



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 8, NO. 11 SECTION 2

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JUNE, 1975

Big Money And Tough Tactics To Ratify E.R.A.

The Equal Rights Amendment, which passed Congress by big majorities and then quickly sailed through many state legislatures during 1972 and 1973 without hearings or debate, went on the rocks in 1974 and 1975. The score in 1974 was: 3 states ratified, 7 states rejected, and one state rescinded its previous ratification (Tennessee). In 1975, only one state ratified, and 16 states rejected. Four efforts failed in 1975 to persuade Nebraska to re-ratify (after having ratified in 1972 and rescinded in 1973). The more women find out about what the Equal Rights Amendment is and what its effects will be, the more they come out in increasing majorities to ask their state legislators to vote NO.

The state legislative hearings during 1974 and 1975 conclusively demonstrated that there is *no* affirmative case for the Equal Rights Amendment. It will give women *no* new rights, benefits, opportunities, or choices. There are *no* discriminatory laws against women or injustices to women that ERA will remedy.

ERA will *not* give women equal pay for equal work. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 already requires this. ERA will *not* give women full educational opportunities. The Education Amendments of 1972 already require this. ERA will *not* make it easier for women to get credit. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974 already requires this.

On the other hand, ERA will take away from women a long list of rights, benefits, and exemptions that women now possess, including the exemption a young woman has from the military draft and from combat duty; the rights of the wife to be financially supported, to be provided with a home, and to have her minor children supported by her husband; and the right of a factory woman to have the benefit of protective labor legislation. This takeaway of rights is fully documented in previous issues of the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*.

This is why we call ERA a fraud. It pretends to improve the status of women, but in reality it is a takeover of rights that women now possess.

Unable to demonstrate any advantage for women in ERA, the proponents have adopted the national strategy of relying on big money and high-pressure tactics instead of on logical arguments. Here are some samples of the big money currently being poured into the campaign to ratify ERA. It is a combination of taxpayers' money, tax-exempt money, and money from radical lib sources.

Federal Spending to Ratify ERA

The report of the House Judiciary Committee on ERA (Report No. 92-359, July 14, 1971) clearly stated that the *only* financial cost of ERA would be the certification by the General Services Administrator, and that "no other costs to the United States are anticipated." However, ERA has already cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The expenditure of the large sums of Federal money described below proves that Section 2 of ERA is a gigantic grab for power at the Federal level. The Federal payrollers can hardly wait to get their hands on large new areas of jurisdiction so that they will have more staff, more money, and more control over our lives.

1. On April 2, President Ford appointed the National Commission on International Women's Year, with Jill Ruckelshaus (known as "the Gloria Steinem of the Republican Party") as Chairman, and 35 members including Alan Alda, whose claim to fame is from the television program "M*A*S*H."

Congresswoman Bella Abzug has introduced the bill to create the IWY Commission (H.R. 4346). It requests an appropriation of \$3.5 million. The Commission expects to be granted at least \$700,000.

However, the IWY Commission is not waiting for Congress to vote the money! It has already opened an office in the State Department and hired 13 employees. It is operating on secret grants from other Federal Departments during FY 1975, as follows: State Department: \$50,000 (plus a pledge of \$75,000 for FY 1976); HEW: \$125,000; Transportation: \$35,000; Interior: \$20,000; Justice: \$10,000; Defense: the services of a \$35,000 executive; Labor: the services of a \$35,000 executive; USIA: the services of two executives; HUD: (a pledge of \$35,000 for FY 1976).

At its first meeting on April 15, the Commission pledged to give top priority to ratification of ERA. The resolution passed by the Commission promised "to do all in our capacity" (that is, on our tax money) to see that ERA is ratified "at the earliest possible moment."

Ruckelshaus and Alda have already launched their campaign with a big media splash, including a widely-reported Washington press conference, and appearances on the NBC *Today Show*, the CBS *Women of the Year* program, and ABC *Issues and Answers*.

