



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 14, NO. 5, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER, 1980

## Does Reagan Know Who Elected Him?

Ronald Reagan was the successful two-term Governor of California, but that's not why he was elected President; our nation has many able Governors. Ronald Reagan had the Republican nomination, but that's not why he was elected President; every Republican vote in the country would still leave him millions of votes short of a majority.

Ronald Reagan did not win because his opponents were weak, unattractive, or poorly financed. Actually, he had very formidable opponents. In the primaries, Reagan faced the fantastically-financed John Connally, the prestigiously-backed George Bush, the super-pro Howard Baker, the media-backed John Anderson, and the young and articulate Philip Crane. In the fall, Reagan faced a tough and determined President Carter who used all the power, personnel and perks of incumbency to win at any cost.

Some of the political weapons used by Carter included announcing federal money grants in key primary states such as Maine, New Hampshire, Florida and Michigan; requiring his Cabinet officers (including State and Defense) collectively to spend 110 days politicking in the campaign; having all federal political employees make ten media contacts per week; using government agencies (such as the U.S. Embassy in Peking and the office of Personnel Management) to attack Reagan's policies; and the deliberate leak of classified data on the stealth bomber.

Ronald Reagan won both the nomination and the election because he rode the rising tides of the Pro-Family Movement and the Conservative Movement. Reagan articulated what those two separate movements want from government, and therefore he harnessed their support and rode them into the White House like an athlete rides the ocean waves on a surfboard. An old adage says, "A rising tide lifts all boats." The rising tide of traditional moral, social and economic currents elected Ronald Reagan President.

### The Pro-Family Movement

The Pro-Family Movement was born in 1975 when the church buses rolled into the State Capitol in Springfield, Illinois, to defeat the Equal Rights Amendment. That was when Stop ERA put together something entirely new in American politics -- a coalition of Catholics, Protestants, Mormons, and Orthodox Jews working together to defeat the Equal Rights

Amendment. That was the year when I prayed that a thousand people would come to the Capitol to convince Illinois Legislators to vote "no" on ERA. They came -- and their numbers have been growing ever since. By 1980, the Baptists were swelling the crowds to 12,000 people. Stop ERA won the support of Legislators of all denominations, Republicans and Democrats, conservative and liberals, union and business, male and female, old and young, married and single, black and white. That's the coalition which has been beating ERA in Illinois for nine years. The media never understood what was happening because it never occurred to them to look in the churches or synagogues or homes or private schools.

By 1980, the Pro-Family Movement consisted of many different segments working for various pro-family objectives, including the Stop ERA movement, the right-to-life movement, the coalition against drafting women, the religious-school movement, the prayer-in-schools movement, the anti-pornography movement, the national-defense movement, and the evangelical Christians who are motivated by a cluster of moral issues including homosexuality.

The Pro-Family Movement began to put out ratings of candidates, and the kinds of issues they covered were something new in politics. Senatorial and Congressional candidates were rated on such issues as the ERA Time Extension, abortion funding, the Human Life Amendment, prayer in public schools, Internal Revenue regulations designed to take away tax exemption from private schools, and the Department of Education.

### The Conservative Movement

The Conservative Movement was born during the New Deal years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Administration and has been growing slowly and surely ever since, oriented largely around economic issues. It has grown very rapidly in the last several years because the logic of events has proved the soundness of its values. It is now obvious to most Americans that the liberals' policies of tax and tax, spend and spend, have brought America to the brink of national failure -- economically, politically, and militarily. Middle Americans now understand that government is not the solution to all our problems, but is part of the problem itself.

The vitality of these two Movements is the reason why the Reagan campaign was substantially unaffected by campaign mistakes made by the Reagan organization or by changes in management, or by the attacks of Carter and the media. When the media orchestrated a national campaign designed to prove that Reagan was careless with the facts, this fell on deaf ears; the Movements cared more that Reagan promised to abolish the Departments of Education and Energy than nitpicking about whether the dollars wasted by HEW came to \$11 billion or a precise \$7 billion. The Pro-Family and Conservative Movements are knowledgeable and have a definite scale of priorities. They are more worried about the major mistakes of Carter than any alleged minor slips of the tongue by Reagan.

