

Table of Contents

Archival audio oral histories from the Give Voice to History Project and bibliographic references, as well as a digital version of this CIVIC Inquiry Kit, are located at UnErased.org/NYC8.

About "We Have the Right to Sit Here!"

Introduction	5
Learning Outcomes	
Essential Question	

Getting Ready

6

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part I: The Incident

Background Information	8
Inquiry Organizer	9
Methods of Nonviolent Protest Organizer	10

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part II: The Court Case

Background Information	11
Language Practice	13
Comprehension Practice	15

Assessment

Create a Tableau	16
Follow-Up Panel Discussion	17
Assessment Rubric	18

Addenda

Give Voice to History Project Introduction Transcript	19
Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part I Transcript	20
Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part II Transcript	22



*Zandra Rolón (left)
and Deborah Johnson,
Los Angeles Magazine,
January 1984.*

About "We Have the Right to Sit Here!"

Introduction

This "We Have the Right to Sit Here!" CIVIC (Connecting Individual Voices to Intersecting Concepts) Inquiry Kit explores the use and effectiveness of nonviolent and nonverbal protest through analysis of a 1983 LGBT rights incident and subsequent court case. You will hear the story of Zandra Rolón and Deborah Johnson who, because of a discriminatory practice, became justice warriors and changed history.

Note: *The language introduced in this CIVIC Inquiry Kit mirrors language in the primary and secondary source materials. Using historically accurate language is necessary to understand the social, political, and cultural perceptions of those we label and understand today as LGBTQ+ (including, but not limited to, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer).*

Learning Outcomes

By using this CIVIC Inquiry Kit, you will be able to

- explore times, places, and ways in which different groups have struggled for equality;
- analyze nonverbal protests during struggles for equality and evaluate their effectiveness;
- examine laws and practices related to sexual orientation and gender;
- identify the progression of the court case *Rolón v. Kulwitzky*.

Essential Question

Has the United States of America lived up to the promise and potential of its history and status?

Getting Ready



Using the Photo Analysis Sheet, analyze this 1965 photo of the third march from Selma, Alabama, to Montgomery, Alabama.

From far left, John Lewis, unidentified nun, Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Bunche, Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, and Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth. Photo courtesy of Susannah Heschel.

Photo Analysis Sheet

Meet the photo.

Quickly scan the photo. What do you notice first? _____

Type of photo (*check all that apply*):

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Portrait | <input type="checkbox"/> Event | <input type="checkbox"/> Documentary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape | <input type="checkbox"/> Family | <input type="checkbox"/> Selfie |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aerial/Satellite | <input type="checkbox"/> Panoramic | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Action | <input type="checkbox"/> Posed | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural | <input type="checkbox"/> Candid | |

Is there a caption? Yes No

Observe its parts.

List the people, objects, and activities you see.

People

Objects

Activities

Write one sentence summarizing this photo. _____

Try to make sense of it.

Answer the following questions as best you can.

Who took this photo? _____

Where is it from? _____

When is it from? _____

What was happening at the time in history this photo was taken? _____

Why was it taken? List evidence from the photo or your knowledge about the photographer that led you to your conclusion.

Use it as historical evidence.

What did you find out from this photo that you might not learn anywhere else? _____

What other documents, photos, or historical evidence are you going to use to help you understand this event or topic? _____

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón

Part I: The Incident

PAPA CHOUX EDICT

When we built Papa Choux's Restaurant 12 years ago we set aside a small area for very special romantic dining, only 6 booths with sheer drapes for semi-privacy. Call buttons for waiters to insure uninterrupted dining, musicians to play your requests—all this for mixed couples, married or unmarried RSVP. 12 years later Ms. Gloria Allred says we cannot do this anymore. We must also seat 2 women or 2 men in these booths.

Papa Choux's will never allow this charade. It would certainly make a mockery of true romantic dining. Our policy at Papa Choux for that area only has been, is now, and will be in the future for mixed couples only.

Very respectfully yours,



Walter Kulwitzky—Seymour Jacoby
(Managing Director) Owner
advertisement

Papa Choux newspaper ad, June 24, 1983.