2. The Status of Women Council in the Department of Labor, with an annual budget of at least \$80,000, has for years been spending a major portion of its time working for ratification of ERA. The Council's executive, Catherine East, who is a fulltime Federal employee, has for years been lecturing to women's groups, traveling around the country, testifying at state legislative hearings, appearing on television, and mailing out expensive booklets printed by the Government Printing Office, all in behalf of ERA. At a recent television debate, she was heard to remark that she has many other things she ought to be doing, but spends all her time "answering Phyllis Schlafly."

3. White House employees for several years have been using government-paid time, government-paid telephones, and government facilities to push ratification for ERA. Among the White House employees who have admitted to the press that they did this were Anne Armstrong and Jill Ruckelshaus, who are no longer on the White House payroll, and Patricia Lindh, who still is.

According to the *Washington Star* of December 11, 1974, representatives from the White House as well as from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission attended a meeting the day before at which the high-priced Washington, D.C. political consulting firm of Bailey, Dourdourff and Eyre was hired by the Business and Professional Women's Clubs and given a budget of \$249,000 to push ratification in 10 states.

Mrs. Betty Ford subsequently ordered two pro-ERA briefings for 160 White House employees. These were given in the White House theater by Bailey, Dourdourff and Eyre. The White House refused to give equal rights to those who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment to present the other side to White House employees.

4. A UPI dispatch of May 18 revealed the financial assistance to the ERA campaign provided through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This dispatch stated that Mrs. Sandra Kramer, acting executive secretary of HEW's advisory committee on the rights and responsibilities of women, is also co-chairperson of the new ERA Development Committee which has just been formed to try to put on a "telethon" at an estimated cost of \$2 million in order to raise a much larger sum from the general public. The same article quoted her as saying that the pro-ERA forces have already spent \$600,000 in 1975. She did not reveal the source of this funding.

5. ERA proponents have also been able to cash in on state and local taxpayers' money through state and local Status of Women Councils. State SOW Councils are usually appointed by the Governor and funded by an appropriation made by the state legislature, although they sometimes devise a way to tie into Federal funds. County and municipal SOW Councils may receive public money in various ways.

Fortunately, many citizens have gotten wise to this unnecessary and unwarranted use of taxpayers' money. The SOW State Councils in Indiana and Texas were abolished after citizen protest, and the appropriations reduced in other states.

6. It was admitted at one of the Illinois state legislative hearings that *Playboy* Magazine made substantial cash payments to the ERA campaign in Illinois, in addition to permitting ERA proponents to use the *Playboy* postage meter for mailings all around the state.

A letter from "ERA Central" thanking *Playboy* for its financial assistance appeared in the February 1974 magazine, page 52.

7. The Rockefeller Foundation gave \$288,000 to the California Status of Women Commission. According to the *Los Angeles Times* of March 1, 1974, the Commission chairwoman stated at a press conference that this would be used for a "mass education process" to promote ERA.

Having already been instrumental in the ratification of ERA by the California legislature, the tax-exempt Rockefeller Foundation money enabled the California Commission to push ERA in state legislatures across the country during 1975. Commission chairman Anita Miller stated on January 3, 1975: "The debate has taken place, and the questions have been answered. Now we must finish the task. The Commission has sent a telegram to the White House asking President Gerald Ford to make the passage of the ERA a priority in 1975."

8. On May 15, a meeting was held in Washington, D.C. called "Women '76: ERA." After a work session attended by fulltime ERA lobbyists and Federal employees at which they planned a national ERA campaign organization and political retribution against state legislators who voted NO, they adjourned to a garden party at the home of Stewart Mott, who probably was George McGovern's largest contributor. In the hiatus before he decides whom to back for President next year, perhaps the militant women can persuade him to finance the ERA campaign.