When Carter and the media charged that Reagan is too conservative or a warmonger, the public was not impressed. The mood of the country has shifted so dramatically that the nation is probably more conservative and defense-minded than Reagan himself.

The eastern establishment tried its best to force on Reagan a political strategy designed to court the liberal Republicans and the country club set in the north-eastern states, while writing off the anti-ERA states such as Illinois, Tennessee and the south. The liberal Republicans, however, are just a shrinking minority in a minority Party. The Pro-Family Movement, with its cross-Party appeal to Democrats, independents and non-voters, was able to harvest the votes in states where liberal Republicans have no influence.

## People the Pollsters Didn't Poll

Ever since the November 4 election, the pollsters and the pundits have been trying to explain away their failure to predict or anticipate the landslide victory that washed Reagan and the Republican Senate into office. The prevailing wisdom the day before the election was that it would be close, and that a large turnout would benefit Carter, but a small turnout would benefit Reagan. The election proved the opposite: the large turnout benefited Reagan. The Pro-Family Movement provided the large margin of victory, and the pollsters had not discovered it because its members do not fit into any generally-recognized political categories.

The reasons why the major pollsters didn't discover the voters who would make up Reagan's margin of victory were: (1) The pollsters don't understand the moral and social issues; they understand only economic and political issues. Therefore they never really believed in the reality of the Pro-Family Movement. (2) The pollsters didn't know how to separate the voters from the traditional non-voters. The pollsters tended to think that the American people, including the evangelical Christians, were forced to choose between Reagan, Carter, and Anderson. In the real world, the choice was between Reagan, Carter, Anderson, and none of the above. (3) The pollsters polled for the purpose of finding out the "main" issues, while they didn't comprehend the "motivating" issues.

Thus, the pollsters came up with the conclusion that economic issues (inflation, jobs, taxes) were the number-one issue, and that national defense was the number-two issue. They were correct; those were the top presidential campaign issues of 1980. However, those issues do not explain Reagan's landslide and the big conservative swing in the Senate.

Most pollsters mistakenly assumed that the Pro-Family Movement (if, indeed, they recognized that it

exists at all) is only a subset of the Conservative Movement. Journalists have for years been treating it that way, but the facts are to the contrary. The Pro-Family Movement has a heritage different from the Conservative Movement, different organizational segments, and different leaders.

V. Lance Tarrance Associates in Houston is one pollster who understood grassroots currents and their effect on elections. His surveys showed that about 15 percent of non-voters can be motivated to return to the polls if they are given sufficient reason to do so, and that the issues most likely to be a source of such motivation are abortion and national defense. "The nation's economic problems are not the real polarizing issues at this point," Tarrance noted. He found also that 21 percent of non-voters are born-again Christians, and the two issues which most motivate them are prayer in schools and abortion.

It was the moral issues that moved millions of Americans into the political process in the first place. After they got to the polls, most would, indeed, say that inflation is the biggest national issue; but inflation was not why they went to the polls.

These people were motivated to vote and work for Ronald Reagan and for the winning U.S. Senators because (a) the candidates articulated the values they cherish on the issues they care about, and (b) the Republican Platform offered a clear choice as opposed to the Democratic Platform, especially on the issues of the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion, homosexual privileges, prayer in public schools, the integrity of the private school system, and appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court.

It was the Pro-Family Movement which carried many states for Reagan after his campaign strategy (e.g., the choice of George Bush for Vice President) had virtually written off the anti-ERA states (Illinois, Tennessee, Kentucky, New York, and the south). Jerry Falwell, founder of Moral Majority, said that the evangelical Christians registered four million *new* voters. James Robison sponsored a tremendous gathering of 20,000 people (including 7,000 preachers) in Dallas at which Reagan was one of the speakers. Pro-family leaders participated in training seminars for campaign volunteers in most of the states that had critical Senate contests, including Iowa, Idaho, Indiana, South Dakota, Florida, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Alaska. The Pro-Family Movement provided the decisive victory margin for Senate and House candidates.

