

The Feminine Mistake:
Burkean Frames in Phyllis Schlafly's Equal Rights Amendment Speeches

Kayla J. Hastrup

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Communication

Jim A. Kuypers, Chair
Robert E. Denton, Jr.
Rachel L. Holloway

April 29, 2015
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Phyllis Schlafly, Equal Rights Amendment, Burkean frames, feminism

The Feminine Mistake:
Burkean Frames in Phyllis Schlafly's Equal Rights Amendment Speeches

Kayla J. Hastrup

ABSTRACT

Situated within the larger scholarship on the women's liberation movement of the 1970s exists a body of literature that analyzes the rhetorical functions of pro- and anti- Equal Rights Amendment messages in relation to communication studies. Although limited in scope, this literature acknowledges the tremendous impact of Phyllis Schlafly's STOP ERA campaign in the prevention of the ratification and unratification of states. However, with the exception of a few theses and dissertations, a lion's share of published articles proclaim the STOP ERA and Schlafly herself to be predominantly negative and serve solely as prevailing threats to the women's movement. As a result, heterogeneous scholarship grounded in communication theory proves limited when applied to critical rhetorical analyses of anti-feminist rhetoric. Using Kenneth Burke's frames of acceptance and rejection as a perspective for rhetorical criticism, this thesis demonstrates how Schlafly's conservative ideals functioned rhetorically through acceptance-based frames in the past, and through rejection-based frames after the failed ERA ratification in 1982. In doing so, I provide today's scholars with an important body of knowledge to further examine the ERA debate and its influence on contemporary feminism. Until rhetoric is fully explored within the cultural and historical conditions distinctive to Schlafly's main speeches during the ERA debate, meaningful debate about the women's movement and feminism's current state is subject to remain truncated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee members for their continued patience and support of my project. First, I wish to thank Dr. Jim Kuypers for providing the encouragement and guidance needed to facilitate my growth as a communication scholar. Since my very first semester as a Master's student, you have challenged me to be a better researcher, writer, and critical thinker. Because of that, I am confident and excited to continue my path as an academic and life-long learner. I would also like to thank Dr. Bob Denton and Dr. Rachel Holloway for lending their significant expertise and wonderful insights to help create a research project that I am proud of and value. The support I received from each of you in developing this thesis has been invaluable. Thank you.

I also wish to thank several faculty members in the department of communication at Virginia Tech for their unreserved and continued support of my academic and teaching career, including Dr. Jimmy Ivory, Dr. John Tedesco, Dr. Buddy Howell, and Brandi Quesenberry. I only hope that one day I can be half as good a teacher as all of you.

I would be remiss if I did not mention how much I appreciate Dr. Beth Waggenpack for providing constant encouragement since day one, and for helping me through some very difficult times. I could not have made it through without you, and for that I am eternally thankful.

Finally, I wish to thank my friends and classmates for always willing to be my sounding board. And, of course, my family for always being there and supporting me with whatever I chose to do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. Review of Literature.....	6
Phyllis Schlafly.....	6
Equal Rights Amendment.....	7
STOP ERA.....	9
Equal Rights and Feminism in Scholarship.....	12
Burkean Frames of Reference.....	15
Frames of Acceptance.....	17
Frames of Rejection.....	19
Chapter 3. Description of Artifact and Method.....	23
Applying Burkean Frames for Criticism.....	23
Criticism as a Method.....	24
Schlafly's ERA Speeches.....	25
Potential Problems and Pitfalls.....	27
Chapter 4. Analysis 1.....	29
Speech 1—1975.....	29
Speech 2—1977.....	36
Chapter 5. Analysis 2.....	40
Speech 3—1984.....	40
Speech 4—2002.....	44
Speech 5—2007.....	49
Chapter 6. Discussion and Conclusions.....	57
Summary.....	57
Analysis 1.....	57
Analysis 2.....	60
Theoretical Implications.....	61
Practical Implications.....	63
Third Wave Feminism.....	64
Conclusion.....	66

Appendix A. Speech 1 Transcript.....	68
Appendix B. Speech 2 Transcript.....	89
Appendix C. Speech 3 Transcript.....	91
Appendix D. Speech 4 Transcript.....	99
Appendix E. Speech 5 Transcript.....	118
Notes.....	129

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In a September 2008 issue of *In These Times*, a politically progressive democratic magazine of news and opinion articles, Susan Douglas, a feminist academic in communication studies and a cultural critic, criticized Sarah Palin for her use of feminism to repudiate feminist causes.¹ In this article, “Feminism Without Feminism,” Douglas briefly made a comparison between Palin and Phyllis Schlafly. When asked if she thought this was an apt comparison during the interview with representatives of *Journal of Communication Inquiry (JCI)*, Douglas replied with a surprising admiration for Schlafly’s intellect:

She’s [Palin] benefited from feminism, which she has done everything in her politics, appearance, and her manner to destroy. That’s why she’s worse than Schlafly. ... I disagree fundamentally and profoundly with her politics, but Phyllis Schlafly was an incredibly hard- working, smart, shrewd woman. She pretty much single-handedly defeated the ERA. She has support, help, and a network, but she was very smart. And that’s what her strength was.²

Douglas’s response represents a seemingly undisputed view by Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) activists and historians concerning Schlafly. Love her or loathe her, Schlafly was the most recognized leader in opposition to the liberal side of the women’s liberation movement. She spearheaded the successful grassroots campaigns against the ERA with the STOP ERA, a group mobilized in 1972 to defeat ratification of the ERA. However, little critical research has examined her effectively persuasive rhetorical devices. A critical inquiry into the rhetorical artistry of Schlafly’s speeches provides a greater understanding and appreciation of her pervasive ability to defeat the ERA.

When Schlafly started her fight against the ERA in 1972, the women’s movement was reaching new heights, and a majority of Americans as well as politicians on both sides supported the amendment.³ However, with an army of women behind her, Schlafly and her STOP ERA campaign (acronym standing for “Stop Taking Our Privileges”) defeated the efforts to ratify the

amendment in 1982. Schlafly's anti-ERA crusade attracted hundreds of thousands of women into the fight against the amendment and earned her a role as feminists' most fervent and threatening opponent. In the process, she embodied a woman who found lasting public success in both the political and domestic arena.⁴

To date, Schlafly continues her STOP ERA campaign through the Eagle Forum, a conservative interest group that espouses pro-family values and a conservative agenda. As of April 2014, Schlafly, at age 90, is still the president of the Eagle Forum and continues her conservative lobbying efforts through *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* newsletters, public debates and speeches, university appearances, radio and TV interviews, and blog updates on the Eagle Forum's website. The organization, which is also the parent organization of the Eagle Forum Education, Legal Defense Fund, and the Eagle Forum PAC, continues to "expose the radical feminists" and support "traditional American values."⁵ While feminist organizations such as the National Organization for Women (NOW) continue to encourage introduction and passage of the amendment to Congress, Schlafly and the Eagle Forum remain vehemently anti-ERA and reactivate the STOP ERA campaign whenever the ERA is reintroduced in the U.S. Congress or a state legislature.⁶ The battle of the ERA may have concluded with failed ratification in 1982, but a contemporary battle between feminists and Schlafly still remains.

Schlafly's contributions to the ERA debate prove particularly important to examine from a practical standpoint as well. Recent polls indicate that majority of women hesitate to associate themselves with the women's movement and the "feminist" label.⁷ According to a 2005 CBS News poll, just 24 percent of women consider themselves to be a feminist.⁸ Although majority of women strongly oppose the feminist label, they tend to strongly support general feminist ideals. When a feminist is described as "someone who believes in the social, political, and

economic equality of the sexes” in the poll question, 65 percent of women identify themselves as a feminist. In other words, although more American women support efforts to strengthen women’s status in society, only a small minority identify as a feminist.

The contemporary struggle for feminists can also be seen in popular culture. On September 20, 2014, British actor and Goodwill Ambassador for UN Women, Emma Watson, gave a speech about gender inequality and how to fight it. Among her claims, she lists that fighting for women’s rights has become problematic in the recent years and women’s rights are “too often synonymous with man-hating.” She goes on to warrant her argument by defining feminism, stating that feminism is “the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities. It is the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes.”⁹ Why, then, is the word that once defined one of the most incendiary revolutions of all times now seen as too strong, too aggressive, and isolating to men? The conscious-raising strategies espoused by feminists during the women’s movement in the 1960s to 1970s no longer hold the same effectiveness they once did. Analyzing from “the other side,” or in the case of the ERA debate, Schlafly’s side, without an inherent bias toward the feminist label provides a unique opportunity for further analysis.

Communication scholars have also documented this shift in feminist perspective. In a 2005 study examining the ideological effects of the failed feminist constitutive rhetoric, Helen Tate noted that “the young woman who espouses equality of opportunity for women, yet repudiates the feminist label is now a staple of the media’s coverage of feminism.”¹⁰ Feminist scholars Donna Nudd and Kristina Whalen argued that “although most women will not self-identify as a feminist, many will profess agreement with the ideals comprising a feminist agenda.”¹¹ Understanding how Schlafly’s conservative ideals functioned rhetorically in the past

provides today's scholars with an important body of knowledge to further examine the ERA debate and its influence on contemporary feminism. Although Schlafly herself would never claim feminism as part of her identity, her effective persuasive rhetoric employed during the ERA debate points to messages that "transform the somewhat rigid categories of gender in positive ways."¹² To put another way, Schlafly offered a more universal definition of womanhood. By critically analyzing her self-identified "top" five ERA-focused speeches from 1975 to 2007,¹³ I reveal Schlafly's unique contribution to contemporary feminism. Furthermore, I reveal Schlafly's rhetorical artistry throughout the STOP ERA campaign.

In order to fully understand and interpret the rhetoric of Schlafly's ERA-focused speeches, it is important to view them through a perspective that allows for both an understanding of ideological rhetoric and social norms. The utility of Kenneth Burke's frames of acceptance and rejection have long been recognized as a useful critical perspective to analyze the political or social attitudes that effect change in historical shifts of orientation.¹⁴ These two frames, according to Burke, are helpful "to equip us for confronting given historical and personal situations."¹⁵ They successfully chart social action by establishing the attitudes and motives as exigencies of living. By viewing public address through frames of acceptance or rejection, critics can discover how others unknowingly used these frames to aid society in understanding and humanely responding to social situations. Examining rhetoric through these frames, critics can see how acceptance toward attitudes is encouraged or discouraged by the rhetors. Despite the powerful insight Burke's frames provide to scholars, no critics have used the frames to focus on the rhetoric employed by Schlafly and the STOP ERA campaign. Given the significant influence and success of Schlafly's STOP ERA campaign, and her unique contribution to contemporary feminism, the lack of critical and non-feminist scholarship that examines her experiences is

surprising. Until rhetoric is fully explored within the cultural and historical conditions distinctive to Schlafly's main speeches during the STOP ERA campaign, meaningful debate about the women's movement current state is subject to remain truncated.

The goals of this paper are both substantive and methodological for the purposes of critical analysis. First, I set the context through which to view Schlafly's speeches by examining her political trajectory and the Equal Rights Amendment history. Second, I review and synthesize previous literature that focused on Schlafly and the STOP ERA campaign to reveal the lacunae in literature resulting from the inherently negative attitudes and liberal feminist ideals expressed. Third, I conceptualize the utility of Burke's framing notions for analyzing speeches and identify its uses and potential pitfalls when applied to criticism. Fourth, I move chronologically from 1975 to 2007 to provide analysis of five of Schlafly's ERA-focused speeches. Finally, I discuss conclusions for both theoretical and practical implications, specifically focusing on contemporary feminism. In doing so, I situate my rhetorical criticism in existing research and offer significant justification for conducting criticism on five of Schlafly's ERA speeches through the lens of acceptance and rejection frames.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Phyllis Schlafly

Phyllis Schlafly is unquestionably one of the very few individuals who was not a politician or general to have a major impact on American political history. To date, Schlafly is often compared to conservative women in politics today. In 1998 she was named one of the “100 most important women of the 20th century” by the *Ladies’ Home Journal*.¹⁶ Since the publication of her best-selling 1964 book, *A Choice Not An Echo*, Schlafly has written prolifically about American policy and military affairs. The story account behind Carol Felsenthal’s coming to write Schlafly’s 1981 biography, *Phyllis Schlafly: The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority*, provides a unique portrait of Schlafly’s power to inspire. In her foreword, Felsenthal explained how she came to write the biography after attacking Schlafly’s ninth book *The Power of the Positive People* in a piece for *The Chicago Tribune* in 1977. An ERA supporter and self-proclaimed feminist, Felsenthal had ridiculed Schlafly’s book, calling it irrational, contradictory, and simple-minded. To Felsenthal’s surprise, letters of protest from women started pouring in with distinct rage toward Felsenthal for “insulting our savior,” as one letter stated.¹⁷ Shortly after, she became fascinated with the woman who could arouse such passionate support, and her meticulously researched, decisive biography is the result.

In order to understand the leadership and power that Schlafly embodied during the ERA debate, and the politically conservative author she still is today, it is important to start with a brief overview of her early life and career. Phyllis McAlpin Stewart was born on August 15, 1924, in St. Louis, Missouri to the proud parents Odile Dodge Stewart and John Bruce Stewart.¹⁸ As noted in Felsenthal’s biography, a major influence on Schlafly’s intellect and spiritual development was the all-girls Sacred Heart school she attended during four years of high school

and in third, seventh, and eighth grades of elementary school.¹⁹ From a very young age, Schlafly showed great prospect as an over-achieving, hard working young woman. By the time she graduated high school, Schlafly had a fierce determination to further her education and seek out new adventures. In 1944, after spending a year at Radcliffe University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, she received her BA from Washington University in St. Louis. Throughout college, she worked on the night shift at the St. Louis Ordnance Plant testing .30 and .50 caliber ammunition by firing rifles and machine guns.²⁰

In October 1949, when she was 25 years old, Phyllis Stewart married attorney John Fred Schlafly, Jr. Their marriage, according to Felsenthal, was one of mutual respect and a shared conservative, individualistic philosophy.²¹ Until Fred's death in 1993, their marriage remained "a partnership between two highly intelligent, highly opinionated people who genuinely like, respect, and—perhaps most important considering their strong personalities—agree with each other."²² Phyllis Schlafly and her late husband are the parents of six children (John, Bruce, Roger, Liza, Answer, and Anne) and 14 grandchildren.²³ In 1977, when Schlafly was testifying against the ERA, media feminists often ridiculed her for not being a trained lawyer.²⁴ So, while defeating the ERA, Schlafly went to Washington University Law School in St. Louis, Missouri and graduated in top of her class.²⁵ When asked what her greatest achievement has been, Schlafly always refers to mothering her children before noting any of her political achievements.

Equal Rights Amendment

Knowing the elements of Schlafly's early life helps to appreciate her role and efforts in the fight against the Equal Rights Amendment. In the early 1970s, the women's liberation movement leaders found political strength in their push to ratify the ERA. The ERA is composed of three Sections:

Section I. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

Section II. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Section III. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.²⁶

First drafted in 1923 by suffragist leader Alice Paul, founder of the US National Woman's Party, the ERA would make constitutional rights fully sex-neutral. The ERA was introduced to Congress every year until it was passed in 1972. With a vote of 84 to 8, 15 votes more than the two-thirds required for constitutional amendments, the ERA was passed as the proposed 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution.²⁷ In the succeeding ten years—from 1972-1982—the majority of Americans told the media that they favored the amendment and supported “equal rights” for women.²⁸ However, on June 30, 1982, the amendment's deadline for ratification passed and the ERA fell three states short of requirement for ratification. The ERA still continues to be introduced to each session of Congress, but pro-ERA activists have not regained momentum for the amendment like they did during the 1970s.

From the beginning, major feminist organizations argued that “equal rights” solely meant “ending special benefits.”²⁹ From 1972 to 1982, supporters of the ERA lobbied, marched, rallied, and petitioned for the equality of men and women under the Constitution as an issue of advocacy.³⁰ Pro-ERA advocacy efforts were predominately led by the National Organization for Women (NOW) and ERAmerica, a national bi-partisan coalition of organizations.³¹ Founded in 1966 by a group of women's rights activists, NOW was determined to bring action toward ratifying the ERA. In its inception, NOW had 49 founders—28 women who signed on at the Third National Convention of Commissions on the Status of Women in June 1966, and another 21 women and men who became founders at the October 1966 NOW Organizing Conference.

A prominent leader of the movement and NOW's first president was Betty Friedan, author of the 1963 bestselling book, *The Feminine Mystique*, which claimed to rescue women from second-class citizenship. Often credited with igniting the women's movement in the 1960s, Friedan helped attract thousands of feminists to the liberation movement. While some differences in levels of radical support existed among NOW members, the women's liberation movement strived to fully embrace the ERA and espouse women's "rights" for constitutional equality. The feminists of the time recognized what they believed was a longing in some of the women of their generation for equal opportunities, respect, and a chance to redefine womanhood on the basis of equality.

STOP ERA

The momentum to ratify the ERA faced a serious shift in political climate when STOP ERA, a group mobilized by women that believed the ERA was not in the best interest of American women, was formed to ensure the amendment's defeat. Starting with a group of her Republican women friends, Schlafly and opponents to the ERA created their own group and rallied, protested, and appeared in public debates with a clear agenda—stop ERA from ratifying in the remaining states. Under Schlafly's lead, the STOP ERA women shared their ideals to the public, specifically noting that the ERA would not give women anything that they hadn't already been granted and in fact would actually take away rights from women and deny some rights, including positively making women subject to the draft, overturning privacy rights, upholding abortion rights, preference in child custody, and devaluing the traditions of womanhood.³² Regardless of stance on the ERA debate, both pro- and anti-ERA campaigns tapped into a feeling that many women of the time had—changes are happening and something needed to be done.

With only three House Members out of 435 on their side, the STOP ERA group set out in 1972 to speak against the ERA. STOP ERA operated on a relatively hierarchical chain of command centering on one person—Schlafly—without whom the STOP ERA campaign would probably not have been successful in preventing ratification. Schlafly took the responsibility for public debate and in doing so, held countless meetings, presented hundreds of speeches, and participated in as many debates with pro-ERA feminists that she could.³³ Schlafly held training conferences for members of her Eagle Forum, in which STOP ERA members were aided in effective letter writing strategies, testifying at public hearings, and general public speaking knowledge. The primary STOP ERA members were composed predominantly of white, middle-aged housewives, conservative Republicans, and fundamentalist religious groups.

By 1977 when the 35th and final state ratified the amendment, the ERA debate received even greater vigor between those who persuaded citizens to accept gender-blind policies and those who fought to save traditional womanhood.³⁴ As the deadline for the passage approached, feminists rallied together in Houston, Texas for The National Women’s Conference in 1977. However, knowing the power of mobilization for sustainability, under the leadership of Schlafly, the STOP ERA campaign staged its own rally in Houston at the same time, drawing in a much larger turnout.³⁵ The dueling rallies brought a great deal of media attention, but the number of supporters brought in by Schlafly demonstrated to Congress that not all women truly wanted the ERA to pass.³⁶

Proponents of the ERA saw STOP ERA as “right-wing radicals who are using the ERA as an organizing tool” for their own, unrelated agenda.³⁷ NOW and other ERA supporters believed that Schlafly played into the same fears that had generated female opposition to woman suffrage.³⁸ Feminists viewed Schlafly as continuing women’s oppression by persuading women

to connive in their own subordination to men. Both groups imposed threatening and often contradictory viewpoints, leaving little room to find common ground or reach an understanding. However, both groups used the years before ratification as an opportunity to push their agendas and publically debate on the issue. For example, during a televised episode of *Firing Line* with William F. Buckley Jr., Schlafly debated with Ann Scott, Vice President for Legislation of NOW.³⁹ Movement leaders established and maintained communication with their followers by appearing on national television and radio talk shows, lecturing or debating at universities and institutions across the nation, and promoting their cause through advertisements.

In the 1970s, much of the apparent support for the ERA came from a sympathetic response to the concept of “rights” and “equality,” but not from a commitment to actual changes in women’s roles.⁴⁰ Among the people who claimed to have heard or read about the ERA, 67 percent favored it, while 25 percent were opposed, and 8 percent had no opinion. Similarly to the struggles women face today with identifying as a feminist, those who supported the ERA also held traditional views about women’s roles, especially in the economic sphere.⁴¹ That is, while the men and women of America approved the principle of equal rights, they only approved so long as it did not completely reconstruct societal values, such as a woman’s right to be exempt from the draft and the traditional role of wives as the homemaker.

ERA supporters, however, wanted real changes to occur in the lives of both men and women through law. For example, admitting women to an all-male organization such as the Boys Scouts would be a “right” for women. Additionally, under the ERA, men would also have the “right” to be admitted into an all-female organization, such as the Girls Scouts, which would ultimately change the character of the organizations.⁴² The tensions between “rights” and radical changes from 1972 to 1982 paved the pathway for Schlafly to build her STOP ERA campaign.

Equal Rights and Feminism in Scholarship

Situated within the larger scholarship on the women's liberation movement of the 1970s exists a body of literature that analyzes the rhetorical functions of pro- and anti- ERA messages in relation to communication studies.⁴³ Although limited in scope, in these research studies, scholars and historians acknowledge the tremendous impact of Phyllis Schlafly's campaign in the prevention of the ratification and the unratification of states.⁴⁴ However, with the exception of a few theses and dissertations, a lion's share of published articles proclaim the STOP ERA and Schlafly herself to be predominantly negative and serve solely as prevailing threats to the women's movement. Additionally, the most influential communication scholarship on the ERA debate happened before or immediately following the failed ratification in 1982. As a result, scholarship that examines the role of debate on the ERA from the public sphere is still not fully understood or agreed upon in academia today.⁴⁵ The homogenous scholarship grounded in feminist perspectives proves unsatisfactory when applied to critical rhetorical analyses of anti-feminist rhetoric.⁴⁶ The narrow view of feminism espoused by academics and "feminists" allows for an opportunity to examine Schlafly's rhetoric from a different perspective, one that offers variety and functions virtually heterogeneous in the study of rhetoric.⁴⁷

Feminist authors and historians acknowledge the tremendous impact of Schlafly's campaign in the prevention of the ratification and the unratification of states.⁴⁸ To date, Schlafly continues her campaign opposing the liberal feminist definition of "equal rights" for women through the Eagle Forum, *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, and by appearing on a variety of conservative news media regularly. Schlafly and the Eagle Forum organization remain vehemently anti-ERA and reactivate the STOP ERA campaign whenever an ERA is reintroduced in the United States Congress or a state legislature.⁴⁹ Although it is nearly impossible to prove

whether the ERA eventually would have been ratified without the influence of the STOP ERA campaign, Schlafly's campaign was undeniably a crucial element in the ultimate defeat of the ERA.⁵⁰ However, although scholars agree on the effect persuasiveness employed by Schlafly and the STOP ERA group, the research that analyzed the campaign and Schlafly's influence is presented, quite ironically, without regard to questions of fairness and objectivity.

For example, in Martha Solomon's 1979 mythical analysis of the rhetoric of STOP ERA, she attributes the effectiveness of STOP ERA in its "conscious or unconscious manipulation" of the diverse elements of the psychological archetype of the mother.⁵¹ In this analysis, Solomon leads readers to believe the STOP ERA campaign was solely flooded with "nonrational persuasiveness" and lacked the "consciousness-raising techniques" employed by ERA supporters and second-wave feminists at large.⁵² In her analysis, the author does not offer an open and balanced critique and instead attributes the public support of the STOP ERA to the "pre-discovered truths and simplistic answers guaranteed to produce fulfillment and happiness."⁵³ Ultimately, the conclusion that STOP ERA supporters did not discover the same alleged "painful self-analysis" as the pro-ERA advocates suggests that ERA supporters participated in a much more meaningful and worthy cause than their opponents. It also limits the view of "consciousness-raising" by identifying such strategy exclusively as a hallmark for the pro-ERA side, thus insinuating that the views proposed by the STOP ERA lack critical understanding and rational debate.

Another example of seemingly biased critical scholarship can be found in Sonja Foss's 1979 analysis of the rhetorical visions created by proponents and opponents of the ERA. In this article, Foss examined the rhetorical worlds or visions in order to provide a clue to the essence or motivation inherent in the ERA debate.⁵⁴ The author argued that in the proponent's world,

women are viewed as standing at, rather than within, the gates of the democracy.⁵⁵ In other words, pro-ERA supporters believe women are excluded from full participation in democracy. They argue that all women want to and should engage in all activities of the working world, but are unable to because of sex discrimination. However, Foss contradicted herself by concluding that proponents willingly participated in the social and political systems, but urged that these be changed.