9. The National Organization for Women (NOW) is openly planning to use tax-exempt contributions to ratify ERA, to elect pro-ERA legislators, and to defeat anti-ERA legislators. NOW president Karen DeCrow spelled it all out at a press conference held in front of Independence Hall and reported by the *Philadelphia Inquirer* on May 6, 1975, as follows:

"The National Organization for Women (NOW), the nation's largest feminist group, announced plans Monday to pump time, money and volunteers into the campaigns of pro-feminist political candidates.

"Until recently, NOW has refrained from actively engaging in partisan politics, fearing such activities would jeopardize its tax-exempt status. The group, however, has been told by the Internal Revenue Service that it could maintain its present tax status and participate in politics as well.

"With this ruling in hand, NOW's national president Karen DeCrow came to Philadelphia Monday to 'declare war' on those states that have not yet approved the Equal Rights Amendment. ...

"NOW has entered a new phase of political activity," said Ms. DeCrow, an attorney from Syracuse, N.Y. "We will fund legislators in favor of ERA and we will defeat those that are against. ..."

"NOW can maintain its tax-exempt status as long as political activities are not its 'primary purpose,' Ms. DeCrow explained. "This means that we can spend 49 percent of our time campaigning, but we can't go up to 50 percent."

Tough Tactics to Bully Legislators

In addition to the spending of large sums of money, the ERA proponents are resorting to a variety of strong-

arm tactics in an effort to intimidate legislators and other individuals. Here are a few of their high-pressure tactics -- all of which constitute a confession that ERA can never be ratified on the basis of logic, reason, or common sense.

1. Backroom deals, threats, blackmail, and women. At a national meeting in Wichita, Kansas on June 28, 1974, pro-ERA leaders from 31 states planned their strategy for 1975. As reported by the *New York Times* on June 29, this included: "Backroom deals ... Don't bother to change their minds, just change their votes. ... Find out which opposition legislators are in serious reelection trouble anyway, and get into the campaign against them after announcing an intent to defeat them because of their opposition to ERA. ... Find someone who is willing to run for the legislature against an opponent of ERA, but who is also willing to withdraw if the legislator changes his position -- and inform the incumbent of this plan. ... Make agreements with other organizations, such as labor unions, to work for their causes if they will assign a high priority to ratification of the Amendment."

As reported by the *Washington Star* the same day, other tactics planned for 1975 included: "Blackmail -- on issues. ... Use every device you can think of. We found out who the man's secretary was, and his wife and his mistress. Find out who he listens to, and get to those girls."

2. The Democratic Convention resolution. ERA proponents attempted in the spring of 1975 to ram through the Democratic National Committee a resolution prohibiting the selection of a site for the 1976 Democratic National Convention in any state which has not ratified ERA. This was a crude squeeze play on particular cities bidding for the Convention in non-ERA states, including Chicago, Illinois; Kansas City, Missouri; New Orleans, Louisiana; and Miami Beach, Florida. This was an open invitation to merchants in those cities to put financial and political pressure on their legislators to force them to conform to the demands of the militant women.

The behavior of the ERA proponents in demanding passage of this resolution caused Chairman Robert Strauss to say they indulged in tactics "that would make Henry Kissinger look humble." A watered-down and virtually meaningless resolution was finally adopted, which was considered a defeat for the ERA militants.

3. The Florida orange boycott. The ERA proponents in the Detroit area, led by attorney Jean King of Ann Arbor, started what they hoped would be a nationwide boycott of Florida oranges, in a desperate effort to bully the Florida legislators into ratifying ERA. Like most such tactics, it was counterproductive, and served only to alienate Florida legislators.

4. Personal attacks on Phyllis Schlafly. These repeated attacks clearly demonstrate the pitiful weakness of the arguments for ERA. Here are some examples of these *ad hominem* attacks:

Senator Birch Bayh, sponsor of ERA in the U.S. Senate, denounced Phyllis at a Washington, D.C. press conference that was widely carried in newspapers all over the country during April 1975 (e.g., the *New York Daily News*, April 22). Bayh said that, when he appeared in a television debate with Phyllis, he "wanted to commit mayhem, live and in full color." The diction-

ary defines mayhem as the crime of willfully inflicting a bodily injury on another so as to cripple or mutilate him (or her). It is pathetic that a U.S. Senator couldn't think of any better arguments for ERA!