Background Information

On January 13, 1983, Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón, two LGBT civil rights activists, went to Papa Choux, a restaurant in Los Angeles, for a romantic dinner. Little did they know that their desire to dine in one of Papa Choux's six booths would lead to a landmark civil rights case. After being seated at the table they had reserved, they were told that they needed to move from the semi-private booth because they were a lesbian couple. Johnson and Rolón initially refused to give up their seats. When forced to leave, they took the names of everyone involved, and soon contacted attorney Gloria Allred. Allred, a well-known civil rights attorney, researched the merits of the case and agreed to sign on. The case was front-page news in Los Angeles for several weeks and became a media spectacle.

Attorney Gloria Allred described the case in this way: "The first case that I can remember that I did was that Papa Choux case. Papa Choux was a fine

dining restaurant in Los Angeles. My clients were an African American woman and her Latina partner. They were both businesswomen; made a reservation to celebrate Martin Luther King's birthday. And, in the Papa Choux restaurant, they had a special section for romantic dining. Patrons would walk up a few steps into a special section, which was a semicircle of booths with sheer curtains. Violinists would come by and play the violins; you could close the curtains and, you know, dine in semi-privacy and kiss or have your wine. They made a reservation for the booths and were seated there at first, but then told by the manager that they could sit anywhere in the restaurant but there. And they were told one of the reasons was because it was for couples only. And they said, 'Well, what are we?' We're not chopped liver; we're a couple. Then they said that it was a house policy that no one could sit in that section unless they were a couple."¹



¹ Thomsen, "All Out Politics: Exclusive Interview with Gloria Allred (Part One)," *FourTwoNine*, August 8, 2013, fourtwonine.com/2013/08/08/2804-all-out-politics-exclusive-interview-with-gloria-allred-part-one/.

Inquiry Organizer

Directions: After listening to the first Johnson and Rolón Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history, complete the table below. For a transcript of the interview, see the Addenda.

What else do you want to know?	Where might you be able to find the answer to this question? Is this a reliable source of information?	Observations: What did you notice? What other thoughts do you have?
Were there laws protecting LGBT people in every state in the 1980s?	Google search on laws and LGBT websites.	I was surprised to hear Rolón say she hadn't faced discrimination.

Lunch counter at the old Woolworth's five-and-dime in Greensboro, North Carolina, site of the famed 1960 sit-ins. Photo by Carol M. Highsmith courtesy of the Library of Congress.



Methods of Nonviolent and/or Nonverbal Protest Organizer

Directions: After listening to the first Johnson and Rolón Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history, conduct research into types of nonviolent and/or nonverbal protest to complete the table below. For a transcript of the interview, see the Addenda.

Type of nonviolent and/or nonverbal protest	Groups or individuals who used this form of protest	Year	Purpose	Effectiveness of the protest	What evidence did you use? P = primary source; S = secondary source
Sit-in	Four black students sit at Woolworth's lunch counter reserved for whites.	1960	Protesting segregation	Sit-ins occur across the South, support comes from all across the U.S.	Photo (P); article on website (S)
Raising one's fist					
Refusing to stand					
Taking a knee					
Blockading or blocking					
Die-in					
March/walk					
Hunger strike					
Refusing to move					
•					
•					

- Use these fields for any other types of nonviolent and/or nonverbal protest you may discover during your research.

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón

Part II: The Court Case

Background Information

The *Rolón v. Kulwitzky* lawsuit was based on the Papa Choux restaurant's violation of California's 1959 Unruh Civil Rights Act, although the provision for sexual orientation was not specifically added until 2005.

The Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code sections 51 through 52, provides protection from discrimination by all business establishments in California, including housing and public accommodations:

All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or sexual orientation are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.²

For more information on the California court system, visit
<http://www.courts.ca.gov/2113.htm>.

For more information on the New York State court system, visit
<https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/structure.shtml>.

² "Unruh Civil Rights Act," California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, accessed July 14, 2018, https://www.dfeh.ca.gov/wpcontent/uploads/sites/32/2017/06/DFEH_UnruhFactSheet.pdf.



Language Practice

Directions: After listening to the second Johnson and Rolón Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history, answer the questions below. For a transcript of the interview, see the Addenda.