The world created by the rhetoric of the ERA opponents, Foss argued, centers on the home. This contrasts with proponents' world that the domain of the ERA is not the home, but rather the world outside.⁵⁶ Foss argued that in the ERA opponents' world, women who "remain in their proper sphere of the home and perform their wifely duties well are glorified ... and are placed on pedestals."⁵⁷ In other words, for the ERA opponents, the sacred ground is in the home and women have only a particular role. The creation of two conflicting rhetorical worlds, Foss argued, limits opportunity for understanding and argumentation. Foss also argued that from the ERA debate emerged two conflicting motivations between oppressive conditions and a particular view of womanhood, and not necessarily from the arguments presented to the public. However, her insights of the ERA opponents are limited to expose mostly themes of womanhood, not the full ERA debate and analysis of the issues that were argued.

Foss's and Solomon's analyses, I argue, represent the radical shift in scholarship toward the standard liberal academic feminist critique. Although the research offers meaningful insights into the worlds created by the rhetorical visions of both pro- and anti- ERA groups, the feminist bias limits the opportunity for critical objectivity. Additionally, there is a lack of context for the historical status of the public sphere. As Alan Gross argued in 2012, "It is not that the separate rhetorically constructed worlds of proponents and opponents of ERA led to a communicative

impasse, but that the progressive atrophy of the public sphere led to the creation of these separate worlds.”⁵⁸ Ultimately, Gross contends that “Americans clearly preferred what they got: the status quo.”⁵⁹ And while one can regret the outcome of the debate, it cannot be assumed that “had the force of the better argument prevailed, the result would have been different.”⁶⁰

With the exception of a few master’s theses and dissertations, the academic scholarship that surrounds Schlafly and the ERA debate, which was largely published during the ERA public debate in the late 1970s, seems to diminish Schlafly’s unique contribution to feminism. Furthermore, little scholarship offers a full understanding of Schlafly’s reflection of the dominant culture’s perspective.⁶¹ Although Schlafly would probably be the first person to dismiss the label of feminist, her early life and political trajectory suggest an inherently feminist, yet also strongly conservative and domestic value agenda. Thus, filling this gap in research by offering a Burkean-based public address criticism proves to be a worthwhile endeavor.

Burkean Frames of Reference

In order to fully understand and interpret the rhetoric of Phyllis Schlafly’s self-selected “top five” ERA-focused speeches, it is important to view them through a perspective with most promising means for understanding ideological rhetoric and social norms. Burke theorized rhetorical “frames of reference” as a way for critics to analyze how effects for understanding and acting in society are produced. The frames provide perspective for interpretation of events and chart the processes and attitudes from which social action occurred. The critic identifying the frames of references can achieve a better understanding of a given social situation by identifying the frame from which the situation’s rhetoric operates. Although not always easily articulated or applied, many rhetorical theorists and critics have recognized Burke’s frames of acceptance and rejection as a useful critical perspective to analyze human communication.⁶²

To begin, it should be noted that in his discussion of dramatism and the pentad perspective, Burke conceptualized a heuristic model that is systemic and has structure. Comparatively, some critics argue that Burke's notions of the frames of acceptance and rejection have minimal structure or direct means for application of theory.⁶³ Despite the lack of cohesion of the framing concepts for rhetorical critics, all frames of reference, according to Burke, are helpful "to equip us for confronting given historical and personal situations."⁶⁴ They successfully chart social action by establishing the attitudes and motives as exigencies of living. Throughout the ERA debate, the women's movement, and Schlafly's speeches specifically, contained both acceptance and rejection reference frames. By identifying the discursive frames, critics can indicate whether the rhetor welcomes or disapproves of a social situation, and provide a greater understanding of human limitations and actions.

In *Attitudes Toward History* Burke argued that "frames" are the "symbolic structures" through which human beings impose order upon their personal and social experiences. In order to conceptualize the notions of Burkean frames, one must situate the discussion around two overarching reference frames of reference: *acceptance* and *rejection*. It is useful to think of acceptance and rejection "in terms of the relationships that constitute a social order; the question is whether there is an attitude of renegotiating the terms of the relationship or a complete rejection of any possibility of a relationship."⁶⁵ Frames that emphasize rejection, such as elegy, satire, and burlesque frames, attempt to "debunk" social perspectives, but they "do not equip us to understand the full complexities of sociality."⁶⁶ On the other hand, frames that emphasize acceptance, such as the epic, tragic, and comic frames, charitably "confront a life perspective as it is," while still allowing the individual to "thunder against it" by providing "maximum consciousness."⁶⁷ That is, rejection-based frames transcend society downward by rejecting any

possibility of a relationship, while acceptance-based frames encourage thoughtful reform through an open and balanced discussion organized in accordance with the social norm.

Frames of Acceptance

The frames of acceptance are the more or less organized system of meanings to gauge a historical situation and adopt a role within it.⁶⁸ Recognizing the power of comedy, Burke believed that it is only through the “humbly ironic” comic frame that we can deconstruct the ideas of our world without self-destruction. According to Burke, the comic frame is the most humane for understanding and acting in society because it has the most promising attitude for developing a collective consciousness independent of specific ideologies. The comic frame acts as a subset of the acceptance frame by combining elements of both the acceptance and tragic frames.⁶⁹ Comedy primarily fits with acceptance frames because it offers a derisive acknowledgement of human foibles through the welcoming use of humor. Acceptance-based frames are neither wholly euphemistic nor wholly debunking; they do not fully substitute negative or undesirable attitudes for offensive, blunt attitudes, nor do they fully attempt to expose society as pretentious, false or exaggerated.⁷⁰ In this sense, a “comic” or “tragic” movement recognizes the need for social order, but never at the cost of humanity of those on the other side.

How, then, does a critic engage in Burkean framing analysis? The goal of a movement operating within an acceptance frame is to achieve change by charitably poking fun at flaws in the system and the actors who uphold it. Given the power of acceptance frames to restore order in the world, it is important to identify the specific attributes that make up the frames. Acceptance-based frames seek to expose “charitable attributes” that offers the most critical perspective, which ultimately reduces tension in society and adds balance to our views of

society. One charitable attribute revealed is the acknowledgment that all people are “necessarily mistaken” and that “all people are exposed to situations in which they must act as fools.”⁷¹ The acceptance perspective frames humans not as vicious or evil, but as mistaken and in need of reconstruction. Comedic frames humorously offer a sense of identification to specific characters because like them, all humans have flaws. Examining rhetoric through the lens of Burke’s frame, critics can see how acceptance toward attitudes is encouraged or discouraged by the rhetors using the frames and how discourse calls for a (re)construction of the social world.

By humorously pointing out failings within the status quo through identification with a fool, the optimistic perspective of acceptance frames urges society to correct through reason rather than tragic victimage.⁷² The framing perspective identifies the social ills as arising from human error, not evil, and uses reason to correct them. Reason, according to Burke, is formed by public grammar.⁷³ In acceptance-based frames, one must name the friendly and unfriendly functions and relationships “as pliant as the situation it would encompass,” which is often done in comedy through humorous commentary.⁷⁴ In naming both friendly and unfriendly functions, the rhetor forms characters and attitudes that are the cues of social behavior in such a way that allows society to take action toward the most logical and critical stance of reason. “It [reason] is formed as a way of ‘thinking backwards’—and he [society] learns to ‘think forward’ with it.”⁷⁵ Defining reason within the vocabulary of public grammar enables the rhetor to present a voice that charitably checks claims made against society while still encompassing all perspectives of a situation.

Utilizing the notions of the acceptance and rejection frames to examine the discourse in speeches has the potential to illuminate how symbolic actions function for potential reconstruction of our world. The open and relatable symbolic attributes in the acceptance frames

serve to demonstrate the idea of “maximum consciousness.” To put another way, acceptance frames offer different viewpoints of a situation and neglect to cast out or banish the “other.” Within acceptance-focused frames, “maximum consciousness” can be achieved through open dialogue and meaningful deconstruction of ideas; therefore, showing respect for all actors involved. By doing this, the rhetor operating from such frame can point out flaws with the status quo without overtly offending anyone because all viewers are then a part of the informed “inside” rather than being scapegoated as the problematic “outsider.”

Another specialized critical device that offers “maximum consciousness” is often seen through the creation, reprimanding and transcendence of a specific character, which Burke identifies as the “fool.”⁷⁶ The intervention of a fool allows the rhetor to humorously call attention to problems in the social world by using an identifiable, relatable example. Comedy drives the fool away, but only temporarily because comedy does not prepare the victim for exile, but instead prepares for open dialogue. When characters scapegoat blame on the “other,” it unintentionally blinds them from derisive acknowledgement of their own foibles. A voice of reason must emerge to resolve the blame before any thoughtful reform is encouraged. Once the fool is able to note his own foibles, the institution that fueled his flaws can become undone and dialogue can begin. Finally, the fool and society can reemerge in a newly repaired social order.⁷⁷ Acceptance frames recognize that humans are not perfect and rhetors use the character of a fool as a way to hold up a mirror to society and ask people to take a look at themselves. In doing so, the perspective reveals the rhetor’s attempt to promote and encourage open dialogue, while still identifying a problem and recognizing a flaw with the social norm.

Frames of Rejection

Though acceptance and rejection cannot be sharply differentiated, Burke contends that the epic, tragedy, and comedy gravitate towards the positive side, while the elegy, satire, and burlesque stress the negative.⁷⁸ The frames of rejection are a by-product of acceptance, and involve primarily a matter of emphasis. Both the rejection and acceptance frames center attention on some critical factors while drawing attention away from others that are ignored or marginalized. Frames of acceptance, for example, over-emphasize what is favorable or under-emphasize unfavorable consequences. Frames of rejection, on the other hand, keep the focus on the unfavorable consequences, or the “culturally dispossessed.”⁷⁹ In this sense, frames of rejection do not properly gauge the situation; and the rhetor who operates out of such frames “does not tend to size up his own resources accurately.”⁸⁰

In contrast with the positive emphasis of acceptance frames, rejection frames draw upon the negative emphasis within the complaints. The elegiac frame serves to exploit good reasons for complaint until the physical limits of the attitude are reached. This rejection frames stresses one’s ability to “avenge oneself by weeping,” thus spreading the imbalance between the weakness of the self and the magnitude of the situation.⁸¹ Insofar as elegy frames serve to protect against one’s enemy, the negative emphasis rejects greater understanding for the entire situation.

Similar to the elegiac frame, the satirist frame also emphasizes rejection. However, a satire-focused frame attacks in others the weaknesses and temptations that are really within oneself. Through satire, rhetors may draw upon imagery from a private vice they have in common with the audience to criticize or attack the audience on some platform of the public area they are opponents.⁸² The rhetor, in this case, gratifies and punishes the vice within himself in an

attempt to attack his opponent. The satiric frame, however, does not allow for full protection against the opponent since there must be some form of identification.

The rhetor of burlesque frames, on the other hand, makes no attempt to “get inside the psyche of his victim.”⁸³ Instead, the burlesque frame selects the external behaviors that best emphasize the absurdities in the opponent, ultimately destroying the victim’s insights. The rhetor, according to Burke, “deliberately suppresses any consideration of mitigating circumstances that would put his subject in better light.”⁸⁴ The method behind the rejection-based focus proves to be both polemic and caricature. As such, it does not provide a well-rounded frame within itself. The method of burlesque, in contrast to acceptance-frames, lacks the corrective, positive features of a well-rounded frame.

Although frames of rejection emphasize forces of negative force, vengeance, and compulsion, they also can develop its own positives, such as “comradeship,” “party discipline,” “solidarity,” thereby restoring the charitable attributes necessary for co-operation.⁸⁵ However, without the resources of acceptance-focused ambivalence, one is not equipped to gauge the full range of human potentialities. In order to effectively cope with their environment, rhetors must utilize the corrective features of acceptance whereby both the friendly and unfriendly functions are named. “The liberal who rates social organisms by its test alone is vowed to disillusionment. He will find that his ideals are too good for this world.”⁸⁶

Before moving to analysis with a perspective of Burkean frames, it is important to note that both frames of acceptance and rejection discussed are inherently self-limiting. That is, according to Burke, to accept one thing, is to reject another. As a frame prepares us to cope with and gauge a situation, it conditions us to accept some things and reject others. Although well-rounded frames still limit understanding in some capacities, they limit us to a lesser degree than

other frames. Burke suggests the adoption of well-rounded frames because they are the least limiting in understanding the richness of human relations, and have built-in capacities to transcend their own limitations.⁸⁷

CHAPTER 3. DESCRIPTION OF ARTIFACTS AND METHOD

Applying Burkean Framing for Criticism

When rhetorically analyzing speeches through Kenneth Burke's frames of reference critics can recognize the rhetor's attempt to encourage or discourage acquiescence to a given social order. The strategies for employing specific frames are formed by the relationship between the rhetor's private situation and the general situation. The frames used reveal limitations imposed by a rhetor's perspective and attitudes toward open or closed dialogue. In general, the rhetoric in an acceptance frame reveals a welcoming attitude that involves a program of action and an open interpretation of human motives. The comic frame specifically provides promising means for understanding historical situations because it offers a lens to convert complex matters of existence into the public vocabulary. Frames of rejection, on the other hand, generally reveal discouraging rhetoric that devalues the opposition and therefore fails to effect social change. For both frames of acceptance and rejection, it is most important to identify language of emphasis within the discourse. When applied to the ERA-focused speeches, the frames tell the adopted systems of attitudes Phyllis Schlafly used to gauge, respond to, and ultimately make sense of functions in the social world regarding the Equal Rights Amendment.

Through Burke's frames of reference, I examine the rhetoric in Schlafly's speeches about the ERA controversy. In doing so, I explore how Schlafly operated (and operates) out of the frames of reference, lending a better understanding to the ERA debate. By examining Schlafly's speeches through the lens of Burkean frames, critics can see how acceptance toward attitudes about the status quo is encouraged or discouraged by the rhetor. Consistent with Burke's notions of framing, my analysis proceeds through four overlapping stages: (1) acknowledgement of failings within the pro-ERA argument, (2) isolation of the accessible, identifiable causes by

defining reason within the vocabulary of public grammar, (3) rhetorical cleansing toward (re)construction by naming both the friendly and unfriendly functions of the issue, and (4) encouragement to return to normalcy. My argument is that when operating out of a frame of acceptance, Schlafly points out flaws with the feminists attempt to change the status quo without overtly offending the majority of the public, thus allowing for social change. Additionally, I argue that when operating out of a frame of rejection, Schlafly discourages thoughtful reform, ultimately transcending society away from understanding the full complexities of the social issue. Examining the frames of reference employed by Schlafly is important because it reveals a telos of consensus in the ERA controversy that has rarely been analyzed. My analysis provides contextual information for making sense of the complex issue surrounding the ERA debate and feminism today.

Criticism as a Method

Criticism as a method explores and highlights the qualities that make us human. As a rhetorical device for understanding, the activity of criticism shows how humans use rhetoric to bring change in the world around us. The evaluation and analysis processes of criticism offer a better understanding of experiences and a more general concept of theory about experiences. Critics are able to improve understanding and appreciation by potentially offering new and exciting ways to view the world.⁸⁸ For the purposes of this paper, criticism seeks to enhance both my own and other's understanding of Schlafly's speeches and her rhetorical framing in ERA focused speeches.

The manner in which I engage in criticism here involves three stages of production: conceptual, communication, and counter-communication.⁸⁹ First, in the conceptual stage, I use the perspective of Burkean frames of reference to guide my analysis. Second, the communication

stage, I build on the evidence produced from my close textual readings to share propositions inclusive of valid arguments. In the third and final stage, the counter-communication stage, I offer discussion points that seek to engage dialogue about matters of importance. Generally speaking, my critical act contains three components of description, analysis, and evaluation.

Description of Speeches

Analysis of five ERA-focused speeches demonstrates the attitudes toward the social order espoused by Schlafly during and after the (successful) fight against the feminists and pro-ERA activists. The framework used in the rhetorical analysis that follows insists that frames draw attention to the ways in which rhetoric deflects and distorts hegemonic power formations, reflecting ideologies that enable and constrain collective social change. In my analysis, the frames tell the adopted systems of attitudes Schlafly used to gauge, respond to, and ultimately make the social world function regarding the ERA. As gleaned through Burkean notions of acceptance and rejection frames, I mobilize the analysis into a critique of the conditions that make Schlafly's successful rhetorical practices possible.

The five speeches were selected because they represent Schlafly's stance on the ERA before and after the ERA defeat. The Eagle Forum Archive library provided five audio recordings and transcriptions of two of those speeches. I transcribed the other audio recordings and shared the transcriptions with the Eagle Forum Archive library. Transcriptions of the speeches are used in order to focus on the complexity and consistency throughout the texts. To underline the process by which framing unfolded in Schlafly's speeches, my analysis progresses by examining the rhetoric for frames of acceptance and frames of rejection. The analysis chapters are separated in two sections, one before the ERA failed ratification in 1982, and the other after the failed ratification. Within these two sections, I reconstruct the ERA debate

chronologically, starting with the first two speeches from 1975 and 1977, and then shifting to the other three speeches from 1985, 2002, and 2007. By highlighting certain conditions, events, and character traits, a Burkean rhetorical analysis emphasizes the symbolic motives surrounding an issue. Schlafly's rhetorical framing, I contend, demonstrates how her discourse identified problems, causes, and remedies at public and political levels. Information regarding each of the five speeches is detailed below.

Speech 1

The first speech I analyze is titled "The Equal Rights Amendment." Schlafly presented it on January 1, 1975 at St. Catherine's College in St. Paul, Minnesota. The speech, followed by a Question and Answer Session with the audience, ran a total of 79 minutes. A transcription was provided to the author by the Eagle Forum Archive library.

Speech 2

The second speech in my analysis, titled "God, Family, and Country," took place at the Pro-Family Rally in Houston, Texas, on November 19, 1977. The Rally held speeches by other participants, including Elisabeth Elliot, Lottie Beth Hobbs, Nellie Gray, Steve Warren, Clay Smothers, Mildred F. Jefferson, Robert Kramer, and Robert K. Dornan. The Pro-Family Rally occurred in Houston during the same time as the International Woman's Year Conference, which was hosted by many pro-ERA advocates. The presenters' speeches combined ran for roughly 50 minutes. Schlafly's speech ran for seven minutes and 11 seconds. A transcription was completed by the author on January 14, 2015, and given to the Eagle Forum Archive library by the author.

Speech 3

The third speech I analyze, titled "The ERA—Is There A Future?," was presented to the Harvard Law School Forum on April 25, 1985 in Boston, Massachusetts. Following a brief

introduction, Schlafly's speech ran for roughly 29 minutes. A transcription was found in *Crises in American Oratory, A History of Rhetorical Inadequacy* by Todd S. Frobish, editor, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 2007.

Speech 4

The fourth speech in my analysis, titled "Twentieth Anniversary of the Defeat of the ERA – A Personal View from Phyllis's Kitchen," was presented during the Eagle Council XXXI in Washington, DC on September 20, 2002. The speech ran for roughly 85 minutes, including speaking breaks for audio and video clips. A partial transcription was provided to the author by the Eagle Forum Archive library and completed by the author on January 15, 2014.

Speech 5

The fifth and final speech I analyze is titled "Doing the Impossible: Defeating the Equal Rights Amendment." This speech took place at Dr. D. James Kennedy's Conference in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on March 2, 2007. The speech ran for roughly 43 minutes, including speaking breaks for video clips. Transcriptions were completed by the author on January 15, 2015, and given to the Eagle Forum Archive library by the author.

Potential Problems and Pitfalls

In sharing my criticism, I hope to provoke readers into meaningful discussion. However, as well-informed critics know, there are some potential problems and pitfalls expected. First, the Burkean perspective used for analysis introduces certain biases into the criticism. Ensuring consistency for generalizability is a difficult task for Burkean frames. In an effort to avoid bias and offer the most promising and strategic analysis, I deliberately sought to allow the perspective to guide my analysis by developing my own interpretation of the perspective. In doing so, I negate the potential for the perspective to dictate my analysis directly.

The second potential pitfall in my criticism is an intentionally narrow definition of rhetoric. For the purposes of my analysis, I use the following definition of rhetoric: “The strategic use of communication, oral or written, to achieve specifiable goals.”⁹⁰ This definition enables the critic to identify the strategic nature of language, as well as the goals expressed in the language. The outcome of analysis on the rhetoric in Schlafly’s ERA speeches provides greater understanding to the problems and abilities expressed in Schlafly’s motives. Using speeches as my rhetorical artifact, I allow for a closer, critical, look at how rhetoric operates to persuade and influence us.

CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS 1

Before the Equal Rights Amendment failed ratification in 1982, Schlafly was speaking out against ERA proponents in as many forums and locations as she could attend. The public platform enabled her to address the American people with a viewpoint that was not displayed in popular media. Consistent with Burke's notions of frames of reference, the following analysis proceeds with four overlapping phases: (1) acknowledgement of social flaws, (2) defining reason within the vocabulary of public grammar, (3) rhetorical cleansing toward (re)construction, and (4) invitation to return to normalcy. My argument is that when primarily operating out of a frame of acceptance, Schlafly points out flaws with the ERA without overtly offending the majority of the public, allowing for acceptance of her viewpoint and rejection of the ERA. Conversely, I argue that when primarily operating out of a frame of rejection, Schlafly discourages thoughtful reform, transcending society away from accepting a cohesive and "charitable" social system.

In the proceeding chapter, I highlight the conditions, events, and character traits presented in "The Equal Rights Amendment" (Speech 1) from 1975 and "God, Family, and Country" (Speech 2) from 1977. I offer an analysis that emphasizes the symbolic motives surrounding Schlafly's view of the ERA; her use of rhetorical framing, I contend, demonstrates how her rhetoric identified problems, causes, and remedies at both public and political levels.

Speech 1—1975

The first speech, titled "The Equal Rights Amendment,"⁹¹ began with humorous story of two men that die and go to heaven, but are first required to go through one of two doors. On the first door, it said, "Men who are dominated by their wives." The second door said, "Men who dominate their wives." Naturally, all the men wanted to line-up behind door number one. But one day, a man turned up at door number two. While in line, one of his friends called over from the

other line and said, “Say, Harry, what are doing standing in front of that door?” And Harry replied, “My wife told me I had to.” This, she argued, is one view of women.

She then stated the other view of women, which are the assumptions expressed by the women’s liberation movement. To express this view, she gave an example of a commercial put out by the National Organization for Women, where there is a picture of a little girl with the caption “This normal, healthy child was born with a handicap: it was born female.” In these brief stories, Schlafly expressed the significant role of women in opposition to men.

The contrasting nature of the two examples demonstrates Schlafly’s ability to situate the problems of the women’s liberation movement in the context of public grammar. She described both sides of society through shared rituals and common terms, such as silly anecdotes and popular public images. Consistent with the acceptance frames, specifically the comic frame, the use of humor enabled the audience to isolate the cause within the vocabulary of public grammar through easily accessible examples. By using humor to describe wives in charge of their own lives and their husbands, Schlafly set herself up to operate her view out of frame of acceptance.

On the other hand, she defined the opposition by highlighting the ambiguity of their argument. For example, she diagnosed the problem with the women’s liberation movement by stating that “somebody—it isn’t clear who; maybe God, maybe the establishment, or society, or a conspiracy of male chauvinist pigs—have dealt women a foul blow by making us female, and it is up to legislation or our constitutional amendments to remedy this terrible injustice.” This described the enemy of the women’s liberation movement as institutions that majority of people ascribe themselves to and would identify with (i.e., men, social norms, religion). She defined society through examples that contrast what it is, in her view, with what it is not.

All within the first few minutes of this speech, Schlafly named both the friendly—Schlafly’s view—and the unfriendly—women’s liberation view—visions of the issues surrounding women in “today’s [1975’s] society.” The views described specifically functioned to grab the audience’s attention, first with humor, then with identification. They also enabled her to name the characters with vocabulary that is formed by public grammar; therefore, the frames they encompass were accessible by the majority. Thus, she acknowledged the problem and sets up the frames of reference for which to push the audience’s thinking toward a particular direction.

After defining the problem and highlighting both sides, Schlafly introduced the ERA supporter’s “remedy for centuries of injustice to women”—the Equal Rights Amendment. She argued that ERA advocates give “tiresome litany of past injustices,” such as not having the right to vote, women not being able to serve on a jury, and women not being able to go to law or medical school. Schlafly offered evidence in the form of a narrative when she shared the opinion of a 93-year-old suffragette who, at the Virginia state legislative hearing, said the proponents of the ERA are “fifty years behind the times; they are fighting a battle that has been long since won.” Here, Schlafly used an example of a woman who has been fighting for women’s rights, not equal rights, to argue her claim that the ERA will do nothing for women. By sharing the story of the suffragette, she used the language of the ERA proponents to discredit them. In doing so, she argued that the problems in society that are addressed by the ERA are “simply not relevant to the world that we live in today.”