Activist black lawyer Florynce Kennedy has repeatedly appeared on radio programs and encouraged her listeners to "hit Phyllis Schlafly in the mouth." In *Parade Magazine* of May 25, Ms. Kennedy explained: "I don't think she should be damaged seriously, but I don't think it would hurt her if somebody slapped her. . . . Instead of so much argument, people should slap."

Ms. Kennedy has lectured on many college campuses, at fees of upwards of \$1,000, and the above is typical of her type of argument for ERA.

When Phyllis debated Betty Friedan (the "mother of women's lib" and founder of NOW) on May 1, 1973 at Illinois State University, Ms. Friedan said: "I'd like to burn you at the stake. . . . I consider you an Aunt Tom." Other pro-ERA spokespersons such as Gloria Steinem and Martha Griffiths seldom give an interview about ERA without making a personal criticism of Phyllis.

Other personal attacks on Phyllis include frequent hissing during her testimony at state legislative hearings, picketing her speeches with signs such as "female chauvinist sow," and assorted epithets. ERA advocates also spend a great deal of their ingenuity in encouraging reporters to ask Phyllis such petty and diversionary questions as, "Who takes care of your children when you are out speaking against ERA?", "How much domestic help do you have?", "What organizations do you belong to?", and "Aren't you really planning to run for office?" -- all of which are totally irrelevant to the ratification of a constitutional amendment.

If ERA proponents had any good arguments for their amendment, they would not need to indulge in such tactics.

5. Violence against other opponents of ERA. The *New Orleans Times-Picayune* reported on June 25, 1974 that vandals attacked the homes of two New Orleans legislators who voted against ERA. Rocks painted red with the word "pig" were tossed through one Representative's window. Notes tied to the rocks referred to his vote against ERA and threatened further attacks against persons and property. The word "pig" was also painted on the automobiles of two Representatives who voted against ERA.

6. The "conspiracy" smear. Unable to understand why ERA is being rejected in state after state after the proponents have spent so many hundreds of thousands of dollars and hired so many fulltime professional lobbyists at State Capitols, they have come up with the "conspiracy" theory to explain their defeat. In one form or another, this "conspiracy" theory has appeared all over the country. For example, here is a direct quotation from a flier distributed at the Capitol in April 1975 in Austin, Texas, where a motion to rescind was under consideration:

"A militant group of fly-by-night organizations claiming to speak for everyone, but representing no one, are seeking to enslave the women of America. Highly vocal women have been organized and brainwashed by the most incredible conspiracy this country has ever witnessed. Extremists from the left and the right have joined hands to rob you and your children of your rights and to destroy your chance for constitutional equality. The radical John Birch Society, the violent Ku Klux

Klan, and the despised Communist Party have pooled their resources with monopolistic insurance companies and big business -- including the most pernicious business of them all -- organized crime."

This "conspiracy" charge is so ridiculous as to make refutation unnecessary. Its circulation is only further evidence of the fact that the ERA proponents have no logical arguments.

7. The use of phony, obsolete, and misleading endorsements. Thousands and probably hundreds of thousands of copies of pro-ERA materials have been distributed around the country listing the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars as having endorsed ERA. Even though this originated in the official U.S. Senate Report on ERA (No. 92-689), the listing is wholly false and had to be publicly retracted. The VFW Ladies Auxiliary never at any time took a pro-ERA stand. Nevertheless, this falsehood has persisted in pro-ERA materials.

Some alleged endorsements are badly obsolete. For example, pro-ERA literature usually lists the endorsement of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This endorsement was made back in 1967 when ERA had a clause attached to protect existing rights. Since then, many of the largest states within the Federation have gone on record in opposition to ERA, including the Illinois, Virginia, Florida, and Arkansas Federations.