1. Line 17: “When we filed, we filed under two laws.”
 - a. To whom does “we” refer in this sentence? _____
 - b. What does “file” mean in this sentence? Is it a verb or a noun? _____
 - c. What are other meanings of the word “file”? _____
2. What is a city ordinance? _____
3. Can you think of a current example of a city ordinance? _____
4. Line 28: What are two other ways to say “blah, blah, blah, blah, blah”? _____
5. What is an injunction? _____
6. Line 50: “We were basically asking him to jump the gun to...” What is the meaning of the idiom “jump the gun”? _____
7. On lines 57–60:
 - a. To whom does “he” refer? _____
 - b. To whom does “I’m” refer? _____
 - c. To whom does “You” refer? _____
8. Line 64: What is another phrase that means “in lieu of”? _____
9. Line 67: “He didn’t want to touch it with a ten-foot pole.”
 - a. What is the meaning of the idiom “not touch something with a ten-foot pole”? _____
 - b. To whom does “he” refer? _____
10. On line 87, what does “window” mean? Is it the kind of window you look out of? _____

Immigration reform activists with raised fists protest at the White House in Washington, D.C., May 1, 2010. Photo by Shutterstock.com.



Students from D.C. area high schools sit with their backs to the White House during the National School Walkout to protest the government's inaction on gun control, Washington, D.C., March 14, 2018. Photo by Shutterstock.com.

Comprehension Practice

Directions: After listening to the second Johnson and Rolón Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history, answer the questions below. For a transcript of the interview, see the Addenda.

1. What does it mean to “file” a case? _____
2. What two laws did Allred use when filing the case? _____

3. What was the purpose of the injunction? _____
4. What reason does the first judge give for not ordering an injunction? _____

5. Line 44: What is the double standard that Johnson refers to when speaking about the lower court? _____
6. The case was on the front page of several newspapers. Why do you think this was front-page news in 1983? _____
7. What did the appellate court decide? _____
8. What impact did the California Supreme Court’s decision have on the appellate court’s ruling? _____
9. The Papa Choux restaurant closed the booths and held a public wake for the death of romantic dining. What do you think their motivations were for doing this? _____

10. Johnson compares their case to incidents in the segregated South. To what incidents might she be referring? Is this a fair comparison? Why or why not? _____

Assessment

Create a Tableau

You and your classmates will create a tableau, or a tableau vivant. A tableau is a living picture, a scene created by one or more participants, sometimes in costume, always silent, and very carefully posed! Props are allowed.

Directions

1. In collaborative groups, choose one example of nonviolent protest from your Methods of Nonviolent and/or Nonverbal Protest Organizer on page 10.
2. In class or outside of class, research this protest.
3. Look at other examples of tableaus (e.g., at <http://sites.psu.edu/morethan selfie/tableau-vivant/>) and find out more about how they are used.
4. Design your tableau. You can replicate a photograph or create a tableau from your own imagination. Ask other classmates to participate in the tableau if you need more characters. Be creative and have fun!
5. Collaborate with your classmates to create a tableau that captures the most important aspect of the protest. Carefully craft gestures, facial expressions, and physical poses.



AIDS quilt, Washington, D.C. Photo by Carol M. Highsmith courtesy of the Library of Congress.

Follow-Up Panel Discussion

Directions

1. In collaborative groups, answer the questions below about the tableau you created. Work together to formulate your answers and write them down. (You will not be able to use your notes during the panel discussion.) Practice answering the questions within your group.
2. A facilitator will ask every panel member to answer two questions, but you will not know in advance which questions you will be asked.
3. You will have 1 to 2 minutes to answer each question. Remember that your body communicates as well as your voice! Are you sitting up? Do you look interested? Are you speaking to the whole class?

While this is a collaborative effort, you will be graded individually.

Discussion Questions

Note: If you and your classmates have kept a log of questions during the inquiry process, these questions can also be used as panel discussion questions. Your teacher may ask additional questions as well.

1. Can you tell the class the topic your group researched and briefly describe the historical event your tableau depicted?
2. Can you explain the meaning of your tableau and how your group decided on the idea that you presented?
3. Tell us about one of the participants in this protest. What role did this person play? What was the person's motivation?
4. How did your group choose this particular topic to research? (Provide a clear explanation.)
5. What primary and secondary sources did you use when doing your research?
6. What was the immediate result of this protest?
7. What were some of the long-term results of this protest?
8. How would you evaluate the effectiveness of this protest?
9. Can you connect the protest you studied to a current protest? If the protest you studied is a current protest, can you connect it to a protest in the past?
10. The Essential Question for this unit in our history class is, "Has the United States of America lived up to the promise and potential of its history and status?"
Based on the protest you studied, how would you answer this question?

Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Thinking; Use of Planning Skills	Few elements of the tableau are purposefully organized.	Some elements of the tableau are purposefully organized.	Elements of the tableau are purposefully organized.	Elements of the tableau are purposefully, precisely organized.
Collaborative Work	Rarely or never participates in planning the tableau or contributing to the questions and responses. Doesn't act like part of the team, even when urged by teammates to contribute.	Sometimes participates in planning the tableau or contributing to the questions and responses. Effort is not consistent.	Almost always interacts with the group and actively participates.	Interacts with the group and actively participates; takes a leadership role or encourages whole group participation.
Focus and Attitude	Doesn't get into character or speaks; mocks classmates.	Holds pose for some of the time, not always in character.	Holds pose, gets into character quickly, shows appropriate facial and body pose.	Excellent focus, very expressive facial expression and body pose, expresses character's emotions and/or feelings.
Panel Discussion	Not prepared, very difficult to understand, or does not respond.	Answers are not well-prepared and demonstrate limited understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates preparation, able to speak clearly and with confidence.	Demonstrates preparation and thorough understanding of the topic. Speaks clearly and confidently.

Adapted from the Council of Ontario Drama and Dance Educators.

Addenda

Give Voice to History Project Introduction Transcript

Eric Marcus: Hi. I'm Eric Marcus from Making Gay History and this is the Give Voice to History Project. In the late 1980s, I recorded a hundred 5 interviews for a book I was writing about the LGBTQ civil rights movement, which we called the gay rights movement back then. After I finished the book, the cassette tapes sat in storage for almost 30 years... But then I dug them out, the New York Public Library digitized them, and I took a listen. Suddenly, I was back with all 10 these people again—at their dining room tables, in their living rooms, sitting across from them and hearing 15 about their lives... Now I get to share these amazing stories with you. Individual stories that connect to the bigger 20 story of American civil rights.

Morty Manford: What, maybe a thousand people sitting in the audience. And the mayor was up at the podium talking. It was just me. What was I going to do? I did what anyone else would do. I walked onto the stage and I took the podium away from John Lindsay.

Perry Watkins: Things are gonna have to change drastically in this country. People are gonna have to wake up and realize, wait a minute, I am an average American citizen. Whether I'm gay or lesbian or anything else, given that simple fact alone, there is no way in hell I should have gone through what I went through in the military.

45

50

55



Sylvia Rivera: Here, I'm out there being a revolutionist for everybody else. I said now it's time to do *my* thing for my *own* people.

25 **Zandra Rolón:** [He] kept giving us the, you know, the back of the bus type of thing, you know. "Well, you can sit over there. And you can sit over here and you'll have free drinks. But you will 30 not, you cannot sit here. You will not be served here."

Deborah Johnson: And if there's anything that King had taught us, it was that we could sit anywhere in the 35 restaurant we wanted to sit.

Ellen DeGeneres: For me on the show to be able to say, "I'm gay," was like... I mean, I cried every take we did. Every time we did that. Even in rehearsal I'd 40 cry when I did it. Because it was such a release for me.

Eric Marcus: Three decades ago, when I started researching and interviewing for my book, I was outraged that I'd never heard these stories before—stories of accidental activists, committed revolutionaries, and happy civil rights warriors, who gave me a greater understanding of who I am and where I'm from.

My hope is that by sharing these stories with you now, in a way that wasn't possible when I was a student, you'll have a deeper understanding of how individuals—people like you and me—can challenge laws, institutions, and assumptions and come together to make big changes. So let's get started!

60

65

70

75

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part I Transcript

In this Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history recorded in 1991, you will hear Deborah Johnson ("D" in the transcript), Zandra Rolón ("Z"), and the interviewer, Eric Marcus ("E").

E: I'm Eric Marcus from Making Gay History. Over the course of two decades beginning in 1988, I conducted a hundred interviews with trailblazers from the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

5 Now, with the Give Voice to History Project, I'm bringing some of those trailblazers into your classrooms to help tell the story of this part of the
10 American Civil Rights Movement.

Meet Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Amato. Deborah grew up in Los Angeles in what she described as a very "upper-middle-class bourgeois 15 black household—a very well-rooted, extremely well-connected family."

Deborah called Zandra's family "a Mexican commune." Zandra explained, jokingly, that she was related 20 to three quarters of the population in Brownsville, Texas.