## Stop ERA Victories in 1980

The Stop ERA Movement scored smashing successes in the 1980 elections. ERA was taken out of the Republican Platform in Detroit in July, despite public weeping by Mary Crisp (who then supported John Anderson). The excellent Republican Platform gave Ronald Reagan the Party backup he deserved and made it easy for him to defend his personal anti-ERA position on the campaign trail despite heckling and picketing by the National Organization for Women (NOW) and a handful of sour-grapes feminists. Reagan deserves our thanks for never retreating from his anti-ERA position despite such harassment. He proved that being anti-ERA is the winning posture for a candidate to take. The Republican Platform Committee deserves Reagan's thanks for resisting media and Republican-feminist pressure to leave Reagan out on the end of a limb by himself on the ERA issue.

Reagan's staunch anti-ERA position made it possible for the Stop ERA Movement to work effectively to persuade Democrats, independents and non-voters to vote for Reagan and for Republican candidates for the U.S. Senate. President Jimmy Carter, in an August White House strategy meeting, said to one of his associates, "I am afraid the anti-ERAs will defeat me." His premonition was accurate.

The Stop ERA Movement won gains in all the State Legislatures where ERA has been voted on in the last five years: Illinois, Florida, North and South Carolina, and Oklahoma. These gains included hard-fought victories in key individual races, such as those for Senate and House leaders and the election of new anti-ERA lady Senators.

The two Congressional sponsors of the unfair, crooked ERA Time Extension passed in 1978 were Birch Bayh in the Senate and Elizabeth Holtzman in the House. Both went down to defeat on November 4. It looks like we won't have to worry about another time extension. Besides, anti-ERA Senator Orrin Hatch replaces pro-ERA Birch Bayh as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

The Stop ERA Movement won a spectacular victory in Iowa where a State ERA was on a referendum on November 4. Iowa was considered to be a northern liberal pro-ERA state and all the customary phony polls predicted that, of course, ERA would pass easily. The voters rejected ERA by 55 percent.

Stop ERA was a tremendous factor in Reagan's campaign to get the Republican nomination. When the polls said that George Bush would carry New Hampshire, Stop ERA leaders went to that state the week before the primary and worked effectively to bring out the pro-family vote and give Reagan a surprise victory.

Illinois was Reagan's most important primary state. When Governor Reagan telephoned Phyllis Schlafly for help the Wednesday night before the primary the following Tuesday in March, the polls were predicting that Illinois Congressman John Anderson would carry the state. Around-the-clock work for the next five days to reach all Stop ERA supporters enabled Reagan to win the Illinois primary.

On May 10, when the Illinois Republican Party held its state convention, an attempt was made by some of the Republican organization to adopt a closed primary system in the future. The sponsors of this motion were irritated at the Democrats who had come into the Republican primary to vote for John Anderson. The motion was overwhelmingly defeated because grassroots Republicans knew that there were many more crossovers for Reagan in the Illinois primary than for Anderson. The Democrats and independents who voted for Reagan were brought into the fold by the Stop ERA Movement.

In 1980, three women ran for the U.S. Senate. The one against ERA was elected, Paula Hawkins of Florida. The two feminists who support ERA were defeated: Elizabeth Holtzman of New York and Mary Buchanan of Colorado. The irony is that Mary Buchanan could have been elected if she had been anti-ERA. She was defeated by Senator Gary Hart, a George McGovern Democrat, and all other Senators of that stripe went down to defeat in 1980.

Comprehensive and expensive federal child care for all children has been a major goal of the women's liberation movement for decades. The original sponsors were Walter Mondale in the Senate and John

Brademas in the House. Both went down to defeat on November 4.