The second piece of evidence she used to discredit ERA proponents is the lack of support they had warranting their claim that women in America were not treated fairly. For example, she argued that “proponents of the [ERA] go about saying ‘Women in this country are kept in

serfdom. They are treated like cattle. They are second-class citizens. They are statistically a non-personhood.” All the examples from the ERA supporters, Schlafly argued, yielded claims of disingenuous reasoning on the pro-ERA side.

By using the language of her opposition against their own claims, Schlafly pointed out the flaws through attributes that Burke would describe as “charitable”—neither wholly euphemistic nor wholly debunking.⁹² She did not attack the failings within the status quo, but instead highlighted how ERA supporters do attack the status quo. For example, turning to the matter of education, Schlafly pointed out that under the laws of the ERA, many single-sex colleges (specifically those that receive any kind of federal funding) would be wiped out, as they would be deemed unconstitutional by discrimination on the basis on sex. Therefore, anyone interested in the “right” to attend a single-sex school would be limited in their options. She called attention to the problem by using an example that would drive her opponent away, but only temporarily. Consistent with frames of acceptance, she provided examples that prepared the audience toward open dialogue that focused on “rights” of women.

Education was not the only issue Schlafly used as an example to discuss the rights that would be taken away from women. She also spoke of the “right” the ERA would take away from the young woman of America—the constitutional “right” to be exempted from a draft. Taking this away, particularly during the time when the Vietnam War was salient in the audiences’ and publics’ minds, put society in a vulnerable position to feel unequipped for confronting the issue of the ERA.

The second right that the ERA would take away from women was “the right of the wives.” She stated, “what laws reflect as an assumption of our society is that the family is what we want for our basic unit. They also reflect the obvious fact that women have babies and men

don't have babies." Furthermore, she argued that the "marriage contract" would hurt women and no-fault divorce would become too easy. Put another way, she argued, "[I]f ERA were ratified the ones who will be hurt the most are the senior women – the women who have made being a wife and mother their full time career, and now no-fault divorce has become rather easy, and her husband can 'trade her in for a new model.'"

In these examples, Schlafly identified with status quo and explored how the ERA would disrupt and destruct social norms. She demonstrated how the ERA would enforce the cynical brutality that comes when reforming public relationships. Schlafly considered the collective property of the larger social system to further position the meanings, attitudes, and character of the ERA advocate's side. In doing so, she provided the "charitable attitude towards people that is required for purposes of persuasion and co-operation."⁹³ Without overtly offending her opponent, and instead focusing on the "rights" of women, Schlafly enabled the pro-ERA advocates to note their own foibles.

The pro-ERA advocates rejection of the status quo, on the other hand, did not provide a well-rounded frame of acceptance in Schlafly's view since they gauged the society solely unfavorably. According to Burke, such rejection is subject to convert society downward, by disruption of social order and persisting a closed system rivalry.⁹⁴ The proponent's attack on the status quo, as described by Schlafly, served as disruption of the social order. Therefore, it can be argued that the ERA proponents' attacks attitudinally divided the American people, not allowing for a well-balanced ecology capable of reform.

Schlafly further warranted her ability to confront the ERA to support her own ideals by allowing the audience to see themselves as a part of a larger system. For example, she spoke of the people who have supported the ERA "in good faith" by sharing how they, herself included,

identify with the slogan “equal pay for equal work.” However, as she pointed out, the ERA does not benefit women in the area of employment. The reasons for this, she stated, are: (1) the ERA does not apply to private industry, therefore no benefits would be in place, and (2) it would weaken and possibly reverse the effects of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 by setting up a strict enforcing mechanism to control claims of discrimination. By demonstrating how some ERA supporters were unknowingly deceived by the name of “equal rights,” Schlafly operated out of a frame of acceptance. She identified them as “unnecessarily mistaken,” instead of pure evil. As stated by Burke, “call a man a villain, and you have the choice of either attacking or cringing. Call him mistaken, and you invite yourself to attempt setting him right.”⁹⁵ Schlafly called them mistaken and urged her audience, and society at large, to correct through thoughtful action rather than tragic victimage.

Another example where Schlafly spoke to the “good faith” of ERA supporters was when describing the effects the ERA would have on protective labor legislation. In discussing this issue, Schlafly started by positioning herself within the language of pro-ERA: “Now I believe that in intellectual, professional, academic, or business pursuits, a woman can compete equally with a man because she’s just as smart.” Here, she made a claim that spoke directly to the claims made by her opposition. She allowed both sides to identify with her vocabulary, equipping them with the forces necessary to confront the issue. With the accepting vocabulary in the minds of her audiences, she then stated the other side of the coin: “But in physical labor a woman cannot compete equally with a man, and it is very unfair to her to put her in a position where the company can push her exactly like a man.” She detailed how protective labor laws mandated certain rest areas, rest periods, and sometimes more generous workers’ compensation for injuries to more parts of the body for a woman than for a man. Particularly for pregnant woman, such

laws are meaningful for the woman who does manual work. An ERA, she argued, would wipe them out; and furthermore they would not extend to men. By detailing both the effects on men and women, she brought more of society into identification with her side; an emphasis that is valuable for correcting social relationships.

Schlafly's acceptance-based rhetoric persisted as she moved through the speech. For example, she again discussed the effects on the "rights" that women would lose, such as the right to single-sex public education. When arguing how the ERA would wipe out single-sex colleges and institutions, she recognized that "most of the people of our country seem to prefer single-sex colleges." Again, she charitably acknowledged her opponents, but argued the other side well. She highlighted the legal ramifications for both pro- and anti- ERA advocates. By containing two-way attributes in her approach, Schlafly's argument managed the social forces favorably. The acceptance frame enabled her audience to return to the lesson of humility without complete rejection of social attitudes.

For the example of education, the remedy would be to maintain the status quo. When discussing the ramification ERA would have on the draft, Schlafly again argued for both sides of the debate. She detailed how under the laws of the ERA, every 18-year-old girl must register for the draft, including married women and mothers. To explain this further, she provided the example of World War II, when married men up through age 35 were drafted and put into combat. Still, Schlafly's argument offered a full exploration of the draft issue. For example, she stated that opportunities were there for "women who *do* want to join in the military." In fact, she said, a position in the military is "an honorable career, and I urge you to do it. The women in the military get the best of both worlds ... You will have the same pay, the same medics, the same fringe benefits, the same GI Bill, the same comparable benefits, but you're absolutely guaranteed

you'll never go into combat." By exploring the two-way attributes of the issue, Schlafly offered the charitable attitude necessary for understanding the full capacities of the debate.

Throughout Schlafly's rhetoric in this 1975 speech, we can see how she created an inferential leap from existing beliefs to the reinforcement of social norms. The ERA proponents, in her descriptions, regulated the uncertainty of issues, diminishing the opportunity for discussion and social revision. On the other hand, Schlafly confronted the total situation by speaking in the vocabulary of public grammar, identifying with the majority and her opponents, and offering a willingness to risk confrontation with the opposition. The corrective features of her speech demonstrated how she equipped the audience to gauge the full range of the issues about the ERA.

Speech 2—1977

As the 1979 deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment approached, feminists and pro-ERA advocates mobilized together at a national conference in Houston, Texas, for a rally called the International Women's Year Conference. Many of the most well known feminists, like Betty Freidan, Gloria Steinem, and three first ladies, including Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Ford, and Mrs. Johnson, were in attendance at the IWY Conference. Recognizing the media attention that was given to the feminists at this time, Schlafly staged her own opposing rally in Houston, bringing tens of thousands of conservative delegates to the Pro-Family Rally, titled "God, Family, and Country."⁹⁶ Along with eight other speakers, Schlafly spoke at this conference, specifically focusing on the ERA debate.

In this speech, Schlafly began by welcoming her "dear friends." She immediately pointed to the dueling rally, stating, "there are many differences between *this* meeting and the one in that other hall today." The first difference she noted was the religious undertone that supported her

meeting and not the other. With an understanding that she was speaking to a predominately religious group, Schlafly built her platform for this speech by linking fear and shame to the IWY meeting. At that meeting, for example, they “did not offer a prayer, but instead offered a moment of silence to begin their conference for fear they would offend some people.” She went on to state how she is very proud that they excluded her from the other convention, and that she is “not ashamed and not afraid” to ask God’s blessing.

Through religion, she was able to identify with her audience, a majority of whom came from Christian-based faith groups, and invited them to listen on with familiarity. She encouraged her audience to see themselves as a noble community.⁹⁷ By noting that she was not ashamed and not afraid, Schlafly positioned her speech with positive and relatable symbolic attributes. At the same time, she positioned the “other rally” as exclusive and negative for rejecting her from attending, thus defining them as a closed system.

After thanking the crowd for being there, Schlafly talked more about the main resolution adopted by the Commission on International Women’s Year—ratification of the ERA. She claimed that they spent taxpayer’s money to stage state and national conferences as media events in order to “pass resolutions that were pre-written and pre-packaged a year and half ago and published in June of 1976.” The media hype, she claimed, was “designed to convince Congress that their proposed resolution is what American women want.” However, she noted, “by coming here today, you have shown that this is *not* what American women want.”

Before Schlafly capitalized on the maximum opportunity for social critique built through her rhetorical framing, she offered specific evidence to support her claims. First, she cited a study from Drake Law School that concluded if the ERA were to ratify, the government would adopt “a wildly permissive role, which would have the effect of driving the homemaker out of

the home.” She argued how laws that support the institution of the family, such as laws that give the wife her “legal right to be in the home” would be made unconstitutional under ERA. Using the strategy of repetition to emphasize her point, Schlafly stated that “some people *do* want this,” they “*do want* to take the wife out of the home,” and “they *do want* to get them in the workforce.” Such an amendment, she argued, would “greatly increase the taxes and the bureaucracy of the federal government.” Why would anyone, she asked, want to give the government more power when it can’t solve society’s current problems?

In this final section of the speech, Schlafly pointed out how everyone is exposed to situations in which he or she must recognize their blindness. For example, the ERA would force women out of the home, even if that were not what they wanted. Schlafly continued by naming the goals of the International Women’s Year as radical and not what the American women want. Since she built the speech’s frame on religious identification, the audience could easily accept the rejection of anti-religious causes. By naming the taxpayers, Schlafly prepared the audience to act against a cause that rejects them (and the majority of society). Using the government as the group that represents the force acting against them, she invited the audience to interpret the ERA as a problem in need of social correction. Finally, she closed with a call to action to correct the social problem—stop the ratification before the 1979 deadline.

Schlafly’s derisive acknowledgment of flaws in the ERA enabled her to place the issues within public grammar. Her use of identification with both her supporters and opponents allowed for a sense of community through charitable language. Consistent with Burke’s frames of acceptance, the audience was able to interpret the full complexities of the ERA and take action toward the most logical and critical stance of reason. The rhetorical artistry of acceptance-based

frames enabled the audience to develop good faith in members who see themselves as part of a larger social system.

CHAPTER 5. ANALYSIS 2

On June 30, 1982, after a three-year extension, the Equal Rights Amendment failed ratification for the second and final time. Since that final burial, Phyllis Schlafly continues to be an outspoken advocate of the conservative movement for more than 42 years. In this chapter I examine the conditions, events, and character traits in Schlafly's post-ERA speeches, highlighting key themes from transcriptions of three speeches: "The ERA—Is There A Future?" (Speech 3) from 1985, "Twentieth Anniversary of the Defeat of the ERA – A Personal View from Phyllis's Kitchen" (Speech 4) from 2002, and "Doing the Impossible: Defeating the Equal Rights Amendment" (Speech 5) from 2007. Continuing in the same vein as the previous chapter, I offer an analysis that demonstrates the motivations for Schlafly to recount her campaign in opposition to the ERA. In doing so, I show how after the ERA failed ratification in 1982, Schlafly's rhetorical focus shifts from frames of charitable acceptance to less positive frames that often stress the "no" (pro-ERA) more strongly than the "yes" (anti-ERA).

Speech 3—1984

"The ERA—Is There a Future?"⁹⁸ was presented to the Harvard Law School Forum on April 25, 1985. In her 29-minute address, Schlafly recounted the history of the ERA and celebrated its many defeats and struggles. The speech began when Schlafly expressed nostalgia for visiting Harvard exactly 40 years after she was at Radcliffe as a student. She then described her past experiences by stating, "I was in the first class where women were not required to wear hats when they walked across the Harvard yard. That was a great break from previous traditions." She also expressed gratitude for Harvard law school, from which her husband graduated, as a place that respects tolerance and academic inquiry. Within the first minutes of the speech, Schlafly sought to identify with her audience by integrated place with cultural affinity.

By sharing the example of wearing hats as an outdated tradition, Schlafly expressed familiarity for understanding outdated traditions—a rhetorical tactic that would enable her to share understanding for non-outdated traditions later in the speech. The personal motives for the speech, she continued, were to talk about the Constitutional issue that had been “debated very vigorously” in the United States for the last 12 years. Although there were years of debate and discussion, Schlafly argued that with the exception of the *Phyllis Schlafly Report* and a 1971 article in the *Harvard Civil Liberty Civil Rights Law Review*, the issue of the ERA had not been critically addressed in modern times; in fact, the scholarly journals, news media, and the press was completely frozen with sharing only one side—the pro-ERA side. As such, Schlafly proclaimed her call to action, to ensure the ERA is fully discussed in regards to its “fantastic effect and significance in the distribution of power in our country, in the military, in the marital contract, and in state and federal relations.”

At this point in the speech, Schlafly described a brief history of the ERA, starting with its birth in 1923 with the Women’s Suffrage Amendment. Next, Schlafly spoke of the March 27, 1972 date when it passed 30 of the 38 total legislatures that are needed for ratification. She discussed the ERA’s three-year extension, which extended the seven-year deadline until June 30, 1982. Schlafly argued that in the final three years, ERA advocates demonstrated “a sort of three-ring circus as they attempted to push it through the legislature” in Illinois. For example, she detailed how on the first floor, there were hunger strikes. On the third floor, there was a chain gang of individuals who chained themselves to the door of the governor’s office. One day, she said, they came in with a plastic sack of pig’s blood and wrote with it all over the marble floors. Finally, she contended that “well, they didn’t get it and it [the ERA] died on June 30, 1982.”

By sharing the extreme examples of pro-ERA advocates, Schlafly built her frame on the necessity of *deposing* the opposition, shunting the speech into a negative emphasis. Schlafly exposed the pro-ERA advocates limitations by highlighting the radical past behaviors. Consistent with Burke's frame of rejection, she emphasized the absurdities in the opponents, deliberately suppressing any consideration of justifying circumstances that would put the opponent in better light. According to Burke, frames of reference "equip us for confronting given and personal situations." Schlafly equipped her audience to confront the situation without the corrective features of an acceptance-based frame. The polemic, negativistic rhetoric stylistically placed the emphasis upon the partiality of rejection rather than the completeness of acceptance. In her recount, the member's responsibility to the larger ecosystem was lacking. Such rhetorical framing limited her ability to teach, please, and bend the audience; thus, inhibiting her ability for increased recognition.

After discussing the clear defeat, Schlafly spoke of the key issues surrounding the ERA debate. First, she discussed the issue of the draft, which was at the very core matter of the ERA. All of the advocates, she argued, admitted that under the laws of the ERA women would be constitutionally required to be drafted equally with men if our country had another draft. Second, she discussed the area of abortion and the effect of abortion on federal taxpayer funding. In effort to simplify the pro-ERA advocates legal argument, Schlafly described their argument as "really simple: an abortion is a surgical procedure performed only on women. Therefore, if you deny tax funds for a medical procedure performed only on women, you have discriminated on account of sex within the meaning of the Equal Rights Amendment." This, she argued, established a clear connection between ERA and abortion funding.

The next key issue she described was the connection between ERA and “gay rights.” She argued that if law must be undiscriminating in regard to sex, the outlawing of same-sex marriages would become invalid. Before moving on to her fourth key issue, the connection between ERA and veterans, Schlafly reminded the audience “this is an area that I’ve been talking about for many years, but was pretty much ignored in the good bit of debate.” According to Schlafly, the pro-ERA advocates argued that since 98 percent of veterans are male, it is sex discriminatory within the meaning of the ERA to have veteran’s preference. When describing this issue, she invited the audience to lay historical blame as a way of “absolving them from some unavowed sense of guilt.”⁹⁹ However, consistent with rejection-based frames, the focus continued to emphasize the unfavorable consequences.

Following the issue between the ERA and veterans, Schlafly discussed a “very large area,” or what the ERA would do to schools. Under ERA, she argued, Title IX would be wiped of all its exceptions, such as discrimination in single-sex schools and colleges. Additionally, she argued that under ERA, there will be a loss of tax exemptions for “all the thousands of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish schools in this country that operated by parent religious bodies that do not ordain women.” By detailing the key issues of the draft, abortion, gay rights, veterans, and schools, Schlafly attempted to build themes of generically human elements. That is, she touched on key issues of values, attitudes, and beliefs of the larger society.

By the end of the speech, Schlafly slightly shifted focus to a more acceptance-based frame of reference. First, she recognized the lack of well-rounded viewpoints in her opponents. For example, before concluding the speech, she reminded the audience that the sensitive, powerful issues that are important to people have not been fully answered by the ERA advocates. She centered more attention on the “culturally dispossessed” consequences of the ERA for the

society at large by presenting a voice of reason that checks claims made against society. The ERA, she argued, “has a past, but it doesn’t have any future. And those casebooks of yours which prematurely included it will have to take it out in the next edition.”

As Burke contended, since all aspects of social living tend to become tied together by symbolic bridges, each portion must involve the whole. By emphasizing the negative attributes of her opponents, Schlafly attitudinally divided her audience between the accuracy of the situation and her personal motives. Her strategic language choice served to motivate her audience, but the emphasis on the unfavorable consequences limited the opportunity for open discussion and devalued the opposition. Toward the end of the speech, however, Schlafly shifted focus to include the full range of human potentialities, thus enabling her audience to effectively cope with their understanding. Without consistency in providing the resources of acceptance-focused ambivalence, Schlafly’s ability to urge society to correct through thoughtful action, such as editing contemporary textbooks and recounting the ERA debate more accurately, was limited.

Speech 4—2002

Similar to Speech 3 from 1984, Schlafly began her 2002 speech, titled “Twentieth Anniversary of the Defeat of ERA – A Personal View from Phyllis’s Kitchen,”¹⁰⁰ by proclaiming the importance of knowing the history of the ERA. It is important to know the “full” history of the ERA, she argued, “so you can explain it to the next generation” who “were born too late to know about ERA.” It is up to the Eagle Forum members to teach the “truth,” she argued, because social studies textbooks and libraries that reference the ERA are “filled with dozens of books by bitter feminists, while anti-feminists books are censored out.” Before previewing the main topics in her speech, Schlafly declared her goal and the goal for the audience: “To make sure that the true history is recorded and told to young people.”

Unlike the first and second speeches from before the failed ratification, Schlafly set-up the third and fourth speeches by building a frame to accept the necessity of overthrowing the current status quo regarding the discussions about the ERA debate. She identified with the audience, fellow Eagle Forum members, by stating that they were a part of a movement that “stood like the Rock of Gibraltar against ERA’s massive attack on traditional values, on life, on marriage, on the family, and on the Constitution.” With her audience motivated through identification, she emphasized the inherent value of the new generation’s “right” to consume the full reality of the ERA debate. In this sense, she valued the necessity for corrective behaviors. However, without gauging the full situation or offering an isolated, relatable definition other than “bitter feminists,” she threw the emphasis stylistically upon the partiality of rejection rather than the completeness of acceptance.

Within the constraints of a rejection frame, Schlafly discussed how she first got involved with the ERA debate. In December of 1971, she received a phone call asking her to debate the ERA, which at the time she knew nothing about. After quickly determining what side she would be on, she set off to her first debate. Following the debate, she published her February 1972 *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, titled “What’s Wrong with Equal Rights for Women?” On March 22, 1972, Congress passed the ERA. Schlafly then shared video clips of news reporters describing the ERA as an amendment that would “guarantee equal rights for women,” which point of view she discredited by sharing how the ERA does not mention women, but instead “sex.”

Schlafly’s speech continued by describing her experiences as the “first national frontal attack on the then-apparently-popular Women’s Liberation Movement.” She highlighted how after appearing on Phil Donohue’s show, she received thousands of letters from women all over the country who were waiting for someone to “refute the feminists.” She described an interview

with Barbara Walters who ended the interview by trying to shut Schlafly up with her hands. Quickly after these initial interviews, Schlafly said she realized a more strategic effort and team were needed. As the logical next step, she mobilized the STOP ERA team of women.

Schlafly shared archived video footage from old debates and news reports as a way to build credibility to her claims. However, the videos only showcased one side, Schlafly's side, of the argument. Put in Burkean terms, Schlafly "deliberately suppressed any consideration of mitigating circumstances" that would put her opponent in better light.¹⁰¹ Also, the videos did not support claims that Schlafly made regarding the censorship of anti-feminist views in contemporary textbooks, which was her main goal of the speech. Although this may be a valid argument, her historical account(s) does not lend credibility for the claim, nor offer the charitable attributes necessary for correction. Without offering the audience both sides of the debate, Schlafly did not provide the "maximum consciousness" that occurs in frames of acceptance. Thus, she lacked awareness of personal responsibility to invite the audience toward the opportunity for (re)construction.

Schlafly moved through the speech chronologically, next by describing 1973, when she made her way through state capitols to testify at hearings: "What I did at those hearings was to lay down the strategy of how ERA should be debated. I argued that ERA was a fraud; it would give no benefits to women, but would instead take away legal rights that women then possessed, such as the right of an eighteen-year-old girl to be exempt from the military draft, and the right of a wife to be supported by her husband." Another document Schlafly and her team used was *Revolution: Tomorrow is Now*, a publication of the NOW. "We told people to be sure and read both sides of the issue," she joked.

On the other hand, Schlafly argued that the ERA advocates could not show any benefits to women, “so they spent most of their time attacking me.” For example, she described how Betty Freidan once told her “she’d like to ‘burn me at the stake’ ... among other things that are too indecent to tell in mixed company.” She also described her tactics for debating the ERA. “We never criticized our opponents, but stuck strictly to the legal arguments.” She described another tactic, “which the feminists would later call our ‘dirty trick.’ We decided to take a loaf of homemade bread to every one of our two hundred, thirty-six Illinois state legislators.” She then gave the example of one Chicago representative who responded to a note she wrote, saying that he had not received any bread, and wanted banana bread. So, Schlafly took him banana bread. Then, she claimed, “he was a young bachelor who didn’t care one way or the other about ERA, but he supported us ever after.” As seen here, some of Schlafly’s stories about the ERA debate did highlight both the favorable factors and the unfavorable consequences. The perspective revealed how Schlafly poked fun at the flaws in the system, the pro-ERA side, and the actors who uphold it, the ERA proponents.

Continuing chronologically from 1975 to 1982, Schlafly detailed her visits to state legislative hearings. She spoke of nearly every state and where each stood on the ERA debate. When moving through the years, Schlafly spent particular time describing 1977: “In the fall of 1977,” Schlafly said, “our cause looked hopeless.” The year 1977 was also the year of the International Women’s Year (IWY) Convention in Houston. The IWY Convention opened with Bella Abzug as chairman and three First Ladies on the platform, including Rosalynn Carter, Betty Ford, and Lady Bird Johnson. “Three thousand media people were on hand to give them massive publicity, with wall-to-wall television coverage for their hot button issues: ERA, abortion, and gay rights,” Schlafly said. After describing the IWY Convention, Schlafly showed

more archived video clips from the convention of pro-ERA advocates speaking to those hot button issues. The IWY, Schlafly contended, “was the turning point in the battle over ERA” because “we had the proof that the ERA agenda includes tax-funded abortions and gay rights.”

For the rest of the speech, Schlafly moved year-to-year, describing the extension in 1979, a meeting with Ronald Regan, corruption from the feminists in 1980, and major court cases (such as *Roster v. Goldberg*) in 1981. “When 1982 opened,” Schlafly said, “everybody sensed we were running the last lap of the race.” When describing from January 19 through June 30, Schlafly spoke about the radical feminist tactics, including a hunger strike on the first floor of the Senate and writing on the Capitol’s marble floors with pig’s blood the name of legislators. Before ending the speech, Schlafly showed a video clip from the celebratory STOP ERA gathering, “The End of an Era,” on June 30, 1982. In the clip Schlafly said, “We have the people with the strength of character, and this battle we have waged has proved it. Thank you for being here.” Schlafly ended Speech 4 by transitioning into an introduction of a repeat performance of the same songs she closed with on that June 30 meeting.

