

Progress Notes for Today

Bar Complaint:

👉 Today I will be Santa street sweeping and submitting a complaint about the State Bar of California for very strangely slow business processes, and for not returning my money. I have noticed that money seems to go missing these days, and that it takes time and patience, patience I no longer have, just to get our money back.

I do feel that discrimination is occurring in the Southwest. While I cannot prove this specifically within the California Bar Association, I have noticed patterns that are too significant to dismiss. Sadly, as a White woman, my understanding is that I am placed last in the Southwest in what is now a predominantly Mexican society.

Based on what I have learned about California school systems, women like me, American women, White American women, now make up just 10% of California state school systems. And yet DEI policies are still employed, with foreigners placed first.

These issues are not isolated to the Southwest. In my research, I noted that some universities have an 80% or greater foreign student body, with only 5-9% White female Americans. There is no doubt that Democratic society has left the U.S. out, by “us,” I mean the United States of America.

👉 Santa Street Sweeping:

I support ending reliance on the Bar. I applaud this administration, as well as states that are taking action. Students should have an equal and fair chance at success without political confrontation, harmful career slowdown (months and months just to receive a response, unfit financial processes) or discrimination.

Some Reasons:

1. Neutrality in Professional Gatekeeping

Supporters argue that accreditation for a professional license should rely on academics, ethics, and competence, not political or ideological frameworks. They contend that a neutral system reduces the perception that applicants must adopt particular viewpoints to advance.

2. Equal Treatment Under the Law

A core claim is that bar eligibility standards should apply uniformly to all applicants regardless of race or background. Proponents say removing prescriptive ideological criteria reinforces equal protection principles and avoids differential treatment.

3. Reduced Financial Burden

ABA accreditation requirements are often linked to higher tuition and operating costs. Supporters argue that reducing or diversifying accreditation pathways can lower costs,

helping students from working- and middle-class families, including many white rural and first-generation students.

4. Expanded Access for Non-Traditional Students

--> State-based or alternative accreditation models may better accommodate older students, veterans, parents, and career-changers who cannot relocate or pay premium tuition tied to national standards.

5. Protection Against Viewpoint Pressure

Some students report concern that speech norms or institutional expectations may influence grading, hiring, or advancement. Advocates say neutral accreditation reduces perceived pressure to conform to prevailing ideological narratives.

6. State Accountability and Federalism

Supporters emphasize that state supreme courts, not private associations, are constitutionally responsible for licensing lawyers. State oversight allows standards to reflect local needs and accountability rather than national uniformity.

7. Competition and Innovation

Ending monopoly control can encourage competition among accreditors, potentially leading to innovative curricula, apprenticeship models, and skills-based training without sacrificing rigor.

8. Objective Metrics Over Process Mandates

Proponents favor measurable outcomes (bar passage, employment, ethics) over process-heavy mandates. They argue outcome metrics are fairer to students and schools alike.

9. Preservation of Geographic Mobility via Reciprocity

States limiting the ABA's role often state their intent to preserve reciprocity through clear standards, ensuring graduates can still practice across jurisdictions while avoiding unnecessary barriers.

10. Public Trust in the Legal Profession

A neutral, transparent system, overseen by courts, may increase public confidence that lawyers are licensed based on competence and character, not politics.

How States Are Framing the Change

Texas: Emphasizes “simpler, objective, ideologically neutral” standards under the authority of the Texas Supreme Court.

Florida: Moves to reduce exclusive reliance on the ABA, with oversight by the Florida Supreme Court and openness to alternative, federally recognized accreditors.

Important Clarification

Supporters generally state that these reforms are not about excluding any group. The stated goal is to remove ideological or discriminatory gatekeeping, lower costs, and restore neutral licensing standards so all students, white students included, are evaluated on merit, mastery, and ethics.

Great news for the University of Maine:

<https://legislature.maine.gov/bills/getPDF.asp...> ❤️

Proposal to the State:

I am proposing that states end reliance on the private bar organization ABA and return full control of legal licensing and accreditation to the state, under the authority of the state supreme court.

My reason for this proposal is that applicants deserve timely responses, transparent financial handling, and clear procedures that respect due process and equal treatment.

When licensing is administered through state authority, standards can be applied consistently, administrative delays can be corrected, and accountability remains with institutions that are answerable to the public.

My proposal seeks to protect American students, restore trust in the legal profession, and ensure that all qualified individuals are evaluated with honesty and integrity.