Back in January 1983, they were a young couple on what was supposed to be a romantic date night. But when 25 they faced discrimination over their dinner reservation, they refused to back down.

Speaking to me in 1991, Zandra told me that she made the reservation for a special occasion.



Z: At the time I was working on Saturdays. So this was the first weekend that we were gonna have a complete weekend together since we had gotten 35 together. It was also the year right before Martin Luther King's birthday was made into a holiday.

And a friend of mine told me about this restaurant that was really nice. And 40 the restaurant had these six booths on one side that were real romantic. And we got there and the, um, waiter kind of questioned us about, "Are you sure you want the booths?" And we told 45 him, yes. And it's the type of booths

where you have to move the table out so that you can get in—like a horse-shoe. And in the middle of the horse-shoe was like a fountain and there was a guy with a, a violinist who came around. And right in front of the table was a little white sheer curtain that closed. And candlelight. And it was just romantic.

50 E: Did it occur to you that this might be a problem?

Z: Not at all. I mean, to me, discrimination never enters my mind first, ever. So they showed us to our table. We sit down. And we're taking our jackets off and this tall humongous guy comes by and...

55 D: ... and yanked the table away and told us, you know, you know, "So sorry, but you can't sit here. It's against the law to serve two men or two women in these booths."

Z: We asked to see the manager.

D: We were not going to move.

Z: The guy that turned out to be the real maître d' kept giving us the, you know, the back of the bus type of thing. "Well, you can sit over there. And you can sit over here and you'll have free drinks." The whole thing. "But you will not, you cannot sit here. You will not be served here." And kept insisting that it was against the law, it was against the law.

70 D: And, you know, that, that really... Oh, it makes me crazy thinking about it. You know, it made me more mad. So you gotta remember, we were there about Martin Luther King's birthday and that we were gonna take off the next day as this real show of solidarity

and its importance and the whole bit. And if there's anything that King had taught us, it was that we could sit
90 anywhere in the restaurant we wanted to sit.

And, I mean, he looked at us like, you know, You can rot and freeze your ass over in hell. You know, we will serve
95 you someplace else, but this section is for other kinds of people than you.

Z: We left fuming and taking everybody's name, just fuming.

I have never, ever, ever been denied
100 blatantly anything because of who I was, ever. You know, I knew about, you know, the discrimination that went on. My grandfather... it was segregated and segregated meant white and others, you know. So I had heard about the discrimination that my grandfather had to go through. But never did it happen to me. And I had never been told that I couldn't do something or have something or be somewhere or... because of
105 who I was or the color of my skin. And I... How dare you! How dare you!

E: So you walk out of there and you want to do what?

115 Z: In the beginning when we left the restaurant we were both in agreement that we've got to do something.

D: But we decided that we were going to talk to Gloria Allred. Gloria Allred is
120 a very famous civil rights attorney. My intention, when I went to the attorney, was just to get the restaurant to stop doing it, that's all. Having a public case was not our intent. It was a price that we had to pay.

Z: Gloria Allred finally did the research and told us that we did have a case, that there was a law, a city ordinance that

prohibited against discrimination on the basis of sex.

130

D: But it was untested. Sexual preference. But it had been untested. And it basically was her call. Where essentially what she said was that it's a very grey matter of the law here. She says, but essentially what's more is the public consciousness-raising and benefit that could be done with this case, which was raise the issues, which wound up happening, because it was an extremely public case.

135

Z: They fought, they put ads in the paper saying basically...

D: They kept taking ads out against us...

140

Z: Saying, "We can go to jail, they can hang us by our thumbs, but we're not going to serve two men or two women."

D: "This makes a mockery, a charade out of true romantic dining." 150

Z: "Gloria Allred has gone too far in leading her own parade."

155

Z and D: "We'll go to jail, we'll hang by our thumbs... but we will never serve two men or two women."



E: This isn't the end of the story for Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Amato. They never set out to test anti-discrimination laws or make history, but they did. And in part two you'll hear how.

So long! Until next time!

160

Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Part II Transcript

In this Give Voice to History Project archival audio oral history recorded in 1991, you will hear Deborah Johnson ("D" in the transcript), Zandra Rolón ("Z"), and the interviewer, Eric Marcus ("E").