In terms of Burke’s frames of reference, Schlafly’s language choice to describe the debate revealed both acceptance and rejection focused rhetoric. In the examples where she shared personal stories, Schlafly named both the friendly and unfriendly functions of the situation, thus operating from a frame of acceptance. However, when describing the radical feminist tactics, she selectively shared the external behaviors that best emphasize the absurdities in the opponents, thus operating out of a frame of rejection. According to Burke, a well-balanced ecology requires the symbiosis of both “service” or charitable attributes, and “spoils” or critical self-reflection. Excluding insight of the “service” toward her opponents made the audience’s task of seeking greater wisdom on the full complexities of the debate more difficult.

When compared to speeches before 1982, little evidence for contemporary claims of confrontation about the ERA debate was provided. Without an opportunity for correction, Schlafly's ability to persuasively incite a better social understanding of values, attitudes, and beliefs was limited. According to Burke, when functions of relationships are deemed unfriendly, the audience will "weigh objective resistances against [its] own resources, to decide how far he can effectively go in combating them."¹⁰² Implicit in these attitudes are the cues of behavior. In order to teach contemporary society of the radical nature behind the feminists in the ERA debate, it is important to frame them as "unnecessarily mistaken." According to Burke, the frames of acceptance would enable audiences to correct the opponents through "thoughtful action rather than tragic victimage," ultimately greater convincing society at large to provide more accurate historical accounts.

Speech 5—2007

In 2007, Schlafly presented the fifth speech, titled "Doing the Impossible: Defeating the Equal Rights Amendment."¹⁰³ She began by referencing the 25-year celebration since the final burial, and similar to Speech 4, she shared background information about the ERA. "The ERA was passionately debated across America from 1972 to 1982. And then, the ERA was rejected by the American people." The biggest lesson learned, she argued, was that in the process of self-government, it was possible for the people to defeat the political and media establishment. "And to win despite incredible odds," she said. As shown through the opening of her speech, Schlafly encouraged the audience to see themselves as noble, so they can draw on history to justify their win against the feminists.

After describing how the ERA passed Congress with only 23 out of 435 members of the House voting no, she then asked a fairly plausible question. "ERA has such a righteous name.

Who could possibly oppose equal rights?" she said. She then showed archived videos of news clips stating how President Richard Nixon and other prominent political powers supported the passage of the ERA. She also described how "pushy women's organizations, a consortium of 33 women's magazines, numerous Hollywood celebrities, and 99 percent of the media" also supported the ERA. However, there was a "a band of unflappable STOP ERA ladies in red" sent out to challenge "all the big guns of modern politics." And those STOP ERA ladies, she argued, were facing an extraordinary challenge, since there was no "friendly TV, radio, or talk show host. Everyone was hostile. There was no Rush Limbaugh talking about the feminazis. ... From the get go, we had to fight the semantics and the momentum."

Next in the speech, Schlafly moved on to talk about the most fundamental problem with the ERA. "Now ERA does not mention women," she said. "ERA calls for equality of rights on account of *sex*. Yet all of the reporters consistently called the ERA the equal rights for *women* amendment. Something to give *women* equal rights." The evidence provided for this claim was again in the form of archived news clips that described "the overwhelming vote" that passed the proposed amendment. Following the news clip, she described the beginning of the STOP ERA campaign. "We only had the telephone and the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*," she said. Over the ten years, she said, she wrote about 100 issues of the newsletter about ERA, specifically about the legal rights that women would lose if ERA were to ratify. That strategic decision, she said, "forced the feminists to spend their time attacking *me* and trying to answer the arguments in my newsletter." Schlafly then claimed that her STOP ERA group and the newsletters showed that ERA was a fraud.

The first reason it was a fraud, she argued, was that there was no benefit to women in employment laws, since they were already "sex neutral." Second, she claimed that the

Constitution only mentioned “sex neutral words, such as we the people, person, citizen, Senator, and President,” therefore adding women would be obsolete. Third, she mentioned how the ERA would give power to the federal courts to define the words “sex” and “equality of rights.” More specifically, she mentioned that Section 2 of ERA would give vast new powers for all the laws that treat men and women differently on account of sex, including marriage, property, divorce, alimony, adoptions, abortion, homosexual laws, sex crimes, private and public schools, boy and girl scouts, prison regulations, and insurance.

In the examples above, Schlafly asserted the responsive chords that would be presented if the ERA were to be ratified. Schlafly did not, however, address the status quo or the charitable attributes of the opponent, which weakened her otherwise strong argument. For example, her argument could have been more effective if she related the issues surrounding the ERA to modern issues, such as the lack of critical scholarship or the censorship of anti-feminist ideals in social studies textbooks. The forced separation depicted the lack of opportunity for unity in society. Given this speech was delivered in 2007, it would have been beneficial to address the current societal view, and offered more sophisticated explanations. Schlafly instead separated herself and the audience from the opposition, forcing unrealistic comparisons, such as the draft argument, which is not relatable to many younger, contemporary women who have not witnessed the draft personally. As mentioned earlier, less than 25 percent of women identify with the feminist label, thus giving Schlafly the potential for an opportunity to advance her ideals to a new generation.

The judgments made by Schlafly demonstrate how she offered listeners the opportunity to incorporate her conceptualization into their understanding of the ERA debate. Schlafly suggested the challenges her group faced, specifically with the media against her, but did not

acknowledge any personal foibles in defeating the “actively supported” ERA. Without a critical self-reflection, the coverage of the history focused solely on rejecting the feminists. With the problem defined, Schlafly sought to diagnose the causes and make moral judgments, but never suggested reasonable remedies.

Before moving through the ten-year debate, Schlafly briefly described the women’s liberation movement, which was then led by Gloria Steinem and Betty Freidan. The movement, Schlafly argued, was at the “peak of its influence and enjoyed unparalleled access to the media.” She also mentioned Friedan’s book, *The Feminine Mystique*, describing how it “whined about the alleged sad state of feminine wives.” Then, Schlafly claimed that her book, *Feminist Fantasies*, “is a wonderful refutation of feminist nonsense” and should be “used in these women studies courses as an antidote to all those tiresome tirades by the feminist.”

After pitching her book, Schlafly shifted to talk about the early 1970s, when she engaged the feminists in debate whenever possible, starting with the Phil Donahue show. She showed an archived clip from the show as well. She also described a debate against Betty Freidan in 1973 at Illinois State University, where Friedan famously said “she’d like to burn me at the stake.” She then described a debate on *The Tomorrow Show* with Tom Snyder, who made an effort to stage a TV debate with two couples facing off against each other. However, according to Schlafly, “he had a terribly hard time finding any ERA advocate who had a husband,” but he did find one and so they debated. Schlafly then showed another archived clip from that debate. She recapped the video clip by stating, “take a good look at her. After the debate, she left her husband and left to live with her lesbian girlfriend.”

Similarly to Speech 4, Schlafly detailed her debates with prominent feminists during the ERA battle. However, by Speech 5, she defined the two sides each as closed system

communities, even though there were still other society members in need of reconstruction. For example, in earlier speeches, she mentioned the “burn me at the stake” quote, but then followed up with “since Freidan is not dumb, I assume her purpose was to taunt me into saying something stupid.” By acknowledging a charitable attribute of Freidan, Schlafly attempted to offer reconciliation, although not as charitably as she could have. However, in Speech 5, she simply moved on from the Freidan quote to share another problem with the opponents.

Progressing chronologically, Schlafly listed all 41 capitols that she testified at from 1972 to 1975. Next, she detailed the different tactics that the STOP ERA women used. Each claim was given evidence in the form of an archived video clip. First, she spoke of the draft, which was “one of our best arguments in the early years because we were just coming out of the Vietnam War.” Second, she described how “feminists were usually belligerent towards the legislators, whereas we were always ladies.” She spoke of the Valentines and Easter cards and described the homemade bread the STOP ERA women made for the legislators. “Of course,” she added, “most feminists were not capable of baking a loaf of bread.”

Schlafly then spoke of 1976, when she led a group of women to picket the White House to protest Betty Ford for lobbying for the ERA. The next year, in 1977, she picketed again, but this time to protest Rosalynn Carter for lobbying for ERA. Schlafly then described her STOP ERA rally in Springfield, Illinois in 1976, and how they did not have “one single big political name at our rally, but that rally, nevertheless, morphed our STOP ERA committee into the nucleus of the mighty pro-family movement that is so powerful today.”

The historical accounts Schlafly offered in Speech 5 were accounts she had shared in previous speeches. The bread baking for legislators, for example, was also mentioned in other speeches. However, in this speech, she also added “most feminists were not capable of baking a

loaf of bread.” In doing so, she further rejected the opponents, shifting away from the issue at hand. Instead of charitably addressing multiple frames of motives, Schlafly constructed the ERA debate in the vocabulary of only her advocates. Therefore, a rhetorical cleansing toward reconstruction would not be possible.

Schlafly also described the pro-ERA tactics in her speech. First, she spoke of a pro-ERA rally in 1976, where ERA advocates “showed their ranks were filled with lesbians, abortion activists, socialist workers and party members, radicals of all kinds, and other unkempt persons.” Other pro-ERA tactics she described included hiring “a professional pie thrower,” who hit Schlafly in the face at the National Republican Club. The next big campaign strategy she described was the IWY Convention in 1977 in Houston, Texas. Again, Schlafly shared archived video clips from the rally. She also shared “the most popular buttons” worn at the conference, including ones that said, “a woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle,” and “Mother Nature is a lesbian.”

Similar to Speech 4, she claimed that the IWY Convention and her counter-convention in 1977 was the turning point for public opinion on the ERA. With the end of the ERA debate approaching, Schlafly said that by 1979 “we gave life to the conservative movement and taught conservatives the lesson that it is really possible to win political battles.” Among the tremendous victories was electing Ronald Reagan as President. She described the extension period of the ERA, from 1979 to 1982, as a period when the “ERAers” staged huge media events. She also described how during the extension, President Jimmy Carter was “promising dams, roads, and bridges in their districts if they [Democratic legislators] would vote yes” on the ERA. She even mentioned “cash bribes” that one feminist was eventually convicted of offering a legislator.

Moving through the extension years, Schlafly spoke of the specific states that defeated ERA for the last time. When describing these states, she mentioned the pro-ERA tactics for each one. For example, on June 4 in North Carolina, “the disgruntled pro-ERAsers sent disgusting bags of chicken manure to the 23 Senators who voted no.” Next, she spoke of the hunger strikes and “chain-gang” at the door of the Senate chambers. Finally, she described when ERA supporters “went to the slaughterhouse and bought plastic bags of pig’s blood” and wrote on the floors the names of the legislators they hated the most. After each of the pro-ERA tactics, she included an archived video clip or photographs of the events as evidence.

Schlafly then described how on June 30, 1982, “fifteen-hundred battle-weary, but triumphant STOP ERA volunteers gathered ... to celebrate our second and final burial of ERA at midnight.” Among the crowd, Schlafly said, was President Reagan. However, the heroes of the day, she said, “were the women who came from the 15 states and never ratified ERA, plus the five states that bravely rescinded their previous ratification.” Before concluding Speech 5, Schlafly shared another archived video clip from the June 30 STOP ERA gathering, where she spoke to the strength of character and God for defeating the ERA. After the final video clip, Schlafly concluded Speech 5. “The evening closed,” she said, “with singing the impossible dream. We had truly won an impossible battle and defeating the unbeatable fold.”

Schlafly ended the final speech by recounting the exact events of STOP ERA group’s night. She built community among her audiences and encouraged them to see themselves as noble. However, through Burke’s frames of reference, we can see that she does not prepare them well for further sacrifices. Without defining reason in the vocabulary of public grammar, or in this case contemporary grammar with updated examples, Schlafly discouraged thoughtful discussion. Since the opponents were never seen as charitable, she did not encourage reform for

the entire society, thus her goal to change the discussions around the ERA debate is likely to be rejected.

Analysis of Schlafly's ERA-focused speeches demonstrates how she adapted her rhetoric to meet the exigency of her situation. Since much reconstruction and greater definitions of the feminist movement is still needed, the frames of rejection in speeches after 1982 lack the opportunity for today's society to seek greater wisdom on the ERA debate. Schlafly's viewpoint offers a unique contribution that is rarely discussed in contemporary literature and popular culture. Consistent with Burke's framing notions, Schlafly's power as a leader and rhetorician enables her to shape our relations with our fellows and the current social structure. However, because the contemporary speeches often operate under a persistence of the ERA rivalry, her unique contribution toward feminism is undermined.

CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The goals of this thesis were to provide greater insight into an understanding and appreciation about Phyllis Schlafly's arguments and the Equal Rights Amendment debate for both theoretical and practical purposes. Operating under a model of description, analysis, and evaluation, I first examined the ERA debate, Schlafly's STOP ERA campaign, and Schlafly's political trajectory. Second, I revealed the necessity for a critical analysis in contemporary scholarship about the ERA debate and identified the utility of using Burke's frames of reference as an insightful perspective. Finally, using criticism as my method, I analyzed five of Schlafly's ERA-focused speeches, moving chronologically from 1975-2007. In an effort to conceptualize my findings, in the following chapter I discuss my contributions and offer a number of conclusions that lead to opportunities for further inquiry.

Summary of Analysis 1

Before the failed ratification of the ERA in 1982, Schlafly utilized the public platform to speak out against the ERA and address the American people on the issues within it. The first two speeches analyzed, from 1975 and 1977 consecutively, demonstrate how Schlafly viewed the ERA before her victory. The rhetorical frames identified tell the adopted systems of attitudes from which Schlafly used to gauge, respond to, and suggest remedies regarding the public's stance on the ERA. As gleaned from my analysis, I argue that before her victory in 1982, Schlafly primarily operated out of frames of acceptance. Such charitable frames enabled her to successfully encourage thoughtful (re)construction of the social problems within the ERA, and persuade the public to reconsider their stance.

The major themes of acceptance emphasized in the first two speeches lend a better understanding into the effectively persuasive strategies employed by Schlafly. Consistent with acceptance-based frames, Schlafly pointed out flaws within the ERA advocates' arguments by placing the issues within the vocabulary of public grammar, offering maximum consciousness of both sides. Additionally, she maintained good faith in her opponent's ability to correct through thoughtful action. For example, she opened both speeches by defining her supporters as noble, and in contrast with the pro-ERA audiences, who were mistaken. The use of humor and identification allowed the speech to function through a frame of acceptance with charitable language.

Schlafly operated out of a frame of acceptance in the first two speeches through the vocabulary she used to describe the pro- and anti- ERA advocates. When describing her view of the ERA, the enemy of the pro-ERA side by association, she would often include prominent groups that a majority of the public ascribes to, such as wives, husbands, and religious persons. In doing so, she defined her viewpoint without overtly offending a majority of the public. At the same time, she defined the enemy of the pro-ERA side with characteristics that would offend the majority. Unlike her opponents, Schlafly did not attack the failings within the status quo, but instead called attention to the problems most in need of social reconstruction. In this sense, Schlafly placed the issues within the vocabulary of public grammar, enabling her audiences to fully reflect on the issues of the ERA.

Schlafly's use of public grammar also allowed for a greater sense of community through charitable language. Her descriptions of the ERA supporters were often taken directly from the pro-ERA language, and she would often use the language of the ERA proponents to discredit them. For example, she shared stories of suffragettes and other women, and continually spoke of

the “rights” that would be taken away from women. By framing the problems in the language of the opponent, she called attention to the disingenuous reasoning on the pro-ERA side by quoting directly what they have said regarding the issues at hand. The use of sharing both sides of the debate enabled Schlafly to offer her audience “maximum consciousness,” or a full understanding of the issues.

The final theme of acceptance in Schlafly’s first two speeches was the way she spoke of the people who have supported the ERA in good faith. For example, she shared how many people, including herself, may have identified with the slogan “equal pay for equal work.” However, as she argued, the word “equal” was used with equivocation in regards to the Equal Rights Amendment. By emphasizing how some of the public, including herself, were unknowingly deceived by the name of “equal rights,” Schlafly identified the public as “unnecessarily mistaken.” As garnered in Burke’s frames of acceptance, calling the public mistaken instead of evil enabled Schlafly to urge her audience, and society at large, to correct its mistakes, or in this case change its stance on the ERA.

In the first analysis chapter, I demonstrated how Schlafly (unknowingly) operated primarily out of frames of acceptance. Schlafly’s use of vocabulary within the public grammar and within her opponent’s language allowed her to offer maximum consciousness and open a dialogue for social reconstruction. Consistent with Burke’s frames of acceptance, the audience was then able to interpret the full complexities of the ERA and take action toward the most logical and critical stance of reason. The rhetorical artistry of acceptance-based frames enabled the audience to develop good faith in members who see themselves as part of a larger social system. Therefore, I argue that in the first two speeches, Schlafly charitably positioned her viewpoint with a most promising means for persuasion and social reform.

Summary of Analysis 2

Building from the charitable disposition gleaned in Schlafly's speeches before the failed ratification of 1982, my second analysis chapter identified Schlafly's motivations to recount the ERA debate after it was successfully defeated. Through analysis of three speeches, from 1984, 2002, and 2007, consecutively, I show how Schlafly's rhetorical framing shifted emphasis from the positive onto the negative, thus sliding primarily into frames of rejection. However, it is important to note that Schlafly did not solely operate through frames of rejection, but instead built her frame primarily on deposing the opposition, shunting the speech into a negative emphasis with occasional positive attributes. That is, she framed the speech with some charitable attributes, but not always with the full completeness of acceptance.

The major themes of rejection identified in my analysis of the speeches following the failed ERA ratification include emphasizing radical past behaviors, operating from a polemic, negativistic rhetoric, and lacking full consideration of the opponent's viewpoint. As demonstrated through Burke's frames of reference, Schlafly's language choices to detail the debate revealed both acceptance and rejection focused frames. However, by neglecting to offer the full complexities of the issue, Schlafly's speeches lacked critical self-reflection and opportunity for thoughtful reform. Since all three speeches called for a reconstruction of how the ERA debate should be described in contemporary scholarship, the frames of rejection do Schlafly a disservice in successfully persuading her audience.

The most evident frame of rejection in the three speeches after the 1982 deadline is Schlafly's description of her opponent as inherently radical. For example, in all three speeches, she detailed the time ERA supporters wrote the names of legislators on the floors of the capitol building in pig's blood. By sharing examples of the radical behaviors of the pro-ERA advocates,

Schlafly emphasized the absurdities of the opponent. Without offering context or describing both sides of the issues at hand, she deliberately suppressed any consideration for charitable recognition. By doing so, she equipped her audience to confront the given situation without the completeness of both sides of the issue.

By highlighting old stories through archived news video clips, Schlafly further emphasized a polemic, negativistic rhetorical frame. The majority of history shared emphasized unfavorable factors espoused by her opponents. For example, in the fourth and fifth speeches, Schlafly described the time Betty Freidan famously told her she'd like to "burn [her] at the stake." In a more charitable effort, speech four included a charitable attribute after by stating how "Freidan is not dumb." In the sense of speech four, Freidan is "unnecessarily mistaken." However, by speech five, Schlafly quickly moves on without greater context, thus not offering the charitable attributes necessary for frames of acceptance. In the last three speeches, the views of Schlafly's opponents that she provided operated through one-way, polemic rhetoric. Consistent with Burke's notions of frames of reference, Schlafly's rhetoric from after the 1982 failed ratification operated primarily under a persistent negative emphasis about the ERA rivalry.

Theoretical Implications

One major contribution of my thesis is an adaptation of Burke's notions of frames of reference as a promising perspective for rhetorical criticism on Schlafly's Equal Rights Amendment focused speeches. In *Attitudes Toward History*, Burke identified the frames with great detail. However, limited in these discussions is an easily identified conceptualization of the frames for critical analysis and feminist criticism, particularly in regards to public address. In my analysis, I use Burke's frames to operate through four overlapping stages: (1) acknowledgement of failings within the status quo, (2) isolation of the accessible, identifiable causes by defining

reason within the vocabulary of public grammar, (3) rhetorical cleansing toward (re)construction by naming both the friendly and unfriendly functions of the issue, and (4) invitation to return to normalcy. Such an analysis offers a new perspective for identifying the motives behind key leaders within the ERA debate.

For the purposes of my critical analysis, I found that before the failed ratification in 1982, Schlafly successfully invites the public to rethink and rediscover the issues within the ERA, thus operating out of a frame of acceptance. In the same vein, I found that after 1982 Schlafly lacks the overtly charitable attributes in acceptance frames, thus discouraging thoughtful reform for the public, particularly for contemporary feminists, that are not already in agreement. Schlafly's rhetorical framing demonstrates how her speech rhetoric identified problems, causes, and remedies at both public and political levels. Before 1982, Schlafly framed her speeches for accepting a reconstruction of the dominant public opinion. However, after 1982, Schlafly rejected the opportunity for thoughtful reform, unless her audience already agreed with her viewpoint.

Despite the utility of Burke's frames for understanding a rhetor's motive, it is important to note the limitations in his perspective. The most apparent limitation is how the frames seem to limit the opportunity for understanding a rhetor's particular audience. For example, through Burke's perspectives, I showed that Schlafly did not offer the same "charitable attitudes" toward her opponents in her speeches after 1982. However, given her audience at those events, perhaps such charitable attributes were unnecessary. Instead, she analyzed her audience and offered the most "charitable" attitudes for them. Schlafly's ability to skillfully adapt to her situation and audience may signal the impact of her perspective for thoughtful reform.

The truncated nature of a frame lacks culmination in an absolute and complete willingness for entertaining favorable thoughts. Critical frames, while capable of competing against the tendency of oppressive behaviors, often lack the necessary observation of the irregularities of democracy.¹⁰⁴ As Burke stated, “a frame, once well fitted for the culture it serves, becomes ill-suited when it remains dominant in a society whose cultural forms have changed.”¹⁰⁵ More simply put, the frames that worked for Schlafly before 1982, may no longer fully equip her audience to confront against the problems in the social world today.

A particular issue within Burke’s frames of reference, as other scholars have noted, is the problem of warrantable outrage.¹⁰⁶ Put another way, a frame of acceptance that served to provide maximum consciousness could still limit audiences in some understanding of the full understanding. Frames, by nature, are inherently limiting because they serve to emphasize some factors, therefore limiting understanding of other factors. Through my analysis of Schlafly’s speeches, I argue that the frame that was once well fitted for society before 1982 became ill suited when prevailed in a society whose cultural forms have changed. Understanding the changes in society lends further explanation to the practical implications gleaned through my analysis.

Practical Implications

Since much reconstruction of the feminist movement is still needed, the frames of rejection in speeches after 1982 lack the opportunity for today’s society to seek greater wisdom on the ERA debate. Schlafly’s viewpoint offers a unique contribution that is rarely discussed in contemporary literature. She describes the full complexities of womanhood to include both men and women, and also to include women who do not necessarily want “equality,” as defined through the ERA. As described in chapter 2, much literature proclaims the STOP ERA and

Schlafly herself to be predominantly negative and serve solely as prevailing threats to the women's movement. As a result, heterogeneous scholarship grounded in communication studies remains limited when applied to critical rhetorical analyses of anti-feminist rhetoric. To put simply, a majority of communication scholarship does not give Schlafly the appropriate critical coverage deserved.

As demonstrated in my analysis, the truncated coverage in contemporary scholarship may seem warranted when solely examining contemporary speeches because of the rejection-based frames she operates from today. As a result, her unique contribution toward feminism is undermined. However, consistent with Burke's framing notions, Schlafly's power as a leader and rhetorician enables her to shape our relations with our fellows and the current social structure. Schlafly's contemporary speeches often operate under a promising resolution for better understanding the ERA rivalry. If she operated primarily out of frames of acceptance in the later speeches, like she did before the failed ratification, it is possible Schlafly could change the discussions regarding the ERA and offer a fuller understanding of the debate.

Third Wave Feminism

Although Schlafly would probably be the first person to dismiss the label of feminist, her early life and political trajectory suggest an inherently feminist, yet also strongly conservative and domestic value agenda. The definitions gleaned through the waves of feminism offer a particularly interesting standpoint to understand Schlafly's unique contributions. Communication scholars often speak of feminism in three phases of waves: first, second and third wave feminism. However, there is little consensus as to best practices for accurately characterizing these waves in their full.