## Other Pro-Family 1980 Victories

Three of the Pro-Family Movement's special favorites won amazing victories over tremendous odds. The hard-fought primary and general election victories to the U.S. Senate of Admiral Jeremiah Denton, our nation's highest-ranking POW, in Alabama, and of Don Nickles in Oklahoma, were due primarily to their Stop ERA and Moral Majority support. Congressman Robert Dornan withstood a major challenge from Gregory Peck's son which was so star-studded and highly-financed that it was dubbed "star wars."

The anti-abortion forces, who had tested and proved their political mettle two years ago by knocking off Senator Dick Clark (the intellectual liberal heir-apparent to Hubert Humphrey), this year collected an impressive list of scalps. Call the roll of the pro-abortion Senators who bit the dust on November 4: Birch Bayh, Frank Church, John Culver, George McGovern, Warren Magnuson, Gaylord Nelson, and Robert Morgan.

Abortion was not, of course, the only factor in those Senate races. But one indication of its crucial importance can be gleaned from the *Des Moines Register* "exit" poll of Iowa voters: 10 percent voted for Chuck Grassley (the winner over Culver) because of his anti-abortion stand. Senator Barry Goldwater's late conversion to support of a Human Life Amendment probably gave him his razor-thin margin of victory.

The new Congress will probably have a conservative majority in both the Senate and the House, although the Senate will have a Republican majority and the House a Democratic majority. Many of the winners owe their election to issue groups rather than to political parties.

Party discipline is no longer what it used to be. In September 1980, House Speaker Tip O'Neill complained that he had had to endure an unprecedented three roll-call votes in the previous seven weeks on motions to overrule the chair (whereas there were only four such votes from 1937 to 1980). The unusual number of roll-call votes this year on motions to overrule the chair on matters of procedure shows that Congressmen know that their issue-oriented constituents are so alert and smart that Congressmen can no longer confuse the issue and evade responsibility by hiding behind procedural maneuvers. The issue involved in the O'Neill outburst was the Internal Revenue attempt to dictate terms and quotas to religious schools -- one of the pro-family issues more important than party allegiance.

Lou Harris and others are now trying to convince Ronald Reagan and the new Senators that the election was not a mandate for a Human Life Amendment, for prayer in the schools, against affirmative action, or for other moral goals. If Reagan and his advisers believe that, they will miss their golden opportunity to build their victory coalition into a lasting foundation among the electorate on which he and his successors can govern for as long as Franklin D. Roosevelt did.

Ronald Reagan and the new conservative Senate have the greatest challenge of our time -- the opportunity to lead America to fulfill its true position of greatness, morally, militarily, and economically. We pray they will have the courage to carry out the mandate from the people who elected them.

# Mixing Religion and Politics

Just as fashions in clothes and in foods change with the times, so do styles and subjects of editorials and "advocacy journalism" on television and in the newspapers. Today it is high fashion to editorialize against the involvement of preachers in politics, and the self-righteous rhetoric ranges from irritation all the way to outrage. The favorite words which feed these outbursts are "zealots," "fanatics," "Khomeini," and even "Nazi" and "Ku Klux Klan."

The high priestess of indignation is Mrs. Patricia Harris, President Carter's Secretary of Health and Human Services. On September 23, 1980, she compared fundamentalist preachers to the "religious zealots in Iran," charging that they "pose a serious threat to the democratic process." She said, "I am beginning to fear that we could have an Ayatollah Khomeini in this country."

Norman Lear (who last year gave a half million dollars to the pro-ERAers) is now so exercised about "the pernicious danger of the Religious New Right" that he has started a new organization to counteract it called "People for the American Way." He expects to have a first-year budget of 3 to 5 million dollars.

The reason for all this indignation and fearmongering is that in 1980 some preachers with large followings urged their people to register and support Ronald Reagan and other pro-family candidates for Congress and State Legislatures.

So what's wrong with that? The "preacher" issue is as phony as a \$3 bill. Preachers have the same First Amendment rights that every American enjoys -- freedom of speech and press, the right to vote and to participate in the political process, and the right to try to persuade others to accept their leadership and advice.