Some endorsements with important-sounding names are obviously designed to mislead the public. "Catholics for ERA" and other pro-ERA Catholic groups are actually tiny fringe groups that *all together* add up to only a small fraction of the eleven-million-member National Council of Catholic Women, which has repeatedly gone on record against ERA.

8. Synthetic news and non-events. When the ERA proponents hired the top Washington, D.C. public relations firm of Bailey, Deardourff and Eyre, this made available an almost unlimited amount of talent and money for publicity. You can put out a lot of press releases, manufacture a lot of "news," and stage many non-events for that amount of money -- especially when it is concentrated in a few states.

That is why newspapers and magazines during the first several months of 1975 printed so many articles stating that ERA would surely be ratified in 1975. Those articles were *not* news or objective reporting in any meaning of those terms. They were just ERA handouts manufactured by slick PR agents. Responsible newspapers and magazines should have given them no more credence than the customary victory predictions of all political candidates. But, whether from gullibility or laziness or bias, most newspapers did print a flood of those false stories. American citizens must learn to distinguish between newspaper stories that are genuine news, and those which are just press handouts from biased sources.

The year 1975 provided many examples of non-events staged by ERA proponents. They simply are unable to get very many people to travel to the State Capitol or attend pro-ERA meetings, but they are rather resourceful in creating non-events by the use of secret money, paid organizers, and latching onto other events.

For example, on March 1 the ERA proponents staged what was represented to be a spontaneous pro-ERA rally in Indianapolis to persuade the Indiana Legisla-

ture that there was genuine grassroots support for the Equal Rights Amendment. In order to get people to attend this non-event, ERA proponents paid 50c a head. The money was distributed like this. Every Business and Professional Women's Club was given a cash payment of \$25 for every 50 persons it was able to get to the rally. That is one way to fill an auditorium!

In Illinois, Stop ERA had three genuine grassroots rallies at the State Capitol in Springfield. Each of those three times, there were 1,000 to 1,500 persons present to register their opposition to ERA. These dignified demonstrations were so effective that ERA proponents tried to imitate them.

Even so, the only way they *appeared* to have a pro-ERA rally was by (1) scheduling their rally at the State Capitol on the same day that the United Auto Workers were demonstrating for a hike in unemployment compensation, the Senior Citizens were demonstrating for tax relief, and state employees were demonstrating for pay increases, and then pinning pro-ERA badges on all those other people, (2) getting the high schools and colleges to provide free buses for large numbers of students, (3) coordinating the demonstration with paid lobbyists. The pro-ERA demonstration required dozens upon dozens of gun-toting state police and Secretary of State investigators to keep order -- an expense which, incidentally, did *not* have to be made by the state for any of the Stop ERA rallies.

9. Misuse of businessmen's generosity. The women's libbers and pro-ERAs play on the civic-mindedness of businessmen to sponsor a program or seminar on women's issues. The company in good faith agrees to foot the bill for renting a hall, bringing in speakers, and providing a meal -- thinking that the meeting will be non-political, merely stress community "involvement," and air all viewpoints. But the women's libbers, who are very aggressive, quickly take charge of the program and the publicity so that *only* the women's lib viewpoint is presented.

Such a conference was sponsored by Western Union at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City on April 9. This is just one more example of how the pro-ERAs advance their goals with other people's money.

What To Do

- 1) Write your U.S. Senators and Congressmen (U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.) and ask them to stop immediately the improper use of Federal money to ratify ERA.
- 2) Write or phone your State Senators and Representatives (at your own State Capitol) and ask them to vote NO on ERA. If you are in a state that has already ratified ERA, ask them to RESCIND ERA.
- 3) Write the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. and ask them to enforce the "fairness doctrine" on women's issues and programming so that the NON-women's lib and NON-ERA views can receive fair and equal treatment.
- 4) Phone your local television and radio stations anytime you see a pro-ERA or pro-women's lib program, editorial or interview, and ask them to present the other side.
- 5) Write the sponsors of all women's lib programs and propaganda, and protest their commercial sponsorship of women's lib views.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.