The second wave of feminism emerged in the mid-1960s from feminist efforts to change woman's status in society and gain equality, namely in the workplace. The central focus of the second wave was on complete gender equality, providing women with the same social, political, legal, and economic rights that men have.¹⁰⁷ Many second wave feminists believed the ratification of the ERA would have accomplished the goals of the second wave. However, critics of second wave feminism argue that too much focus fell on experiential equality and failed to incorporate the voices of many young women, men, and minorities.¹⁰⁸ The problems that plagued the second wave led women in the 1990s to coin a new wave that sought to resolve those problems, third wave feminism.

Unlike the eschewing victimization stabilized in second wave feminism ideological constructs, third wave feminism worked to include notions of "universal womanhood," body, gender, sexuality, and heteronormativity.¹⁰⁹ Third wave feminists readopted the very lipstick, high heels, and socially constructed definitions of feminine beauty that second wave feminists vehemently correlated with a sexist patriarchy and male oppression. Pinkfloor Interaction, a European game developer, expressed this very notion by stating: "It's possible to have a push-up bra and a brain at the same time."

Schlafly's rejection of the inherent victimization of feminists showcased how the tools of the oppressor can be used to persuade the majority of the public. In this sense, Schlafly was partially a third wave feminist during the second wave. That is, she embraced the power of womanhood to exemplify the importance of an anti-ERA agenda. Given the significant influence and success of Schlafly's STOP ERA campaign, and her unique contribution to contemporary feminism, the lack of critical and non-feminist scholarship that examines her experiences is

concerning. I hope my paper offers a unique, and in some ways more critical, standpoint for which to reconsider the ERA debate.

Conclusion

For the feminists in the 1970s, the battle of the ERA proved to be more than just a fight against inequality. With increasing frustration toward their inability to stop Schlafly, feminist leaders employed inherently negative rhetoric in an attempt to silence her without focusing on public opinion. This was their “feminine mistake.” They did not include the completeness of acceptance-focused frames in their rhetoric. Schlafly’s rhetoric, on the other hand, successfully tapped into the feeling of the majority of American public—they did not want significant changes in gender roles, whether at work, home, or in society at large. Before the failed ratification in 1982, Schlafly used her turn at the podium to drive home the illegitimacy of the pro-ERA advocates. Consistent with Burke’s notions of acceptance frames, Schlafly used the rejection techniques aimed against her to her own advantage. In doing so, she gained the public’s trust and enabled thoughtful reform that ensured the ERA did not ratify.

The feminist scholarship reviewed in chapter two suggests that the rejection frames espoused by the feminist tended to marginalize women and lacked the charitable attributes necessary for social reform. At the same time, Schlafly’s STOP ERA campaign, particularly before the 1982 deadline, reclaimed feminism from the radical left by elevating the situation through public grammar and broadening her agenda to embrace the status quo. By winning the battle against ratification of the ERA, Schlafly illustrated that successfully persuasive rhetoric need not attack traditional social norms. Rather, Schlafly’s frames of acceptance offer an inclusive agenda that can be utilized for political and social gains.

Understanding the effectiveness and acceptance-focused rhetoric espoused in Schlafly's speeches before 1982 lends a greater understanding to the more tragic perspective espoused in her rhetoric after the win. Schlafly offered the public a new perspective for understanding the ERA debate and social views of womanhood. However, as demonstrated in my analysis, Schlafly would have greater success for thoughtful social reform in scholarship and historical recounts of the ERA battle if she operates more deliberately out of a frame of acceptance. As described by Burke, "the progress of humane enlightenment can go no further than in picturing people not as *vicious*, but as *mistaken*."¹¹⁰ With the realignment and rediscovery of feminist ideals in contemporary society, Schlafly has the potential to again offer a voice for the "silent majority."

APPENDIX A. SPEECH 1

Title: "The Equal Rights Amendment"

Date: January 1, 1975

Location: St. Catherine's College, St. Paul, MN

Format: Speech

Length: 79 minutes

There are two contrary views of women current in our society today. One is, I think, best demonstrated by an old story that goes like this: They say when men die and go to heaven, they are required to go through one of two doors. On the first door are inscribed the words "Men Who are Dominated by Their Wives." Over the other door, there's "Men Who Dominate Their Wives." And naturally there is always a very long line in front of the first door, and hardly ever any line in front of the second door. But one day, an insignificant-looking man turned up in front of the door that said "Men Who Dominate Their Wives." And one of his friends called over from the other line and said, "Say, Harry, what are you doing standing in front of that door?" And Harry replied, "My wife told me I had to stand in front of that door."

This demonstrates one view of women. There's another view of women which is popularized by the Women's Liberation Movement, and which was most succinctly stated in a commercial which was developed by the National Organization for Women, the principal women's lib group. And it was one of the television spots in many areas, also in newspapers and magazines and services. This commercial shows the picture of a darling, curly-headed child, and the caption over the picture is, "This normal, healthy child was born with a handicap: it was born female." Now that is the starting assumption of the Women's Lib Movement, that somebody —it isn't clear who; maybe God, maybe the establishment, or society, or a conspiracy of male chauvinist pigs—have dealt women a foul blow by making us female, and it is up to legislation or our constitutional amendments to remedy this terrible injustice. And that has been a frame of reference in the way they start.

And so they proposed the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution as this remedy for centuries of injustice to women. The proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment go around the country giving us a tiresome litany of past injustices that has long since been remedied. They cry out about women not having the right to vote, and women not being able to serve on a jury, and women not being able to go to law school or medical school, and other obsolete things that have long since passed from our society. I really think you have to have psychological problems or have a chip on your shoulder because at one time in this country women didn't have the right to vote; it's been more than fifty years since this problem was solved. I think the Equal Rights Amendment was very well summed up by [(Starvington?)] at the Virginia legislative hearing, a woman who identified herself as ninety-three years old, an original suffragette who had been campaigning for women's rights for more than half a century. She said the proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment are fifty years behind the times; they are fighting a battle that has been

long since won. And I think she said it very well, because all these things that they've criticized have long since been passed in our society. Yet they keep talking about it and crying about it and addressing themselves to problems that no longer exist. They simply are not relevant to the world that we live in today.

I debated one PhD from the University of Wisconsin who started her talk by saying, "Our sisters in other lands have made more progress toward women's rights than we have in the United States." I said, "Please name one other country where women are as well off as they are in the United States." And she had no reply. And yet, proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment go about saying, "Women in this country are kept in serfdom. They are treated like chattel. They are second class citizens. They are statistically a non-personhood." This simply isn't true, and those are not exaggerated statements; those are all actual quotes from proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Now, if you were to attend the state legislation hearings around the country, (as I have been to a number of them), the first thing that will strike you when you listen to the arguments of the proponents is that they have no case. They are not able to cite any injustices against women that ERA will remedy; they are not able to cite any laws that discriminate against women that ERA will wipe out; they are not able to cite any rights or benefits that ERA will give them. Many people who have supported the Equal Rights Amendment in good faith have done so because somehow they identify it with the slogan "equal pay for equal work." Now that's a good objective anybody would support; I did not encounter one person who was against equal pay for equal work. But the thing you find out when you listen to the lawyers for the proponents is that ERA has absolutely nothing to do with equal pay for equal work. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely no way that the Equal Rights Amendment will benefit women in the area of employment. As a matter of fact, when I made that last statement in a debate with Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, who is their leading congressional proponent, she replied, "I never claimed it would."

Now they've closed their case, because most people who have supported ERA have done so because they thought it would benefit women in the area where everybody knows there has been discrimination in the past. But it will not, and every lawyer who has appeared at the state legislative hearings has admitted that ERA will not benefit women at all in the field of employment, and that is rightly so, the first reason being that ERA doesn't apply to private industry; it only applies to federal and state laws. And the second reason is that there's no way it can consider the effect of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. Although this is very specific, it applies to power and fame and emotion. It sets up the enforcing mechanism, the agency that handles the complaints. If any woman thinks she has been discriminated against, she can file her claim; it won't cost her any money; she won't have to hire a lawyer, but it would be a winning motion. They thought that this law ... multi-million-dollar settlements against most of the big companies in our land, when they won \$38 million against AT&T. The third one called for back pay not only to women who hadn't been paid what they should have been paid, but also

to women who hadn't been promoted as they should have been promoted, and even to women who did not apply for jobs because they didn't think they would get them. But what more in the world could anybody want in order to give women equal employment opportunities?

Now after AT&T had this settlement forced on it, they opened all their jobs on a non-discriminatory basis. And some people thought that women would rush out and get all those high-paying jobs where you climb up all those telephone poles. And a few of them did; one of them, said after a week, she said the men wouldn't carry the ladders for her. When they opened up the jobs to everybody, the men discovered that they could come in and get the nice sit-down jobs answering the telephone—and those of you who do much long-distance telephoning know that about twenty-five percent of those jobs are now held by men, so there's been a net loss of jobs for women in the telephone industry. But ERA won't add anything to employment. When the women won a \$30 million settlement against U.S. Steel, the company was mandated to hire twenty percent women in its production. Now, you may or may not think that hiring women in production in steel mills is an advance in the cause of women but, at any event, those jobs are there if she wants them. And the Equal Rights Amendment will add absolutely nothing to it. And it is a measure of the hypocrisy and the fraud of the Equal Rights Amendment that proponents continue to go about speaking to uninformed groups, and the way they have garbled the law and identify ERA with equal pay for equal work, while their lawyers are supposed to admit and do admit at the state legislative hearings that ERA will do absolutely nothing for women in that area.

Now let's take the matter of education. Another area where in the past there has been discrimination against women. ERA will do nothing whatever for women in the field of education but the fact of the Education Amendments of 1972. Here again we have a very old law. It applies to different parts of magnet schools, any school that has any federal aid whatsoever covering additions, hiring, promotions, scholarships, grants of all kinds ... that affects discrimination. Well, there's no way that ERA could add anything to women's opportunity to get an education. Now there is an exception in the education amendments of 1972; they exempted admissions to single-sex colleges if they have been traditionally single-sex for many years. Now, there were a number of colleges that actually preferred to retain their single-sex status. We could name a few – Smith, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke – a bunch of exemptions that, of course, would not be constitutional if ERA were ratified. It can acknowledge or exempt any federal aid or scholarship grant of any kind whatsoever. And this, of course, would apply to approximately ninety eight percent of the colleges. You see, a single sex college by definition discriminates on the basis of sex: a girls' college discriminates against boys, and a boys' college discriminates against girls. Now, what the ERA proponent lawyers will tell you, ERA will wipe out single-sex colleges, and they want it to. They do not feel that one should have the right to make a favorable [inaudible] college that would discriminate on the basis of sex. Now, I know that most of the people of our country seem to prefer co-ed colleges. I don't see how this advances the cause for anybody to deprive those who prefer single-sex colleges of their

right to attend. But that is the inescapable result of ERA that cannot be disputed. Now, when Congress passed the Education Amendments of 1972, it moved the (colleges)? into the Department of Education and Welfare for implementation, and it took HEW two years to produce their regulations to implement it. And so in June 1974, HEW came out with eighty pages of regulations. And there was quite an explosion when they came out, because these regulations said that all sex education classes had to be co-ed, that all gym classes had to be co-ed, and that fraternities and sororities could not continue to operate as single-sex organizations on the campus of any college that received any general revenue. Well, there was quite an explosion, and Casper Weinberger held a press conference within a week, and said, "Well, who said right now?" We didn't really need to mean practice... And he said, "I can't exempt the rest of it without specific authority from Congress because I believe that the law requires us to make all these things co-ed."

So then, the Congressmen began to hear from the fraternities and sororities and gym directors that they began to feel the impact of the HEW regulations. And then the proponents of the Education Amendments of 1972 threw up their hands and said, "Oh, we didn't mean this kind of nonsense when we passed that law!" But, HEW thought it did. So, the Congressmen proposed a draft of a rather quickie amendment, and they got it through both Houses in record speed; it passed just before Christmas, and it specifically exempted from the Education Amendments of 1972 as per the (?) HEW regulations: gym classes, fraternities, sororities, Girls Scouts, Boy Scouts, YWCA, YMCA, boys' clubs, girls' clubs, and camp programs. And there was no problem; nobody really wanted to wipe out the single-sex nature of these organizations, and that took care of the problem for the time being. Of course, we can certainly recognize such an exemption would become unconstitutional under ERA. If you have a constitutional amendment, you are stuck with it, [inaudible] all over the nation and you've got to take it all down the line in all of these aspects.

Now we see another variation of this in the matter of college and school athletics. HEW has been regulating with the athletic implementation of this Act, and they have now come forth with some regulations, which are now authorized in [inaudible] the way you get signatures. And you may or may not agree with the specifics of it, but they apply what some people might consider a rational approach to the problem. They [inaudible] women's athletics and to say they can [inaudible] in non-contact sports, the women have the right to compete with the men if the comparable (?) facilities are not provided. But they do make the provision that, in contact sports, no college or high school is compelled to put girls and boys on the same team.

Now, that type of rational approach is possible at the present time, but we'll now contrast that with what you get under the Equal Rights Amendment, and we have a beautiful illustration of that in the state of Pennsylvania, where they have passed a state Equal Rights Amendment and are already beginning to feel the effects. Just a few weeks ago, the Pennsylvania courts handed down a decision on the state Equal Rights Amendment which mandated every high school in the state of Pennsylvania to permit girls and boys to compete and practice together in all contact

sports, specifically including football and wrestling. And this was done under the Equal Rights Amendment and it is mandatory under the Equal Rights Amendment. Now, please note that the decision did *not* say that the school has to have a girls' football team and a girls' wrestling team if you have a boys' team; they would have to compete together. And this is the co-ed nature, the gender-free nature that is required by the Equal Rights Amendment, and we have this perfect example in the state of Pennsylvania of what the Equal Rights Amendment requires. I think that is just a good example of the nonsense and mischief of that is invoked when you require everything that is touched by federal law, state law, the educational systems, public funding, or administrative regulations to be absolutely gender-free. It is the default to every question of the law up and down the line.

Now let's move for a moment from the educational institutions that get public aid to the private schools, and see what it's like if we add all girls. There was a Supreme Court decision about a year ago that is relevant to this discussion. Internal Revenue handed down a regulation a couple of years ago that said that any school—private school, that is—which discriminated in its admissions on the basis of race cannot have a tax-exempt status. Now, the school in question was a private religious school that did not get any federal aid. But, of course, a private school has a [inaudible] which is known as tax exemption. And Internal Revenue said it can't be tax-exempt if you discriminate on the basis of race, and this ruling was upheld by the Supreme Court. Now I don't happen to agree with that school rule, but I want you to consider what this will mean when a similar ruling is applied to discrimination on the basis of sex, implying that it becomes absolutely clear that no private school, even if it takes no federal aid, would be permitted to function as a single-sex school – as an all-girls or all-boys school – because, by their definition, such schools discriminate on the basis of sex. And while there are not too many at the college level, there are many more at the secondary level. And I was at these hearings and asked the ERA proponent lawyers if this will be the result, they say, “Yes, it will be the result, and we *want* it to be the result, because we don't think any educational institution should the right to discriminate on the basis of sex and still hold tax exempt status.” So, if you want to make all educational institutions at every level, private or public, co-ed, mandated co-ed under federal regulation, ERA would surely do that. Then I saw the senator at this particular hearing ask the proponent lawyer the next logical step: if ERA would put this to private schools, what about the churches themselves, which hold tax exempt status also? And she hesitated, and then didn't care to commit herself one way or the other on the effect that ERA would have on the churches.

Well, I think the logic of this is compelling. We know that the women's liberation movement is making a strong drive at the present time against churches that discriminate on the basis of sex. And while we hold discrimination on the basis of sex, some others have called it simply assigning a different role to men and women in the ministerial functions, or the family units. The women's lib movement is making a special drive to force the churches to ordain women as clergy [applause]...now for those of you who espoused that as true, you are now seeing that it is. And they are trying to force the women to go into the seminaries, and into theological

institutions on an absolutely [applause] and to give them financial aid to get them in the fair quota, and they will lose their tax exemption if they don't do it. Now, this is certainly one of their objectives.

Now, the tough question is that they look upon the Equal Rights Amendment as the Constitutional basis for litigation to achieve that goal. And that is what they'll do, because this judge will give them the means to litigate toward their objective. Now, there are some churches today that are ordaining women, and that's their right to do so; I fully support their right to do that if that is their choice. But there are other churches that do not care to ordain women, and I do not feel that we should give to Internal Revenue the power to withdraw their tax exemption if they do not cave in [applause].

Let's move onto some other issues. The Equal Rights Amendment not only won't do anything for women in some of the areas we've discussed, but if we've equated that the federalist takeaway of the rights that women now possess.

Now let's talk about, first of all, the right that it will take away from the young woman: the right to be exempted from the draft. Now we seem to fight in these foreign wars about every ten years—the politicians keep promising peace, but we keep having these wars about every ten years—and all young men aged eighteen have to register for the draft. You know that if you don't register for the draft, you go to jail—several hundred young men went to jail last year because they didn't register—and the most immediate thing that will happen if the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified is that every eighteen-year-old girl will be compelled to go out into the [applause] there, sign up, register, get a draft number, be part of the lottery system and be available for call. Now, this is not what the majority of American women want, and the only way they get around this issue are the legislators with the whole issue of the draft demonstrate with full clarity the hypocrisy of the proponents. The way they line up the support of these women's organizations, they'll go into an uninformed women's group, and they will handle this issue like this: they will say, "Oh, you don't think Congress will really draft women, do you?" Or they will say, "*All* of the women will not be drafted." Well, now those are sleazy arguments, that's it. Nobody ever said *all* women will be drafted; obviously, if you're over age and you only have one eye and one leg you're not going to be drafted. The young men that have been drafted and have served in these wars and ERA will compel there must be on the same basis ...which was put out in this article in Family Circle, which was distributed to the rest of you who are here this evening, which says—and I want you to get the hypocrisy of these types of arguments; this argument's written on this yellow sheet passed out a second ago – in the past, Congress has exempted all married men; the ERA would require it to exempt all married women as well. Now, I can only assume that [inaudible, Ina Brown?] is lying, or she's so dumb that she can't remember back to World War II. Now, there are a few people in this audience that can remember back to World War II; they know that married men up through age thirty five were drafted and put into combat, and then there's nothing in ERA that says you don't draft married men or married women; all the ERA does, it says you have to treat the sexes equally; and that is, if the

national emergencies call for the draft of married men and fathers and the placing them into combat in some south pacific jungle, then married women and mothers would have to be treated exactly the same. All ERA requires is a quota.

Now, when these ERA proponents come into the legislative hearing they sing a different tune. They don't put out this stuff of "Oh, you don't think Congress will really draft women, do you?" Oh, no, they don't think they have to say that to the legislators and lawyers there, so they take an entirely different tactic. They come in and say, "We *want* women drafted and we *want* them put into combat, and we don't think women will get their equal and full rights in our society until they are treated absolutely equally to men. And I heard one legislator ask one of these proponents, "Well, if we draft women, couldn't you give all the women the desk jobs, the safe jobs, and leave the fighting up to the men?" And she replied, "Oh, no, because that would discriminate against women and deprive us of our equal opportunity to win a Congressional Medal of Honor." Now, proponents never bother to wonder whether or not she would leave dead. And I don't know if there are many of these women who are agitating for the draft; right now, we're going up to Vietnam. That just won't do it; they want somebody else to go, but not themselves. They hate this issue of the draft [inaudible]...ERA, and I read it through twice; you know, somehow they never get around to mentioning the draft issue. It just doesn't exist. They can't, because they know the American people don't want our young women placed in the draft and sent off to fight [shouting]...Now suppose young women are going to say, "You *will* go along with [applause]...it's an honorable career, and I urge you to do it. They're looking for you. They need people in the army, and you've got people. The women in the military get the best of both worlds; you will have it coming and going. You will have the same pay, the same medics, the same fringe benefits, the same GI Bill, the same comparable benefits, but you're absolutely guaranteed you'll never go into combat. If you could guarantee that to the young men, you'd have no trouble raising an army anytime.

Now let's move onto another subject, and that is the takeaway of the rights of the wives. One of the great things about the country we live in is that it is a society that respects the family as the basic unit. And we have many laws at the state and federal level which are designed to hold the family together. Now, maybe there's some better way that civilization will sometime discover for living together in a civilized community, but I don't know what it is, and I would like to stick with the family as the basic unit.

Now, what laws reflect as an assumption of our society is that the family is what we want for our basic unit. They also reflect the obvious fact that women have babies and men don't have babies. Now I've had some colleges, they tell me they're working on some other alternatives to that, too, but until I see it, I will also start with that as the fundamental assumption. Now take some of these fundamental assumptions: the laws that every one of our fifty states make it a financial obligation of the husband to support his wife. These are good laws; these are laws designed to keep the family together, laws designed to give the wife the right to be in her home with her own babies because we look upon the fundamental home as a good that we want to protect and

encourage. These laws also require the husband to provide a home for his wife in accordance with his means. These laws and other laws require the husband to be the primary support of his minor children. There are many things that these laws reflect in our legal system. This assumption that the husband has the obligation of support is what enables a married woman who does not have paid employment to take credit in her husband's name. Why? Because the [inaudible] is what gives her the right to ... her bills against her husband. These are the laws which enables a woman who has made her career in the home to get security benefits based on her husband's earnings. Why? Because we recognized this obligation before.

Now, these laws of family and family property vary slightly from state to state; there are a number of states that have certain special and unique privileges and exceptions for widows, because we think of widows as a certain class of people who are entitled to some special financial advantage, and these laws vary from state to state, but they're good laws. Now, when ERA comes along, what ERA does is to make everything equal; no matter what the laws say to do, they've got to treat men and women absolutely equally. And this is the takeaway of the rights that the wife now has. In every incident, it will take away the rights that the wife now has; this is why Senator [Sam Ervin?] called ERA "the most destructive piece of legislation that has ever passed the United States Congress."

[inaudible] had already gone into effect. The first thing that happened in this area was that the Colorado court threw out the family support laws – they said that only husbands could go to jail for not supporting their wives; wives can't go to jail for not supporting their husbands, so that's discriminatory, and they struck it down. And then the Colorado legislature addressed itself to the problem, and they did. What will be required under ERA? And that is, they struck out the sexist words – now the sexist words are "male," "female," "man," "woman," "husband," and "wife" – and they replaced them with sex-neutral words which are "person" and "spouse." So now the Colorado law names the principle support "spouse." And anybody can plainly see that's not the same thing at all as saying that a husband will support his wife. So now the wife has an equal financial obligation under pain of being convicted of guilty of a class-five felony. So there is a clause, with normal exceptions made for the wife who is pregnant, or has six children at home, or whatever. It's equality and has to be determined equally.

Pennsylvania's another state with a state ERA; under that, the Pennsylvania courts invalidated the special rights that wives had for separate maintenance and for payment of her lawyer's fees. They said, "That's discriminatory, so we should strike them down." Please know they did not extend it to the men, they just struck them down.

The Pennsylvania courts have also invalidated the Pennsylvania law making the father the primary supporter of his minor children; they put the equal financial burden on the mother. Now this is equality, and in no way can you say that this is an advance on the cause of women; it takes away the rights that women now have.

I personally think that if ERA were ratified the ones who will be hurt the most are the senior women – the women who have made being a wife and mother their full time career, and now no-fault divorce has become rather easy, and her husband can “trade her in for a new model” – she now is being faced with a court interpreting a settlement in terms of equality, and courts increasingly are saying, “too bad lady” with respect to the beginners (?) of the home, “This is the age of equality; go out and take care of yourself now.” And that is what it is doing to the marriage contract and it is very hurtful to the best interests of women.

Another whole area it will affect is the area of women and their right to protective labor legislation in the manual labor field. Now I believe that in intellectual, professional, academic, or business pursuits, a woman can compete equally with a man because she’s just as smart. But in physical labor a woman cannot compete equally with a man, and it is very unfair to her to put her in a position where the company can push her exactly like a man. It’s in recognition of the obvious physical differences between men and women that the state has erected this fabric of protective labor legislation. These are meaningful laws to the women who have nothing to sell in the marketplace but their physical labor. These women don’t have careers; they just have jobs, and they’re working because they need the money. And what ERA does is to wipe out the protection that we have formerly given them in terms of making them subject to be worked too many hours a day, too many days of the week. Protective labor legislation has mandated certain rest areas, rest periods, chairs to sit down on, sometimes more generous workers’ compensation for injuries to more parts of the body for a woman than a man – and these are things that are meaningful to the woman who does manual work. And ERA will wipe them all out, and don’t let anyone tell you that when the courts look at this, they will extend them to the men. That is ridiculous, and has not happened in any single incidence. In every case where the protective labor legislation has been struck down under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the women have lost it and the men have not gained it.