For many years it has been known that the evangelical and fundamentalist Christians have a high level of non-voters. Some surveys showed that up to 50 percent were not even registered. While the Christians have been in their pews, the liberals have been getting their people to the polls. Now the liberals are upset at the way the Christians have awakened and come out to vote. The liberal counterattack is to yell smear words and epithets and hope to chase the Christians back into their pews like the groundhog frightened by his shadow.

## Separation of Church and State

Although Khomeini is the catchword of the intemperate rabble-rousers leading the charge against preachers in politics, "separation of church and state" is the cliché most used by those wringing their hands and crying crocodile tears of fear. These slogans are intended to harass, intimidate, and frighten the evangelicals and fundamentalists away from politics.

Separation of church and state is a time-honored pillar of our American Constitution and culture, but it doesn't mean what the liberals allege it means. As designed by the framers of the First Amendment, it means simply that the United States must not have any established state religion as do England, Sweden, and many other Western nations.

Separation of church and state certainly never meant that religion should be excluded from public life or from our schools and colleges. Prior to 1962, it never meant that a prayer could not be said in a public school; the Supreme Court invented that definition.

Separation of church and state never meant that preachers could not be active in politics and even be elected to office. The election in the 1970s of Roman Catholic Father Robert Drinan as a Congressman from Massachusetts and of Mormon Bishop Orrin Hatch as a Senator from Utah clearly prove that.

Funny thing, when Pope John Paul II ordered Father Drinan out of politics, the liberal establishment groaned at

the harshness of the Pope's order. But now that evangelical Christian ministers are expressing their views about Congressional and Presidential elections, suddenly we are told that religion and politics don't mix.

When Cardinal Medeiros of Boston recommended that Catholics vote for pro-life candidates in the primary, columnists furiously discussed whether he violated the separation of church and state. But when 13 Protestant ministers urged the Massachusetts Legislature to defeat a constitutional amendment reinstating capital punishment, we didn't hear a peep of protest from the same sources. When Jerry Falwell speaks out against ERA, the liberals tell him to get back into church. But when Iowa Bishop Maurice Dingman had his statement supporting ERA distributed in all the Catholic churches the Sunday before the referendum, we heard no protest about separation of church and state.

The liberals who object to preachers in politics today shake their heads, wrinkle their brows, and opine about the danger that "moral absolutists" will "impose their own morality" on American citizens. Funny thing, the liberal establishment did not discern the same threat ten years ago when the Fathers Berrigan, the Rev. William Sloane Coffin, and the Rev. Martin Luther King tried to impose their morality on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The liberals are expressing shock and dismay because the evangelical preachers are denouncing SALT II and calling for the rebuilding of U.S. military defense as a "moral" issue. Funny thing, those same liberals did not get at all exercised when the Catholic Bishops and the National Council of Churches worked for SALT II and the Panama Treaty that gave away our Canal, or when Catholic nuns organized by "Network" lobbied against the B-1 bomber. For years, liberal clergymen have been heavily involved in disarmament and in anti-nuclear agitation.

One of the phoniest arguments used by those who see a right-wing plot under every fundamentalist pulpit is that preachers have no right to be in politics because they don't pay taxes. Since when is paying taxes the criterion for the suffrage?

Millions of Americans on welfare and in low income categories do not pay taxes, but no one suggests that their voting privileges be taken away. The hundred-million-dollar foundations pay no taxes but are highly influential on controversial national policies. No one suggested that Nelson and David Rockefeller should stay out of politics because a large base of their influence is the tax-exempt Rockefeller Foundation.

The real reason the liberals are so upset is because they have made secular humanism our de facto state religion in government and education, and they realize that those who believe in the external verities and the Ten Commandments of the Judeo-Christian culture are starting to exercise their inalienable political rights.

It's better to be a member of the moral majority than of the immoral minority.

## The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: \$10 per year. Extra copies available: 25 cents each; 6 copies \$1; 50 copies \$5; 100 copies \$8.