- E: I'm Eric Marcus from Making Gay History. Over the course of two decades beginning in 1988, I conducted a hundred interviews with trailblazers from 5 the LGBTQ civil rights movement. Now, with the Give Voice to History Project, I'm bringing some of those trailblazers into your classrooms to help tell the story of this part of the 10 American Civil Rights Movement.
- We're back with Deborah Johnson and Zandra Rolón Amato for the second part of their story of how they challenged discrimination after a Los 15 Angeles restaurant refused to seat them in a romantic booth for two.
- ∞
- D: When we filed, we filed under two laws. One was a local ordinance, which 20 was a city ordinance that prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, specifically in housing, employment, and public accommodations. We also filed under the state Unruh Civil Rights Act. Unruh is the 25 guy, Jesse Unruh, was the author of the bill. The Unruh Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, creed, race, color, nationality, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, but it doesn't 30 specifically say sexual orientation, so the courts have been interpreting that. So, we went to court, first time go-round, for an injunction. An injunction is basically to ask the restaurant not to 35 do it anymore. The lower court said, "No, we're not going to do that because we think it's an important issue and it should really go to trial. And if we issue that injunction the restaurant may be hurt, and, furthermore, we're not so 40 sure, basically, that you have any rights as lesbians." You know, because the lower court thought that there was a double standard in society. That's what 45 he said, and that is what went on the paper—that behavior that was okay for straight people in public was not okay for gay people and that the public might be offended by us. 50 We were basically asking him to jump the gun to... 55 Z: ... and make a decision.
- D: Yes, stop the practice. You don't know how long it's going to take to go to court. Issue an injunction. Stop the practice now so that nobody else gets hurt. And he's saying, "Well, I'm not willing to jump the gun, because I really don't know what's going to happen. You should go to court. You should have a trial." 60 We go to court, again, for what's called a motion of summary judgment, which is in lieu of a trial, which basically says, you know, here are all the facts. Nobody disputes the facts, give us a ruling. He didn't want to touch it with a ten-foot pole either. Then it makes it to the appellate court. 65 70 E: Every time there's a decision... 75 Z: Major, major. We're in magazines, we're in every single newspaper.
- D: *Los Angeles Magazine.*
- Z: *Los Angeles Times, the Valley.*
- E: And every single time... 75
- Z: And front page!
- D: The appellate court basically overturned the lower court decisions. The lower courts rule against us and the appellate court rules for us, so they have a right to petition the Supreme Court, which they did. When the Supreme Court said they weren't going to hear it, then that meant that the next lowest 80

- 85** level, the appellate court's ruling, was going to stand. There's like a four- or five-day window in between the appellate court finding out that the Supreme Court is not going to hear and them following through with what they started to do in the first place. In that window, they closed down and had all of these ads and had this public wake, and everything else. So, it's like rather than serve us and comply with the law, they just closed the booths. "We're not going to do it at all." So they had a public wake, with the cameras from the 11 o'clock news and the whole bit. Free drinks. "True romantic dining died on this day." Ads out.
- Z:** Yeah, it was terrible.
- D:** And they closed it.
- Z:** They, from the very beginning, put the boxing gloves on. Their intent was, we're going to fight you to the very end, which is what we ended up doing.
- E:** So that was the end of the booths?
- Z:** That was the end of the booths, that was the end of the booths.
- D:** Well, yeah, because we went back, and then they issued the injunction and they issued the motion of summary judgment. We won and they paid the attorney's fees and gave us our fine, 250 dollars a piece, which was the fine for the local (audience) ordinance.
- Z:** They had to pay the attorney's fees, which was almost...
- 120** **D:** Almost 30,000, almost 30,000 dollars. So they closed the booths. It's kind of like what they did in Mississippi and Alabama. You know. Instead of letting the black kids swim in the public pools, they just closed the pool.
- E:** Right. Pull white kids out of the public school and start an academy...
- D:** Yeah, that's what they did, they just closed it.
- E:** Was it worth it? 130
- Z and D:** Oh, yeah. Oh, hell yeah.
- ∞
- E:** Even though the owner of the Papa Choux restaurant simply carted his romantic booths to the curb, Deborah and Zandra's case put teeth into the local gay rights ordinance. 135
- While their case didn't actually change California's civil rights bill to add sexual orientation, the appellate court interpreted the law to *include* sexual orientation.
- Also, their high-profile court challenge made national news and showed the impact of prejudice on ordinary citizens who were simply trying to live their lives. 140
- 145**

"We Have the Right to Sit Here!"

Nonfiction

Grades 8-12