Now, there are all kinds of additional endless mischief and nonsense the ERA is going to cause, and I came across one recently which I think illustrates this. There was a financial commentator, a columnist, named Sylvia Porter, whose column appears in newspapers across the country – I don’t know if she appears here, but she’s very well-respected as a syndicated columnist in *Money Matters*. She recently said in one of her columns that there was a bill before Congress to require husbands to pay social security taxes on their wives who were in the home and did not have paid employment. And she said, in some length to argue, that this would require the husbands to pay double social security taxes, and that is true; it would be double. But after all, if you have to hire somebody to do the housework, you would have to pay social security on her; therefore, it’s only right that he would have to pay social security taxes on his wife. Now, Miss Parker said in her next sentence, “Whether or not this bill passes, the Equal Rights Amendment, when ratified, will require it.”

Now, just think over what this means. I have seen a wide range of estimates as to what the worth of a housewife is; they all start about \$12,000 a year and go up. Now it's unclear whether the husband is going to have to pay social security taxes on his wife at the 8 percent rate of self-employed persons or at a 5.6 rate of people you employ plus an additional 5.6 paid by the husband as the employer. But in any event, it would probably figure out to at least \$960 per year in additional taxes that the husband would have to pay on his wife who does not have paid employment. And, of course, with this additional tax, he will not get any additional benefits because the wife already has the right to draw Social Security benefits based on her husband's earnings. So, if anyone tells you that ERA is going to give new dignity to the housewife, just remember that all this "new dignity" is going to cost you at least \$960 per year in additional taxes. And there are more accounts of people in our country today that are already paying more social security taxes than they are income taxes.

Another aspect of Equal Rights Amendment is Section II; Section II says Congress will have the power to enforce it by appropriate legislation. This is the grab for power at the federal level. This is what we'll take off the hands of the state legislatures, make new areas of jurisdiction that the federal government hasn't yet got its meddling fingers into, including marriage, marriage private law, divorce, child custody, [church?] regulations and [inaudible] – and any kind of legislation that makes a difference between men and women. Why anybody would want to give a whole new batch of jurisdiction to the federal government when it can't begin to solve the problems we have now is more than I can understand. But ERA can do it. I can't think of the reason why we can find so many people on the federal payroll who are working, lobbying, scraping (?), and testifying in behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment. They have been doing it for years on your tax money. Time and again, when I go out to speak at my friends, they have to pass the hat to pay my plane fare. I chide my opponents as they [inaudible] your tax money. They [inaudible], they do it out of the [inaudible], they testify before state legislatures for biddings, they do television debates, they travel all around the country speaking to [inaudible] organizations, they use the telephone [inaudible] calling all over the country. Mrs. Ford held a lengthy session for 160 White House employees [inaudible] on the government dime to tell them why they ought to support the Equal Rights Amendment [inaudible]. Those who are for the Equal Rights Amendment are not for equal rights but they who are *against* the Equal Rights Amendment. And I know it's just about a week ago the President appointed a Commission of International Women's Year. And he appointed the Mrs. Ruckelshaus as chairman, gave her nine offices of the state department and a budget of \$700,000, and they announced that their first priority is ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment... [applause] Constitutional amendment. They have to get ready all these expensive booklets at taxpayers' expense – mailing them out in Washington – and they have all this money to spend; and in addition to government money, they have many other sources; you know they hire the top political consulting firms in the country, Bailey Deardourff and [inaudible] with a budget of \$249,000 to push ERA in the states that had not yet ratified it. They have other sources, too; the Rockefeller Foundation gave \$288,000 to the Status of Women Council in California, which was announced to be used to propagandize for ERA

nationally. And millions of [inaudible] with of *Playboy* magazine – this is what happened in the ERA efforts. This is another example of the hypocrisy of the proponents; they try to take the position that they're against people treating women as sex objects like in *Playboy* magazine, but they certainly are quite willing to take *Playboy* money under the table. This is just one more example of the hypocrisy and the difference in the message that the proponents give depending on which type of group they are talking to; you get more truth when you get them at a state legislative hearing when they have to be subject to cross examination.

So here are a couple reasons why the momentum is all on our side. Last year, the support was 8-3 in our favor; three states ratified, seven states rejected, and one state rescinded its previous ratification. This year, the score is 14-1 in our favor; one ratified, but fourteen state legislatures rejected the Equal Rights Amendment. The momentum is all against the Equal Rights Amendment and when women find out what's in it and what it will do, they recognize that there isn't anything good for women but on the other hand, it is a big takeaway of the rights we now have, and they are coming out in droves in state after state asking the legislatures to rescind their previous ratification and to reject them in the states that have not yet ratified. Thank you very much.

[*Q and A Session:*]

Because we're interested in accommodating as many of our audience as possible, that would like to ask Mrs. Schlafly questions, we respectfully ask you not to indulge in debate or discussion, but simply state your question. We would ask you to state one question per person if you please.

Question: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, aren't you aware that one House of Congress cannot pass a law? It takes two Houses of Congress. [Applause] Now it is true, we do have the option; Congress has the power to grant exemptions today; that is true. They had a draft for the past three years, and they never used it. [Inaudible.] The point is that if you have ERA, Congress will not have the power to exempt them. And we want them exempted. [Inaudible.] That option is there because the American people want it. Once ERA is ratified, you no longer have the option to exempt women; women have got to be treated exactly like men, no matter what the emergency is. And that's what we don't like, because we do want women exempted.

Question: [Inaudible – recording fades out]

Phyllis: That is correct, we all know cases where husbands have been taken ... by unworthy wives. I do think, for every one that you can find, there are fifty wives who have been led by an unworthy husband. And I feel that the marriage obligation should be lived up to by both parties. But in no way is ERA going to help women, and I don't think it would solve the problem that you've raised either. The only possible way that it might help is that it will take away from the wife the presumption of custody of her children. Now that is a presumption which is found in all

our courts in the present time. That's automatically granted in the showing of an unworthy mother; she doesn't get her children. But she has the presumption of custody, and I know a lot of fathers who get through this are bitter about that. But just remember that that's not the way the Equal Rights Amendment is sold; the ERA, the Equal Rights Amendment is presented as something which is going to benefit women, and in no way could you show that is it going to benefit women.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: You should read some of the literature and the way they spell it out. No, I'm not discriminating against men, but I do support the laws that bring the family together. And I'll tell you, one of the laws that makes a difference and that the women's libbers just hate is the law that says the husband has the right to establish the domicile. Now, I think that's a good law. And if a woman doesn't want to live in her husband's house, then she shouldn't get married. Now that would require the husband to keep on getting the [inaudible], and the other right to say where it is. Now, I think that's a good law, and you know the ERA would wipe that out.

Questioner: I've read much about you in the national press, particularly about your connections with the foundation and your relations with the John Birch Society. Would you please comment on that?

Phyllis: What's your question? Do you want my comment on that?

Questioner: Yes, I would like to know how factual that is.

Phyllis: Well, what foundation are you talking about?

Questioner: It was the foundation that you established that, apparently, [inaudible] was funded in part by the John Birch Society. And is that your philosophical faith?

Phyllis: Well, I'll gladly answer that.

Questioner: Well, that, and is the John Birch Society your philosophical faith?

Phyllis: Well, I'll be glad to answer this. Now, we're discussing an amendment to the Constitution. If I were proposing a piece of legislation, I would be telling you what good it would do for you – A, B, C, and D. The proponents have no affirmative case; they are not going to do that. So they spend a good bit of their time talking about me, my lifestyle, my children, who takes care of my children, what are all the places I belong to and where do I get my money. Now, really, that has nothing whatever to do with [inaudible]. And the first time that she had read a lot about that in the press, I simply proved the weakness of the case of the proponents that they had to resort to [inaudible]. But to anyone who's interested I will be happy to answer. I've not met with the John Birch Society; they've not given me one dime of money; I do not know what foundation you're talking about, but I have no money for ERA from any foundation, from

any organization, from any government, from any society. I'm glad you brought up the subject of money, because we have existed simply on small, voluntary contributions that we need (and if anybody wanted to contribute), which you can mail to: Stop ERA, Alton, IL 62002.

Now let me tell you in addition: This is funny because we have done nothing expensive. We have no rented office, we have no paid staff, we don't have one single person on the payroll, we don't have any national public relations office, we don't have any national ad campaigns; we have nothing but small donor contributions that pay for such things as giving free literature to the press, letterheads, and a few phone calls. Now, I debated the president of NOW in New York a few weeks ago, and they very formally had slanted questions that they had prepared, and one of the questions they thought about for two weeks so they could ask it. "Uh, Mrs. Schlafly, we saw on the Harry Reasoner Show that you have thousands of the women in the state capitol in Springfield who paid for those demonstrations." I said they didn't cost me a dime! Those people drove their own cars, rode their own buses, carried their own sandwiches, made and carried their own signs. It didn't cost one dime. And those three hundred newspaper women were standing there, you could see they didn't believe me. They didn't understand how this could be done without money. The thing they don't understand is that the American women *don't* want this, that they're paying their money out of their *own* pockets to go against it. [Applause]

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, what makes you think that you're able to [inaudible]?

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, she got a PhD without ERA; now what does she want?

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, if the Episcopal Church wants to ordain women, I think that's their business. Now you're telling me that ERA will give her the right to use the enforcement power of the federal government to force the Episcopal Church to ordain her if the Episcopal Church doesn't *want* to ordain her, well, thanks for making my case.

Well, maybe I'll have to modify that to say that the ERA will help certain groups of people. If they want to require the churches to ordain women, I think it will give them the basis to litigate it. If they are homosexuals and want the right for homosexuals to marry, to get a joint income tax deduction and the right to adopt children, I think ERA will give them that, and if they are looking for the Constitutional right to abortion, I think ERA will help them with that. But beyond that, no; it won't give anything to women.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: All Social Security taxes get [inaudible] by the government.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: The people who pay Social Security taxes.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: The husband's got the money and let's hope he recognizes his obligation to support her.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: It certainly helps... The [inaudible] of the Social Security system certainly isn't wrong, and if you think it ought to be solved by making the husband double taxes, that's one way to solve it.

Questioner: [inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, it would bring a lot of extra money.

Questioner: What large financial groups are the motivating factors behind the ERA?

Phyllis: Well, who's really pushing for the Equal Rights Amendment? Well, the principle group pushing for the Equal Rights Amendment is the National Organization for Women. They've testified at all the hearings; practically everybody I fight on the other side is a member of the National Organization for Women; they opened up paid lobbyist offices at the state capitol, they have paid lobbyists, and when I did this debate a couple weeks ago, the press asked the president what's their annual budget; she said, "I haven't paid a dime."

Of the identified number of voting groups, we know the Rockefeller Foundation, which had been a principle movement for population control in this country, gave \$288,000 to the Status of Women Commission in California, which they are using nationally for ERA, and they have announced themselves in support of ERA because they feel that it will have [inaudible] taking them out of the home and reducing the population of this country. Then, I have also identified the large amount of federal tax money that has gone into it through the state Status of Women Council; a large amount of state money has gone into it. In addition, there are a number of women's organizations that have made money with [inaudible]. They have expensive paid lobbyists in most of the state legislatures, where this has been an issue. We don't have one paid lobbyist. They hired one very high-priced lawyer in Texas to lobby for them there, and he told people they offered him so much money, he just couldn't turn it down.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: She didn't have a question.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, that's a very good point, and I think the co-ed gym classes are just one example of the mischief that ERA causes. You see, what the proponents are striving for, in their own language, is a gender-free society – gender-free in everything that is touched by federal or state law, public funding, the schools, and administrative regulation. And this is not what the majority of American women want, because there are just reasonable differences that reasonable men and women want to make.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, nobody wants her son to get drafted to fight in some foreign war; that's a very unhappy prospect to contemplate. But I think most people who have both teenage boys and teenage girls recognize that there *are* differences, and it's not a matter of how much you love one or the other. Now I will let my teenage boys go alone late at night in the downtowns of the big cities of our country, but I will not let my teenage daughter do the same thing. These are obvious differences; it isn't a matter of loving one more than the other – it's about recognizing that there are worse things that happen to a young girl in the hands of vicious men than happen to a young man.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Now, the question is, “Can you rescind Minnesota's previous ratification of ERA?” A lawyer for Birch By, and a lawyer for Tom Paul (?), saying you can't rescind. But fortunately, those lawyers don't get to make the laws of our own country. And there are a lot more prescriptive(?) Constitutional authorities who say that a state has every right to address it. Senator Sam Ervin, the dean of the Constitutional authority for the Senate, says that the state has every right to rescind. Professor John Mack of Yale Law School said the same thing; Professor [Pearl?] of the University of Chicago Law School said the same thing; and as a matter of fact, don't let them tell you that you can't, because two states already have: Nebraska and Tennessee have already rescinded. Nobody's trying to get it passed; it already has; it didn't. And I think this year the proponents knew that [inaudible] because in Alaska it was ratified in '72 and rescinded in '73. They made four attempts in the legislature this year to re-ratify, and they failed. And I think that shows that the proponents recognize that the decision is valid.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, let me explain that Wisconsin ratified it early without much of the public press, as you pointed out. The measure that was on the ballot was a *state* ERA, and it was soundly defeated by over 60,000 votes. I can verify what you say that people did not understand that ERA would be ratified in Wisconsin. I spoke to the Milwaukee AAUW – American Association of University Women – six months after ERA had been ratified in Wisconsin, and here was a fine group. We had the college-educated women, and a beautiful courthouse that they maintained; they didn't know that ERA had been ratified in Wisconsin. Now, the cause of this is that, in short what happened, in most of the states that ratified early, there was no general public

debate in the press. People didn't know it existed. As a matter of fact, there are still a lot of people who think ERA has been a Proctor and Gamble detergent.

But the new states where it has become an issue, where it has become controversial to talk about reservations, the more you talk about it, the more women don't want it; they recognize that it's a total fraud that won't do anything that we want, and with the radical results to remaking our society that the majority of our women do not want.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: I think a woman married in the '20s or the '30s or the '40s would be understanding that the marriage contract meant the obligation of her husband to support her, and that she had made an honorable career in the home as wife and mother, and the right to expect that the contract that she had entered into would be kept. And I think that she had the right to have it kept. And regardless of what you may think about women today, whether preparing yourself for a career or having a new relationship with your husband, I think you have no right to go back and redo those contracts of years ago. And it's true that once you have made a career in the home as wife and mother, at the age of 50 or 60, she really is not capable of going out and getting a job – we have this thing called “age discrimination” and ERA is not going to remedy that. I think ERA is very unfair to those women. Being in the home is an honorable career. The woman today has the full freedom of choice; if you don't want that, you can go out and make your career somewhere else. But don't take away the right and/or law of choice of that career in the home.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, if the rights to work go away, whatever complaint you may have in the view of credit is now made obsolete by the passage of the Depository Institution Amendments Act of 1974 that completely abolished and ended all discrimination in the area of credit. So now the problem of credit is all solved by federal legislation.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, she didn't say that. Well, no; she asked me what to do about the problem, and I told her what to do about the problem. Now, if you're going to ask me if I think that there hasn't been some discrimination, well, of course there's been discrimination. There have been all kinds of problems. But the way to deal with them is with specific legislation. Last year in Illinois, we passed nine bills to take care of little pockets of discrimination that people were concerned about. They go through quickly; there's no problem. They passed with big margins; they go into effect. That's the way to handle any problems that emerge, not by this sledgehammer approach that's going to take away rights that we've always [inaudible] we've been discussing.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, in regard to advertising for this meeting, nobody went through my accounts (?), so I can assume, well, I'm sure it didn't come out with the college. If people who are brave with my point of view want to raise their own money and advertise this meeting, well, that's certainly their right to do so. Now, in regards to lobbying for the ERA in the Minnesota legislature, it was a rather easy path when you have a group because there wasn't much controversy in the state of Minnesota.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Okay, I just challenge you not to give any paid lobbyists a blanket petition, because if it were strictly on volunteers, I think that [inaudible].

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: What you can do to stop the inequality in tax spending for the Equal Rights Amendment – at the federal level, the only people who would be involved would be your Senators and Congressmen. Let them know you're fed up with it. Cut out the appropriations at the federal level. Cut out the \$700,000 that they just gave to Jill Ruckelshaus for International Women's Year.

Now at the state level, and I don't know what your situation is in this [inaudible], but most states have something called the Status of Women Council. In some states they are funded by state taxpayers' funds; in some states they clue in the federal [inaudible], and in some states it's a combination [inaudible]....; now, they're supposed to do, our experience is that these Status of Women Councils spend most of their time lobbying and working for ERA. Now you can approach that through your state legislators or through your governor, who has appointed them. In at least one state we've got a Status of Women Council right now eliminated, and in another state we've got the funding completely cut off; in another state, we were able to get a fair representation of both points of view. And you know that's how these women's lib proponents – they're not willing to give a fair side of to the other point of view; they only want their point of view. And if this is going to be funded by tax money, then at least they ought to give a fair presentation to the point of view of the women in the home.

Questioner: Mrs. Schlafly, I'd like to know why you put so much faith in the federal laws that prohibit discrimination in education and in employment, and not just the federal laws that prohibit sex discrimination on the basis of age.

Phyllis: But there aren't any laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of age.

Questioner: There are; there are federal laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of age for people between the ages of 40 and 50.

Phyllis: Well... [inaudible] they are enforcing the laws against sex discrimination with a vengeance. In fact, that they are over-enforcing; I think a good example of over-enforcement in

the sex discrimination field is the cities where police departments are under court orders to throw out the physical qualifications and take women on a one-to-one basis and assign them to patrol duty. This is, in my opinion, a mischievous and nonsensical over-enforcement of the laws against sex discrimination; that was something that was never intended. But they could not have the same type of authority to enforce any laws against age discrimination because that's so widespread.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, the biggest difference that there is between one female and another female cannot be as great as the difference between any female and any male.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: In many respects, yes. But what the women's lib movement is striving for, in many cases, is to force companies to hire women whether or not they're qualified, just because they're women.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Oh, that's unfair to your definition of sexism, but I'd certainly like a society in which we are able to recognize differences in the body of law, regulations, and so forth.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, again, it depends again on how you define discrimination. If it is discrimination that girls are exempt from the draft then I am for discrimination.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: But that isn't what ERA says at all. ERA has nothing to do with your being able to achieve your fulfillment in regard to your commonly-held whatever-else-you-said. ERA does not address itself to that. ERA addresses itself specifically to federal and state law.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: I'm not telling you at all that this is a matter of the language of it. The language of it is that the equality of life under the law shall not be denied or infringed by the United States on account of sex. But that doesn't have to do with you fulfilling your individuality or opportunity; it has to do with federal and state law, and what it means is that every federal and state law has got to treat men and women absolutely equally. And I say women are going to come out on the short end of the law, and most people don't want it. Next question.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Well, I write a monthly newsletter called *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, and over the last couple of years I have accumulated twenty-four different newsletters on various aspects of the Equal Rights Amendment. They look like this: the whole packet of twenty-four newsletters, all different aspects touched on tonight, and many of the court cases and authentic documentation, is available outside our doors tonight for \$3 per packet. That's right, it's not subsidized by any organization; it's strictly a free enterprise production; it's available at practically cost; we don't even get a salary out of it, but I invite you to buy it at \$3 per packet.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: How will ERA affect federal and state inheritance law? At the federal level it's called the federal estate tax, and it will have no effect because all of our federal tax laws and state laws are written in sex-neutral language and refer to "spouse" and "taxpayer" and so forth; they do not refer to "men" and "women." At the state level, there are variations from state to state; in many states, the women have superior inheritance rights – there are many states where a woman gets a special, better break; she is going to lose it under ERA, because ERA requires for it to be equal. Now, I understand that in the state of Minnesota, a widow has a special tax break under inheritance laws that gives her a larger deduction from the inheritance tax than a man, and I understand that your legislature is now considering making that equal by applying the tax deduction also to the men; this will cost your state an additional \$5 million a year. If you want to do it that way and pay that cost, you're welcome to do it. If ERA did it for you, then what they would propose to do would be just to wipe it out [inaudible]; that's usually the way they would enforce [inaudible]...usually just levy an additional tax, and then just wipe out everything that was there. The Supreme Court just recently upheld a special tax advantage for widows in the state of Florida. That's another state that gives a special tax break to widows; there are a number of states that do. And I've seen ERA lawyers come in from other states and say, "That's a good example; that's discrimination. ERA will wipe that out; there's no reason why widows should get any special tax breaks." Now, surely you're not saying that it's state law, but you're saying that in the other states.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: In my opinion, the principle doctrine of the women's lib movement is for abortion, government-planned abortion, available anytime, anywhere. And they want, in the words of Bella Abzug, the "Constitutional right to an abortion." Now, they know that their right to an abortion today is based on a Supreme Court decision – a split decision. And that might change; there might be a change in personnel on the court; a human life amendment might be passed; the right to life movement is growing. And you have to understand that the women's lib movement wouldn't [inaudible]. A woman's sensibility to be pregnant and is to be forced to the in justice of (?) This is the great inequality that we've got to have remedied by the Constitution. Now, I think it's quite clear in their literature, and they expect that ERA will put into the Constitution their Constitutional "right" to an abortion. The top legal authority in the right to life field is Dr.

[inaudible], whose personal testament has said that he feels that ERA will be really advantageous to the abortionists and damage the movement for the Equal Rights Amendment. A second [inaudible] authority in the right to life movement is Dr. Charles Rice of the Notre Dame Law School; he says he feels that it would severely restrict the right of state legislatures to pass any legislation restricting or regulating abortion, because abortion legislation by its very definition is sexist – it falls only on women; it doesn't fall to men. There's got to be some explanation for the tremendous drive that motivates the Equal Rights Amendment when we can demonstrate that it isn't going to do any of the things that they claim it's going to do. And I think one explanation is the assistance it would give to abortion.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: ERA will take away choice in many fields. ERA will take away the choice of the young woman to register or not to register for the draft. It will take away the right and the choice of a college girl to select a co-ed college or a single-sex college. It will take away from the woman the right to select between a career and a full-time wife and mother, and the legal rights to support her choice of that role, or to go into paid employment. And in every other area, it will take away choices that she now enjoys.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: No, no, I really don't. The question is, "Is [inaudible] related to the regional government [inaudible]?" No, I really don't think so.

Questioner: Would it be possible for it to be related in a very subtle way?

Phyllis: Well, it must be too subtle for me. I really don't see the connection. Of course, it is true that the ERA fits into the desires of any group that wants to transfer power down to Washington. [Inaudible] admitted at a Missouri hearing that the intent of Section II is to make state laws uniform. Now that is not our system of government; our system of government is that we have differences – in property law, in tax law, in criminal law – from state to state, and, well, we like these differences. We think this is conducive to freedom and competition. For those who want more power to the federal government; well, I think ERA will give them an assist. There's another scholarly article written by a college professor, which I reprinted in one of my letters on economics and ERA. And he takes the point of view that the people who want more spending power in the hands of the federal government have just about reached capacity in regards to the tax burden that they put on the American people. The American people are fed up with paying taxes and are going against the taxes as hard as they can. Now where are they going to get a whole new source of tax dollars supporting the antics of the bureaucrats in Washington? Well, obviously, if we get all the women out of the home and into paid employment, this is tremendous new revenue for the federal government. And I think that there are people that think that because this will help the women population and give all these poor people in Washington more money

to spend so they can direct our lives, which they think is much better than all the [inaudible] people spending their own money.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Is that a connection between the [inaudible] and the federally-financed daycare centers? Yes, there is; I can't tell you that that ERA is going to mandate daycare centers, but I can tell you that practically everybody I debate on the other side is for federally-financed daycare centers, and this is one of their objectives. It certainly is a principle objective of the National Organization for Women, and they feel that you've got to get the burden of the children off the backs of women, and somehow they think it's the government's obligation to take care of the children so these women can be out fulfilling their role in whatever they want. And for those of you who want to go into related issues, I suggest you get a hold of the publication of the National Organization for Women, which is called *Revolution: Tomorrow is NOW*. It is very revolutionary; it was well-made. And it shows clearly in here how they are fertility #1, and how they are for government-financed abortion and sterilization, government-financed childcare centers, Roe v. Wade-ian legislation, reversing the stem of the tide for women in the home through the school textbooks, making more of the churches that discriminate against women; they hate veterans – they're against all veterans' preference, and they're for of all time [inaudible]. You ought to read what they're for, and then you will see that the proponents leading this battle know exactly what they're for and what they're after. They take a lot of naïve people along with them, but those naïve people who are supporting ERA for other purposes are not going to be in on the decisions when the interpretations of the ERA make it down by the courts. I think this'll be the last question.

Questioner: [Inaudible]

Phyllis: Oh, yes; they don't like volunteer work. They want to get the women into paid employment. And, of course, this is all part of the drive to get the women out of the home; they look down on the women in the home and in the volunteer work that women do, and they want to get them out and into the workforce. I think that is part of their movement, and you're right – that is another one of their proposals. Now, I think we've reached [inaudible] the afternoon, and I thank you for being a very good audience.

APPENDIX B. SPEECH 2

Title: Pro-Family Rally, "God, Family, and Country"

Date: November 19, 1977

Location: NRG Arena (formally Astroarena), Houston, TX

Subject: Life Issues, ERA, Morality, Family, Politics

Format: Speeches

Other Participants: Elisabeth Elliot, Lottie Beth Hobbs, Nellie Gray, Steve Warren, Clay Smothers, Mildred F. Jefferson, Robert Kramer, Robert K. Dornan

Notes: Pro-Family Rally occurred in Houston during the same time as the International Woman's Year Conference by pro-ERA advocates.

Length: 49 minutes, 44 seconds

Phyllis's Speech Time: 31:33 – 38:44

Thank you Mr. Chairman and good afternoon dear friends.

There are many differences between *this* meeting and the one in that other hall today. We started out by offering a prayer and I think you should know that at that *other* meeting they didn't have a prayer... they just started out with a moment of silence for fear they would offend many of their members who were present. I'm very proud that they excluded me from that convention. And I'm here where were *not ashamed* and *not afraid* to ask God's blessing on this crowd assembled here today.

But I do thank all of you for coming and for giving us here on the platform the thrill of seeing this marvelous crowd. I am informed that there are 15,000 inside and several thousand more who have unfortunately been turned away.

At the very first meeting of the Commission on International Women's Year, they adopted an official resolution: To urge and push for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment as their highest priority. They resolved, quote, to do on their capacity to see that the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified at the earliest possible moment, closed quote. Now when you have 5 million dollars to spend, all in your capacity is a lot indeed. I can tell you that if we had \$5 million we would've buried it five years ago.

The Commission on International Women's Year is a costly mistake at the taxpayer's expense. The whole thing was designed as a media event. A charade to go through the motions of these phony state conferences and national conferences in order to pass resolutions that were pre-written and pre-packaged a year and a half ago and published in June of 1976. And then, after it was all over, to tell the Congress and the state legislators that *this* is what American women want. By coming here today, you have shown that that is *not* what American women want.

Several years ago a study was made about the Equal Rights Amendment at the Drake Law School in Iowa. And they concluded that if the Equal Rights Amendment were ever ratified, it would encourage the legislators, and the state, and the courts, to adopt a wildly permissive role, which would have the effect of driving the homemaker out of the home. This is what certain people want.

And why would it do that? It would do that, first of all, because it would make unconstitutional any state law, which makes it the obligation of the husband to support his wife and children. These laws are basic to the institution of the family. These are the laws which give to the wife her legal right to be in the home. These are the laws, which give to the children their right to have a mother in the home. Some people *do* want this. The Equal Rights Amendment proponents *do want* that obligation to be sex-equal. They *do want* to take the wife out of the home. They *do want* to get them in the workforce because then this will greatly increase the taxes and the bureaucracy of the federal government.

Section 2 of the Equal Rights Amendment gives the whole enforcement power on the Equal Rights Amendment to the federal government. Why in the world would anybody want to give the Washington politicians and bureaucrats and judges more power than they now have, when they can't *possibly* solve the problems they have already?

The Equal *Rights* Amendment says you cannot discriminate on account of sex. And if you want to deny a marriage license to a man and a man, or deny a homosexual the right to teach in the schools, or adopt children, it is on account of sex that you would deny it, and that would be unconstitutional under the ERA.

<Video scans to baby in crowd with STOP ERA hat>

We reject the anti-family goals of the equal rights amendment and the International Women's Year. Contrary to their radical resolutions, the American people and the American women do not want the ERA. They do not want abortion. They do not want lesbian privileges. And they do not want universal childcare in the hands of the government.

When I look out at this crowd today, I know that you have the energy and the dedication to *defeat* this assault on the family. If you cared enough to come here today, I know that you *can* do it. You can turn back this tied all across the country. If you stay with us, the Equal Rights Amendment *will die* 16 months from Tuesday.

In order to have held the line for the last five years against the tremendous odds of White House lobbying, federal government expenditure, prominent people, and big money, we *had* to have somebody on our side who is more powerful than the President of the United States.

But we need your help and we can have another party on March 22, 1979 if you will put your energy to the task between now and then.

APPENDIX C. SPEECH 3

Title: "The ERA—Is There a Future?"

Date: April 25, 1984

Location: Harvard Law School Forum, Boston, MA

Format: Speech

Length: 29 minutes

Transcription: Found in *Crises in American Oratory, A History of Rhetorical Inadequacy* by Todd S. Frobish, editor. The publisher is Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 2007.

< Introduction: Phyllis Schlafly earned her law degree from Washington University, and a Master's in Political Science from Harvard University, and is probably best known for being an outspoken advocate of the conservative movement for forty years. She first gained attention after the publication of her best-selling 1964 book, *A Choice Not an Echo*. Schlafly has since published twenty books on subjects ranging from feminism to family issues, nuclear strategy, education, and child care. The Phyllis Schlafly Report, her monthly newsletter, has been in circulation for more than 25 years, her syndicated column is printed in 100 newspapers, her radio commentaries are broadcast on 460 stations, and her radio talk show is heard weekly on 45 stations. In 1972, she started her national volunteer organization, the Eagle Forum, and has since been the leader of the pro family movement, which was pivotal in resisting the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). Schlafly has spent her life working in support of right-wing causes, but found her calling with the ERA. As a national voice for conservative issues, she receives a lot of criticism. In this speech, she recounts the history of the ERA and celebrates its many defeats. Included here is her twenty-nine-minute address delivered at Harvard Law School, which was followed by a forty-four-minute question-and-answer session. >

Schlafly: Well, that was indeed an interesting introduction. Good evening students and guests. Now that you've heard what some people think I said, I will be glad to let you know what I'm really going to say.

Coming here to visit with you here at Harvard tonight is a little bit of nostalgia for me. It is exactly forty years ago when I came as a student to Radcliffe. I was in the first class where women were not required to wear hats when they walked across the Harvard yard. That was a great break from previous traditions. However, the Harvard graduate school was fully co-ed at that time and I was in class and competed with all the men and my diploma was signed by the Harvard President. But that was indeed a long time ago.

I am very glad that the Harvard law school from which my husband graduated a number of years ago is a place that respects tolerance and academic inquiry. I came to talk about a Constitutional issue that has been debated very vigorously in this country for 12 years. It has had more than 100 votes in various legislatures or by the people on referendums. And yet, there has not been a critical treatment of this Constitutional issue in any important law journals anywhere except the Phyllis Schlafly report since the article written by Professor Paul Freund in the Harvard Civil

Liberty Civil Rights Law Review in 1971. It is positively amazing in that all those years of debate and discussion and votes in so many states that it was not addressed critically in the other journals which brings matters to the attention of scholars, law students, and the public. It is unlikely that there has ever been any issue in modern times where one side was so completely froze now in the scholarly journals, in the news media, and in the press. And yet, this has been despite the fact that this issue of the Equal Rights Amendment is an issue of fantastic effect and significance in the distribution of power in our county, in the military, in the marital contract, in state and federal relations. We wonder why it has been not discussed on the issues in so many areas where it, I think, should have been.

So let's start off with a brief history of the subject.

The Equal Rights Amendment was first introduced into Congress in 1923. It was born in the era of the Women's Suffrage Amendment. I'll recite it for you in case you don't know it by heart. It says "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." Section two says "Congress will have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article," and Section three has it go into effect within 2 years.

During the next approximately forty-five years, all those Congresses had the good judgment to leave this Amendment decently buried in the bottom drawer.

During the time when it emerged a little bit, it had attached to it an amendment known as the Hayden Clause which said nothing in this amendment will be construed to deprive women of any of the rights, benefits, or protections they now possess.

But in 1971, a group of women went down to Washington, two dozen women, and they lobbied up and down the halls of Congress and they convinced the Congressmen that now is the time the American people wanted the Equal Rights Amendment. And so Congress voted it out by overwhelmingly majority. Only twenty-three voted against it in the house; only nine voted against it in the Senate.

When it came out of the House Committee, it had attached to it something called the Wiggins Clause, which exempted the effect of ERA on the draft and women in combat. But that was taken out on the floor by the ERA advocates who wanted no exceptions and who did want women drafted and put into military combat. So they removed that clause.

When it went over to the Senate, nine amendments were proposed to exempt various effects of the ERA. The amendments were all defeated and the ERA was voted out in its strict and absolute language.

There followed a tremendous rush for ratification, accompanied by all kinds of strange maneuverings. For example, the Delaware Legislature in one House passed ERA even before it

was passed by the US Senate. Hawaii passed it within hours. Alaska passed it only in Section 1, apparently they must have done it by phone, they didn't hear about Sections 2 and 3. Some states passed it within ten minutes. It was passed very much like, in the body like this, somebody were to stand up and say "lets all give three cheers for the ladies," everybody but a clod would vote "Rah, Rah, Rah." And that's the way it went through the original legislatures. Within twelve months, of the dates that it came out of Congress, on March 27, 1972, it had passed 30 of the 38 legislatures that are needed for ratification.

In the succeeding four or five years, they got five more states, but five other states rescinded their previous action. Now the original ERA that came out of Congress had a preamble to it that gave it a seven-year time limit. It said the ERA would become part of the Constitution if ratified by thirty-eight state legislatures within seven years. And as they saw the end of the seven years coming, they knew they weren't going to get the thirty-eight states, and so they went back to Congress and got Congress to vote them an unprecedented extension, which, of course, was changing the terms of the original amendment. But, nevertheless, they passed it, and passed the extension by simple majority instead of by the two-thirds requirement for Constitutional amendments, and they got their additional three years. The three years gave them until June 30, 1982.

The ERA advocates devoted those last three years three to hammering away at the states where they thought they had the best chance to pass. In Illinois, the state legislature voted on ERA every year for ten years. The Florida legislature voted on it about nine years. State like North Carolina and Oklahoma voted on it at least 6 different years.

Illinois, in the Spring or 1982, became a sort of a three-ring circus as they attempted to push it through the legislature. On the first floor, we had the hunger strikers. One in a wheelchair, some occasionally being carried in on a stretcher as they were hoping by this hunger strike to intimidate legislators in voted for ERA. On the second floor, no, it was on the third floor, they had the chain gang, who chained themselves sometimes to the door of the governor's office and sometimes to the door of the Senate. At times, they would come in and lie down in front of the rostrum of the speaker, hoping that that would prevail on the legislators to vote yes. Then, one day, they came in with a plastic sack of blood that they had gotten from the butcher place and, it was pig's blood, and they wrote with it all over the marble floors, especially the names of the legislators they hated the most. Maybe some of them are here tonight, I don't know. And then this was also the state where one of the advocates offered the legislator a thousand dollar bribe to switch his vote from no to yes. She was ultimately convicted and the conviction was upheld on appeal. Well they didn't get it and it died on June 30, 1982.

And it appeared to arise again from the ashes after that. It was introduced again in the House with get fanfare in January of 1983. Speaker Tip O'Neill gave it his full support with the number HJRES1, and we were again told by all the press that it as going to pass. Speak O'Neill blurted up on the 15th of November last, and it failed.

Probably no issue has ever had so much power going behind it. They certainly had the full support of the President of the United States during the Ford and Carter administration. Under Jimmy Carter, they ran their campaign right out of the White House. They had most of the governors. I think its fair to say they had ninety-nine percent of the media in this country. But they couldn't sell it. And during this period of time, ERA was put on referendum quite a number of times. It was nearly always defeated and defeated rather massively as it was even in the state of NY, where it was defeated by 420,000 votes.

In the last six months of the ERA campaign in 1982, the advocates raised a great deal of money and they were spending a million dollars a month on television, targeted in the states where they thought it would do the most good. But they didn't have a product to sell. It is very difficult to sell something as an advantage for women when the first and most immediate effect is that eighteen year-old women would have to register for the military draft. I don't think that if you spent a million dollars a day on advertising you could sell that product. But at any rate, they spent their money and they did not win. The product that they were trying to sell, they were always unable able to show that it would do any good whatsoever for women.

Now the issue of the draft and the military combat was always a very core issue in this matter of ERA because that is the one area where you need a matter of total compulsion. A lot of other things that you don't like, in effect, you have a way to escape one way or another. But when it comes to the matter of the military draft, if you get your greeting from the President and you don't show up, you are liable to have a Federal Marshals come around and prosecute you for disobeyed the law. This is also an issue in which there was never any dispute about what the effect of ERA would be. All of the advocates over all these years have always admitted quite readily that, yes, women would be drafted equally with men; yes, ERA would require the draft registration of women; yes, women would be put into combat like men; yes, the Equal Rights Amendment would make unconstitutional the Male Only Draft Law and the law that excludes women from military combat.

And, so, by 1980, when the ERAers realized they were again running out of time and they weren't getting any more states. They apparently adopted the strategy that if they can just hurry up and draft women now, they would take away from us our best argument. So they sold Roselyn Carter the idea and she sold Jimmy Carter the idea who then (shout from audience) proposed in his State of the Union message in 1980 the equal draft registration of men and women. That was in his State of the Union message in 1980. Well, even his Democratic leadership in Congress would not go along with that. This idea was overwhelmingly defeated in both houses of Congress. But the advocates of ERA were not dissuaded. They participated in the lawsuit that found its way up to the Supreme Court, under the name of Rostker versus Goldberg. The National Organization for Women was among those who filed a brief in that case, claiming that the exemption of women from the draft made women second-class citizens and that service in the military would be a politically maturing experience. And so they the pleaded with the court to order the immediate draft registration of women just like men. They lost in June of 1981

when the Supreme Court upheld the Sex Discriminatory Male Draft Registration Act. And, it is clear that this would be overturned in ERA. All of the advocates of ERA have always admitted the effect in this area.

The effect in the area of abortion is another very interesting area. And in particular, the effect on abortion funding. Many of us have realized and talked about this effect since the very beginning of the debate in 1972. But rather uniformly, the advocates of the era tried to deny that there was any connection between ERA and abortion. When the Supreme Court upheld the Hyde Amendment in *Harris versus McRae* in 1980, some of them changed their tune. *Harris versus McRae* was the case that upheld the Hyde Amendment, which barred the spending of federal taxpayer funds to fund abortions. *Harris versus McRae* was upheld by 5 to 4. And in response to that, there apparently were some ERAers and abortionists who thought now is the time to go for abortion funding under the state ERA, and so the ACLU filed a brief in lawsuits in three states, Massachusetts, Hawaii, and Pennsylvania, making the argument that the state Equal Rights Amendments in those states required the spending of state tax funds for abortions, because wanted to get the abortions paid for with taxpayers money. Now how could they possibly argue that when state ERA obviously doesn't mention abortion? Here is their legal argument. Their argument is actually really simple: an abortion is a surgical procedure performed only on women. Therefore, if you deny tax funds for a medical procedure performed only on women, you have discriminated on account of sex within the meaning of the Equal Rights Amendment. It was not clear how for awhile what the court was going to decide, but just a few, weeks ago, a state court in Pennsylvania did buy that argument under the state Pennsylvania Equal Rights Amendment.

<Some audience clapping. >

So this has established the connection between ERA and abortion funding beyond a shadow of a doubt. There are a lot of other corroborative evidence, such as the opinion of the Supreme Court, the new shipbuilding case last year in which the court said that it is now clear that discrimination on account of pregnancy is by definition discrimination on account of sex.

<Some audience clapping. >

So, it is very obvious that this is the opinion of a large number of people and that that would be a major sect of the Equal Rights Amendment. Unfortunately, for the state of the ERA advocates, there is a clear, easy majority in Congress in favor of the Hyde Amendment and against taxpayer funding of abortion. And so that has what has created the stalemate at the present time.

Next, we take up the connection between ERA and gay rights. Now this connection was largely admitted by most of the lawyers speaking on the subject during the early years. For example, back in 1970, noted feminist lawyer Rita Howser gave a major speech to the American Bar Association in which she said that ERA would require us granting marriage licenses to homosexuals. In 1973, excuse the term, the Yale Law Journal published a review article in which

is took the same position that the Equal Rights Amendment would require the granting of marriage licenses to homosexuals. In 1972, Professor Paul Freund had testified before Senate Committee: if the law must be as undiscriminating in regard to sex as race, the laws outlawing same-sex marriages will become as invalid as the laws forbidding miscegenation. Barbara Babcock, who was the author of one of the major textbooks on sex discrimination used in law schools, said in her book published in 1975 that it is not clear what the effect of ERA would be in the homosexual area, but it was clear from the way she wrote it that she chose it, assuming that ERA would implement the gay rights agenda.

Then you have the connection between ERA and veterans. And again, this is an area that I've been talking about for many years, but was pretty much ignored in the good bit of the debate. We knew that the feminists were very much against veteran's preference because they brought the case—in the Massachusetts versus Feeney case—up in Supreme Court in an attempt to outlaw veteran's preference. But last year in the testimony before House Judiciary Committee, the president of the League of Women's Voters, who is a leading advocate of ERA, said flat out that ERA would overturn Massachusetts versus Feeney and make unconstitutional the veteran's preference laws. Again their argument is very similar to their legal theory about abortion. Anybody knows that female veterans get the same preference as male veterans, but that isn't their version of equality. Their argument is that since ninety-eight percent of veterans are male, it is sex discriminatory within the meaning of the Equal Rights Amendment to have veteran's preference because that discriminates against non-veteran females. Of course, under the present constitution they didn't win, but under ERA it would be a different story.

Then comes the matter of what does ERA do to schools. That is a very large area. As I'm sure you know, Title IX forbids discrimination in schools and colleges, except federal aid. However, there are a lot of exceptions in Title IX. They excepted all the single sex schools and colleges. There are about a hundred all female colleges, a few all male colleges, and probably thousands of single sex elementary and secondary schools. Title IX also exempts such things as fraternities, sororities, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, YMCAs, YWCAs, and so forth. It is pretty clear that under ERA, a constitutional rule would have no exceptions—would wipe out all the exceptions in Title IX. I don't think anybody could dispute that. Under *Runion versus McClary* I think it is pretty clear that the mandate to abolish sex discrimination in elementary and secondary schools would apply even where no federal aid was involved because there was no aid question involved in the *Runion* case.

And then last year came along the case called *Bob Jones University versus United States* and that has opened up a whole new can of worms in connection with ERA. What this does is to put in jeopardy a losing its income tax exemption every school that is operated by a church or synagogue which does not ordain women or which treats men and women differently. (some audience clapping) Again, it's clear that a lot of people want to do this. Now what the ruling was in the *Bob Jones* case was that we have a national mandate against race discrimination, therefore, any school that has any regulation whatsoever that is in violation or contradiction to the mandate

against race discrimination can have its tax exemption removed by Internal Revenue. The regulation incidentally in the Bob Jones case was a regulation about dating.

But in any event, I'm not disputing or criticizing the Bob Jones decision. I'm asking you to consider the application of the Bob Jones rule under ERA. If ERA means anything in this world, it would mean a national mandate against sex discrimination. I have heard many presidents of the American Bar Association testify that the legal impact of ERA would be to apply the same rules of sex that we now apply to race. So when you apply the Bob Jones ruling under ERA, you come up with the loss of tax exemptions for all the thousands of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish schools in this country that are operated by parent religious bodies that do not ordain women or which make a difference of treatment on account of sex. Now you may say it's a First Amendment problem, but Bob Jones University tried to invoke the First Amendment and they didn't get to first base with it. So I'm not saying that the churches will lose the tax exemption, I'm saying that the schools that are operated by the Churches would lose their tax exemptions.

Then you have the question, another terribly interesting question under ERA, which is the matter of insurance. And, in fact, unisex insurance has been one of the most interesting issues in the current Congress in Washington. Again, the ERA advocates formulated their game plan, they conjured up this idea of conspiracy of insurance companies standing in the way of passing the ERA, and they thought that if they can just make insurance unisex first then they would get ERA on a goose platter. So they proposed a bill to enforce unisex insurance, which I'm sure you see would have the same effect as ERA—which has no exceptions.

Now the funny thing about the notion of unisex insurance is that it would do nothing but cost women hundreds of dollars a year in additional automobile accident insurance premiums, every year, for which they wouldn't get a dime's worth of additional coverage. In addition, it would cost women a great deal more in terms of life insurance. Women pay less life insurance because they live longer. Women pay less automobile accident insurance because they're better drivers and they don't have as many accidents. The actuarial information on this is absolutely overwhelming; nobody could possibly deny it. Women would have to pay in some areas as much as nine hundred dollars a year more for automobile coverage than they pay now just for the joy of knowing, that at last they were equal to men. Well, this again was a pretty hard thing to sell, and they didn't make it.

On November the 9th, the House Judiciary Committee had its meeting in which they were going to vote out ERA. It was one of the most interesting days I ever spent. It lasted all day, from nine in the morning until about four-thirty in the afternoon. The various Congressmen proposed amendments to prevent ERA from having all of the effects that I've outlined here today. There were nine amendments proposed. Every one of them was defeated. But it was clear that the sponsors of ERA could not answer or dispute the effect or the possible effects. Their only answer was just trust the court. So all of the amendments failed, however, they all got at least twelve votes. It's well known in Washington that the Judiciary Committee is so liberal that anything that

gets a dozen votes there will pass on the House floor. So going out of that committee meeting that afternoon, Patricia Schroeder and Don Edwards ran to Tip O'Neill and said no way can we allow these amendments to be proposed on the House floor. And that is why Speaker O'Neill brought up ERA under "suspension of the rules," which forbade the offering of any amendment. This was completely unprecedented; no constitutional amendment in history has ever been brought up under "suspension of the rules" except one, which was totally non-controversial. And it failed, and it will always fail, because it is an insult to the constitutional process to tell us that we cannot address the sensitive, powerful issues which are important to people and for which the ERA advocates have not been able to provide any answer.

The Equal Rights Amendment has a past, but it doesn't have any future. And those casebooks of yours, which prematurely included it, will have to take it out in the next edition. Thank you.

APPENDIX D. SPEECH 4

Title: "Twentieth Anniversary of the Defeat of ERA – A Personal View from Phyllis's Kitchen,"
Eagle Council XXXI
Date: September 20, 2002
Location: Washington, DC
Format: Speech
Length: 85 minutes

Phyllis: This year, we are celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the second and final burial of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution. I receive a constant stream of calls from reporters and from students who were born too late to know about ERA and are curious as to why such a righteous-sounding Amendment was defeated. Some are reporters trying to cope with the latest press release from now, some are high school students participating in a debate, and some are college students writing a PhD dissertation. In this audience tonight are some who fought with me along the ten-year trail of defeating ERA, but every one of you can be proud that you are part of a movement that stood like the Rock of Gibraltar against ERA's massive attack on traditional values, on life, on marriage, on the family, and on the Constitution. It's so important for you to know the history of ERA so you can explain it to the next generation. They will never learn the truth from their social studies textbooks or from libraries, because they are filled with dozens of books by bitter feminists, while anti-feminist books are censored out. It's up to Eagle Forum members to make sure that the true history is recorded and told to young people.

Tonight I'm not going to give you a legal brief on what's wrong with ERA, or the complete history of how it was defeated in so many states by so many dedicated women, many of whom have already passed on to their eternal reward. That will have to wait until I write my book on ERA. Tonight I'm going to give you a personal view of what the battle looked like from my kitchen, taking you along the campaign trail I traveled for ten years in opposition to ERA. In the fall of 1971, my priority interest was the danger to America from the Soviet Union continuing to build what we now call weapons of mass destruction. I had written two books on the subject with Admiral Chester Ward, *The Gravediggers* and *Strikes from Space*, and in 1971 I was giving a speech all over the country entitled "Evidence of the Soviet Threat", setting forth the alarming facts about the growing Soviet superiority in missiles, megatonnage, and throw weight.

In December of 1971, I received a phone call from a woman I knew only as a purchaser of many copies of *A Choice Not an Echo*. She asked me to come and debate the Equal Rights Amendment in Darien, Connecticut at a library called The Source. I told her I didn't want to debate anything except the Soviet Threat and, anyway, I didn't know anything about ERA, and wasn't sure which side I'd be on. She replied, "I'll send you a packet of materials and I know which side you will be on."

She was right, and talked me into coming. When Ann Coulter published her bestselling book, *Slander*, this year, she revealed the coincidence that her brother was on the panel of high school students asking me questions on that memorable evening, December 8, 1971, in Darien, Connecticut, my first debate on ERA. I had started my *Phyllis Schlafly Report* in 1967, and sold subscriptions at five dollars a year. I used the research for my Connecticut debate to write my February 1972 *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, called “What’s Wrong with Equal Rights for Women?” I had been writing about nuclear missiles, but that *Report* was the missile that started our movement. The ERA was passed by Congress the next month on March 22, 1979. All news reporters infuriatingly and consistently called ERA the “Equal Rights for Women Amendment”, something to give “women” equal rights. Of course, ERA does not mention women; the word is “sex”.

< [Video clips] *The House today by the overwhelming vote of 354 to 23 passed a proposed constitutional amendment to guarantee equal rights for women. / In other news, in a historic decision, the Senate voted 84-8 to approve a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights to women. The proposal goes to the states for ratification.* >

Phyllis: And that’s the way it was from the start. A few weeks later I received an excited 8:00 a.m. phone call from Ann Patterson in Oklahoma who said, “Phyllis, we took your *Report* to the state capitol, and we defeated ERA. Then one of my *Choice Not an Echo* friends, Marjorie Thoreau in Illinois, started calling Phil Donohue, whose daily program originating in Dayton, Ohio was attracting a national following. She nagged and nagged his producer to invite an obscure housewife from a little river town in Illinois to balance the several feminists he had featured on his program. She finally succeeded, and I went to Dayton in April, where I shocked Donohue by making the first national frontal attack on the then-apparently-popular Women’s Liberation Movement.

< [Video clip] *Phil: Your daughter, then, is not going to be, sort of, trapped in a house.*

Phyllis: Well, the house isn’t trapping. Are you trying to tell me that it’s “liberation” for a woman to go out and sit at a typewriter all day, or stand at a factory machine all day, instead of being in her own home where she can plan her own hours? You know, Phil, the Army has some new ads, some new billboards, out around, and the big headline says the Army has openings for cooks, and then they show a man and a woman standing in front of a big stack of potatoes in an Army kitchen. Now you’re going to tell me it’s “liberation” for a woman to leave her nice kitchen, with her stove and her sink and her refrigerator that her ever-loving husband bought for her, and go out and cook in an army kitchen and peel potatoes under the direction of some sergeant (and perish the thought if the sergeant is a woman!), and you tell me that’s liberation? Why, that isn’t liberation; liberation is in the home. >

Phyllis: Well, you missed the punch line: the punch line was: “Perish the thought if a sergeant is a woman!”

Well, that show brought a ton of letters from women all over the country who were waiting for someone to refute the feminists. The Illinois State Legislature scheduled a House hearing for June 6. I felt too inadequate to testify about the U.S. Constitution, so I persuaded my attorney husband, Fred, to be our lead witness, and took a carload of my local Republican women friends to the state capitol to support him. Then I began to be invited to debate ERA. In August, I was on the *NBC Today* show with Barbara Walters; the interview ended with Barbara trying to shut me up with her hands, a memorable TV image that people laughed about all over the country. After that, I realized we needed organized resistance to the ERA steamroller; I invited one hundred women from thirty states to meet me in St. Louis on September 26, 1972. At the Airport Marriott Hotel, we spent all day developing arguments against the ERA; we adopted the name “Stop ERA”, and we selected our insignia, the stop sign. Then the one hundred women and I rode a bus down to the St. Louis riverfront, where we dined on the Golden Rod Showboat. After dinner, I climbed up on the stage where so many melodramas had been performed, just like in the famous musical *Showboat*, and I gave a speech on leadership. I didn’t just ask them to defeat ERA; I urged those girls—that’s what we called ourselves in those days—to go home and become leaders in the cause of good government, to set up a statewide committee to stop ERA, and, paraphrasing the title of my first book, to be a voice, not an echo. Then Anne McGraw sang one of my favorite songs, “Stout-Hearted Men”; little did we know that night how stout-hearted we would have to be over the next ten years.

Well, that was the start of a David and Goliath constitutional battle waged in state capitols across America. When Congress sent ERA to the states, it looked unstoppable. It had the “big mo”, that is, political momentum. It had such a good name; who could possibly oppose equal rights? Supporting the ERA were all members of Congress except eight in the Senate and twenty-three in the House, all the pushy, prominent women’s organizations, a consortium of thirty-five women’s magazines, numerous Hollywood celebrities, ninety-nine percent of the media, everybody who had pretensions to power in politics from left to right (that is, from Ted Kennedy to George Wallace), and three Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and Jimmy Carter.

< [Video clips] *President Nixon said today that he favors passage of the Equal Rights Amendment for Women. / The Equal Rights Amendment, which I wholeheartedly endorse, has not yet been ratified by the number of states necessary to make it a part of our Constitution. Let 1975, International Women’s Year, be the year that ERA is ratified. / Vice President Mondale today called the Florida state legislators at President Carter’s request urging support of the Equal Rights Amendment. It comes up for a senate vote there tomorrow. The National Organization for Women has threatened an economic boycott of Florida if ERA fails, that boycott to include persuading organizations to cancel conventions there. >*

Phyllis: But the unstoppable was stopped by the unflappable Stop ERA ladies in red. A little band of women headquartered in my kitchen on the bluffs of the Mississippi River in Alton, Illinois had fought and defeated all the big guns of modern politics. The first state that made

national ERA news was Arkansas, where a hearing was called in January 1973. Even though a majority of legislators were signed on as co-sponsors, friends urged me to fly to Little Rock and testify, and I did. ERA was derailed that day by the spontaneous reaction of Arkansas women.

< [Video clips] *One legislator got fifty letters in a day. The letters and calls came mostly from older, middle income, conservative women. Some were fearful that if the Amendment were passed, women would be drafted. Others imagined radicals were out to make men and women use the same public restrooms. A group from the south of the state chartered a bus to the capitol and made their protests in person. Aside from their specific fears, the women all seemed to share the general deep fear: this Amendment would somehow change their roles as women, and change what might now be expected of them.* >

Phyllis: After Arkansas, the calls for me to come to state capitols came fast and furious, and I started a frantic schedule to testify at one state capitol after another where I faced hearing rooms, usually packed with hostile feminists and bewildered state legislators. In February, 1973, I testified at hearings in Richmond, Virginia; Jefferson City, Missouri; Atlanta, Georgia; Raleigh, North Carolina; and Phoenix, Arizona. On the way back from Phoenix, I stopped off in Omaha to have breakfast with Nebraska legislators. The result was that Nebraska was the first state to rescind its ratification of ERA.

From there, I flew to Bismarck, North Dakota; then to Columbia, South Carolina, and then all the way out to Las Vegas, Nevada, where the legislators allowed me exactly four minutes to make my case. All that was in February.

What I did at those hearings was to lay down the strategy of how ERA should be debated. I argued that ERA was a fraud; it would give no benefits to women, but would instead take away legal rights that women then possessed, such as the right of an eighteen-year-old girl to be exempt from the military draft, and the right of a wife to be supported by her husband. We documented our arguments straight from the writings of the pro-ERA legal authorities: Yale Professor Thomas I. Emerson's one-hundred-page article in the *Yale Law Journal* and ACLU lawyer Ruth Bader Ginsburg's book, *Sex Bias in the U.S. Code*. The ERA-ers couldn't show any specific benefits to women, so they spent most of their time attacking me. We never criticized our opponents, but stuck strictly to the legal arguments. Another document we used was *Revolution: Tomorrow is Now*, a publication of the National Organization for Women that set forth NOW's radical pro-abortion and pro-lesbian goals. We reprinted this document and sold it to raise funds for Stop ERA. We told people to be sure and read both sides of the issue.

Then, I went to New York City to appear on the *Mike Douglas Show* against NOW President Wilma Scott Heide. Television in those days was very different; while television coverage was biased against us twenty-to-one, at least there were some programs where I could say a couple of sentences without being cut off. When Mike Douglas introduced me, he said, "Mrs. Schlafly, you have seven minutes to tell us what's wrong with ERA, and Ms. Heide will have the same."

Can you imagine Bill O'Reilly or Sean Hannity telling a guest, "You have seven minutes to answer?" Now the guest is lucky to get seven seconds without interruption.

My travels continued; I went twice to Columbus, Ohio, to testify at state legislative hearings, and twice more to Richmond, Virginia and to Charleston, West Virginia. I went to Nashville, Tennessee to testify for rescission. I made my first trip to Florida to debate a loudmouth feminist in Miami. I didn't need to go to Tallahassee because Shirley Spellerberg, who had figured out the evils of the ERA before I did, was effectively lobbying her legislators.

Meanwhile, a powerful pro-ERA push was building in Illinois that we had to deal with. Our little group, then headed by Kate Hoffman, had a brilliant idea; actually, the best idea of our whole ten-year campaign, the idea that the feminists would later call our "dirty trick". We decided to take a loaf of homemade bread to every one of our two hundred, thirty-six Illinois state legislators. We got women all over the state to bring their homemade bread to the motel across the street from the capitol. We borrowed a hotel laundry cart and wheeled it into the capitol and delivered the bread to each office. The next day I got worried that we might have missed a legislator, so I sent a letter to all of them to let me know if they didn't get a loaf. One Chicago representative wrote me right back and said, "You did miss me, and I want my bread. And furthermore, I want banana bread." So we made a special deal of taking him banana bread. He was a young bachelor who didn't care one way or the other about ERA, but he supported us ever after. I testified at two Illinois hearings that year, and ERA was defeated in both the Senate and the House. The pro-ERA-ers began to put me up against their heavyweights. On May 1, I drove to Bloomington, Illinois, to debate Betty Freidan at Illinois State University; that's the day when she famously said she'd like to "burn me at the stake". She said other things that are too indecent to tell in mixed company; since Freidan is not dumb, I assume her purpose was to taunt me into saying something stupid.

I made my first ERA trip to Alabama, where Eunie Smith arranged for me to do a televised debate with a then-prominent feminist, Sissy Farenthold. I did a TV debate with Congresswoman Martha Griffiths and with Pat Schroeder; they never denied my argument that ERA would draft women.

< [Video clip] Pat: *The point is that under the Equal Rights Amendment, Congress will no longer have the option; congress will be constitutionally required to draft women on the same basis as men.*

Host: Do you agree with that, Congresswoman Schroeder?

Pat: I agree that we have the power, and whether or not we will continue to use it depends on the state of emergency.

Host: Do you agree that you will have no option if the Equal Rights Amendment passes?

Pat: That's right, we'll have to put laws in that apply both to males and females equally, and that—

Phyllis: Do you want to draft women?

Pat: —and that you can only draft women for combat duty if they can perform the same functions, and men and women would have to be equal.

Host: Do you think that's desirable?

Pat: Yes, I think that's all right. >

Phyllis: Remember, in 1973 we were just emerging from the Vietnam War, and the draft was not very popular. Every September, we had another Eagle Council with various training sessions on tactics and media. Since we didn't have any paid staff, we rewarded our worthy workers with Eagle Awards. The year 1974 was more of the same; I traveled to testify at hearings in Augusta, Maine; Montpelier, Vermont, and again in Jefferson City, Missouri; again in Richmond, Virginia, and again in Charleston, West Virginia, and again in Springfield, Illinois. In between, we were making many drives to the Illinois State Capitol to lobby legislators. One of the many television debates I did that year was on Tom Snyder's *Tomorrow Show*. He wanted to stage a couple versus couple debate, and he had a really hard time digging up any pro-ERA leader who had a husband. The only one he could find was Brenda Feigen Fasteau, and we debated on national television.

< [Video clip] *Phyllis: The Equal Rights Amendment would impose a doctrinaire equality on men and women, and that's why we think it is a fraud because it will actually take away from women some of the important rights they now have by law. For example, it will take away women's right to be exempt from the draft and to be exempt from combat duty; it will take away the right of a wife to be supported by her husband in a home provided by her husband and her right to have her husband support her minor children. It will impose an equal obligation on the wife for the financial support of her family. In addition to that, it would wipe out all of the protective labor legislation on the books, which is very necessary and a benefit to working women who work in industry and do manual labor.*

Tom: All right, Mark; why the ERA, if ratified and put into law, will not put women in combat as suggested by Fred and Phyllis.

Mark: First of all, less than a fraction of one percent of men eligible for the draft ever get into what can be called "combat", to begin with. Secondly, the Amendment would require not that women, per se, be put in with men, per se, into combat, but that all physically-qualified persons be put into combat without regard to sex. Women are now required, if they want to get into the military, to be better qualified better educated—more character references and so on—and are thus deprived of the extensive and important GI benefits. I mean, they may not be important to

the people in your income category, but they are to an awful lot of people, and that's a way in which women suffer, I think.

Phyllis: Yet, here are some very important points; now, I can tell you that the lawyers for the Equal Rights Amendment are saying that the height and weight standards and physical requirements would have to be adjusted to reach a mean between men and women.

Mark: Which lawyers?

Phyllis: Well, such as Dr. Emerson of Yale, who's the leading legal "light" of the proponents; that's his claim in his article. And then, most women are larger than the most decorated man in World War II, Audie Murphy. I can tell you that at the Virginia

Brenda: Most women are larger?

Phyllis: Yes, larger than Audie Murphy?

Mark: But are they stronger?

Fred: He was only 120 pounds; he'd have to eat half a dozen bananas to make 125 pounds to get in the Army.

Phyllis: All right.

Fred: And he was the most decorated man in World War II, Audie Murphy. Five feet two.

Brenda: I don't think it's true that most women are larger than 125 pounds at this moment.

Phyllis: All right. Now, at the Virginia hearing, the legislators asked one of the proponents, "Couldn't we give the women—"

Tom: I was going to ask for a weight and height chart here, but I'm not going to do it.

Phyllis: —asked one of the proponents, "Couldn't we give the women the safe jobs and give the men the fighting jobs?" And she replied, "Oh, no, because that would discriminate against women and deprive them of their equal opportunity to win a Congressional Medal of Honor." Now, most Medal of Honor winners are dead. And it isn't true that only one percent go into combat; the latest Pentagon figures were that twenty-two percent were in combat in Vietnam. >

Phyllis: You can see how mad Brenda was! After the debate, she left her husband and went to live with her lesbian girlfriend.

1975 opened up with a bitterly cold trip to testify in Bismarck, North Dakota. I remember that hearing very well, because it was where I heard the one and only example of a state law that discriminated against women that ERA would remedy. In North Dakota, they had an old law still

on the books that said that wives could not make homemade wine without their husband's consent.

Then, I testified at another round of state legislative hearings in Carson City Nevada, twice more in Jefferson City, Missouri, and twice more in Springfield, Illinois. By this time, I was usually arranging to speak last so I could immediately refute the false arguments made by the ERA-ers. On Valentine's Day, I did an exciting debate on ERA before the entire Arkansas Legislature. That was the year when I decided to go to law school in my spare time, so I would be sure never to let our movement down by inaccurate statements.

Then came hearings in Columbia, South Carolina; Providence, Rhode Island; Denver, Colorado, and in Frankfort, Kentucky to urge rescission. At most of these hearings, I faced a room full of angry feminists. But one hearing was different; Austin, Texas was unforgettable because a friendly audience of thousands of women wearing pink dresses came out to support me. Meanwhile, the battle in Illinois was ongoing. I could sense we were falling behind. I would take a few carloads of women to Springfield to lobby every couple of weeks, but I could see we were not having enough of an impact. The odds were so great against us. We had small demonstrations in February, March, April, May, June; Illinois held another vote, and we won, but each vote was getting more scary. At that time, everyone in Illinois had one state senator, two state representatives of one party, and one state representative of the other party. That meant each constituent had to contact four representatives in Springfield. I prepared a flyer with four coupons with the names of the representatives and had five thousand copies printed separately for each district in Illinois. I loaded the immense stack of flyers in my station wagon, drove up the state, making stops all up Illinois, to give them to a Stop ERA-er who would get people to sign and mail them in. The mail then started to pour into Springfield.

In November, we had an unexpected boost to our morale; New York and New Jersey both had a referendum on adopting a state ERA and, contrary to all predictions, both liberal Northeastern states decisively rejected ERA.

1976 started with a trip to Pierre, South Dakota to rescind that state's ratification of ERA. The successful South Dakota rescission effort was brilliantly managed by Kitty Werthmann. In February, I led our women into doing something they had never done before, and they were very apprehensive about it. I led a small group of Stop ERA women to picket in front of the White House in Washington to protest Betty Ford's lobbying for ERA.

< [Video clip] *First Lady Betty Ford has been actively campaigning for the constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for women, even to the point of telephoning state legislators. About thirty-five pickets showed up at the White House today to protest her activity, but Mrs. Ford told reporters she's sticking to her guns.* >

Phyllis: A couple of our ladies told me later they confessed to their husband that they had done something that might have been immoral, but they did it for Phyllis and the cause. Then came

April 27, 1976: the day that changed the face of politics forever. Illinois was the frontline of the battle, the state the ERA-ers most wanted to get, and where they had all their big political guns on their side: the governor, the Senate and House leadership, and the media. I realize that our friends in the legislature were intimidated by the razzmatazz of celebrities and media and money and aggressive feminists and, furthermore, they didn't really believe that our side was in significant numbers to matter. Up until that time, ERA had been held back by just a handful of people consisting of a few dozen Republican women who had gone to Washington with me in 1967 to try to elect me president of the National Federation of Republican Women, the local representatives of the National Council of Catholic Women, and one brave Orthodox Jewish rabbi in Chicago. I decided we had to have an event to convince the legislators we were real, and that there were lots of us. I dreamed we could bring a thousand people to our state capitol to rally against ERA, something that had never before happened in our state. Where could we find more troops? Only one place: the churches. So we sent out the message to all the churches: all the Protestants and Evangelicals, the Catholics, the Mormons. The essential player in that first big rally was Eagle Forum's original first vice president, Tottie Ellis, and her husband Carol, a professor in a Church of Christ seminary in Tennessee, who telephoned his ex-students living in Illinois and told them to come to our rally.

And a thousand people came from all over the state, many riding on buses with signs that read "Joy" and "Jesus Saves". Many carried babies in their arms; we had homemade signs galore. Those were my singing days, and I sang a parody I wrote called "Bella's Bunch." We hand-delivered our homemade bread to all the offices. Somehow, I can't find any press photos to show you of that landmark event, but that thrilling Stop ERA rally in Springfield completely changed politics. That was the day that Eagle Forum invented the pro-family movement, and we all know how it has grown to become a mighty national force. That momentous day in Springfield, Illinois was a coming together of believers of all denominations, many of whom had never been together before, but whom we persuaded to work together for a political goal we shared; namely, protection of the traditional rights of wives, of eighteen-year-old girls, of marriage and the family, and of the Constitution itself against the radical feminists and their destructive push for a gender-neutral society. That rally morphed our little Stop ERA committee into a mighty movement that the legislators had to deal with.

The ERA-ers, led by NOW, decided they had to respond with a rally of their own, which they staged three weeks later. Indeed, they did put on a big rally, but we were ready for them. We arranged for an airplane to buzz overhead carrying a streamer that read: "Illinois women oppose ERA. Libbers go home". We hired two photographers to take pictures of their rally, which I then published in the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*. A picture tells a thousand words, and those pictures proved that their ranks were filled with lesbians, abortionists, Socialist Worker Party activists, and other unkempt radicals. Illinois was not the only state where ERA-ers displayed their radical streaks. **Lee Wei Song** will remember how twenty ERA-ers paraded into the Georgia State Capitol in Atlanta dressed in purple pantsuits and wearing bus driver caps that said "Gay and

proud of it". We were also helped in Virginia when the ERA-ers spit on the Speaker of the House, staged a sit-down at the state capitol in Richmond, and had to be carried out by police.

< [Video clip] *The deadline for ratification is March 22, 1979—little more than a year away—and the amendment is still three states short of the necessary thirty-eight. As time grows short, the fight has become increasingly bitter. ERA supporters were arrested after they protested defeat in the committee of the Virginia Legislature.* >

Phyllis: The rest of 1976 was taken up with more debates with leading feminists. Over the ten years, I debated every feminist you ever heard of with the exception of Gloria Steinem, who consistently refused to debate me. I debated every president of NOW, Karen DeCrow fifty times, Eleanor Smeal I've lost track of how many times, Patricia Ireland; other the feminists I tangled with include Bella Abzug, Betty Freidan, federal bureaucrat Catherine East, congressional sponsors of ERA Martha Griffiths in the House and Birch Bayh in the Senate, Mrs. Birch Bayh, Jill Ruckelshaus, Barbara Mikulski, Melissa Fenwick, Joyce Brothers, Maureen Reagan, and Sarah Weddington of *Roe v. Wade* fame over fifty times.

1976 was the year when I started my long series of college speeches and debates, which now number more than five hundred. In 1977 the hearings started all over again, and I resumed my travels. The ERA-ers forced all the states that had rejected ERA to go through the process again and again, with more hearings and more votes. I testified in Indianapolis, Indiana; Atlanta, Georgia; Topeka, Kansas; and Little Rock, Arkansas. In February I led a picket line in front of the White House to protest Rosalynn Carter lobbying for ERA.

< [Video clip] *Rosalynn: Time is running out, and we, we just have to get the Equal Rights Amendment ratified; it's too important to just let it drift away.* >

Phyllis: That time, the demonstration was a lot of fun, and nobody had any regrets. Our spirits were lifted when Nevada defeated ERA on a statewide referendum in February. Thank you, Janine Hansen. We had a big stop ERA rally in Raleigh, North Carolina, where the famous Watergate Senator Sam Ervin joined me on the platform. And in March, we had another thousand-person Stop ERA rally in Springfield, and the Illinois House voted again to reject ERA. In March, I went to testify again in Columbia, South Carolina, and Vivian Rice will remember this big rally on the capitol steps.

< [Video clip] *Today is the fifth anniversary of ERA's passage by Congress, and so far thirty-five states have ratified it. Three more are needed to make it part of the constitution. Bill Worden has more from Columbia, South Carolina.*

Bill: It is not a happy birthday for ERA; the motion here in South Carolina is running strongly against it, as it is in all other southern states. When the state Senate began public hearings today, Stop ERA forces stopped off a long campaign with a rally on the capitol steps. The national chairman of Stop ERA, Phyllis Schlafly, believes it should never have come this far.

Phyllis: The Equal Rights Amendment would be dead today if it were not for the massive federal spending and White House interference that is trying to cram ERA down our throats. >

Phyllis: In April, we had just as exciting a rally in Tallahassee, led by Shirley Spellerberg, who turned out twenty-five hundred people, but ten ERA-ers standing on the other side of the capitol got all the media coverage.

In April, I went to New York City to receive a reward from the Women's National Republican Club at the Waldorf Astoria; that was the day that the ERA-ers hired a professional pie thrower to hit me in the face with an apple pie.

The Illinois activities went on and on. In April, I had to testify again in Springfield, and we had more rallies. That year, we had an apple pie day, taking a homemade apple pie to all two hundred, thirty-six legislators. That was an exhausting undertaking, but we had to show them that we're "for Mom and apple pie".

In the fall of 1977, our cause looked hopeless. The ERA campaign was run right out of Jimmy Carter's White House in what is called the War Room. Carter's daughter invited legislators in key states to come to the White House to be schmoozed for ERA. I remember one brave Democratic state legislator from Miami who was invited twice to the White House to be lobbied by Carter's daughter to switch from "no" to "yes". That's heavy stuff; a lot of people would do most anything for a White House invitation. But he stood firm, and when the libs realized they couldn't get him to switch, they turned on him viciously. They filled his mail with every kind of obscenity, including a lot of disgusting items I can't even describe to this audience. But he never switched.

In 1977, the ERA-ers knew they needed reinforcements so, like typical liberals, they went to the government for help. They got Congress to appropriate \$5 million for a tax-funded lobby for ERA called International Women's Year, known as IWY. A convention in each of the fifty states elected delegates to go to Houston in November 1977. No opponent of ERA was permitted to speak from the platform in any of those fifty tax-funded meetings or the national convention. The elections were full of fraud and shenanigans to ensure that the feminists had a decisive majority of delegates.

The International Women's Year Convention opened in Houston with Bella Abzug as chairman and three First Ladies sitting with her on the platform: Rosalynn Carter, Betty Ford, and "Lady Bird" Johnson. Among the delegates was every feminist you ever heard of, and they set forth their demands, telling the world what women want, starting with ratification of ERA. Three thousand media people were on hand to give them massive publicity, with wall-to-wall television coverage for their hot button issues: ERA, abortion, and gay rights. Thanks to public television coverage, you have a close up look at the feminists.

< [Video clip] *Madam Chairperson, I move the adoption of the following resolutions: the Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified. / I would like to ask this body to give the most resounding and urgent vote demanding the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment within the coming year! Because, otherwise, the enormous expenditure of energy and money and effort that has brought us to this point will be in vain, and these ten years of movement will be in vain. / There is only one thing, get used to this word, and that is Equal Rights Amendment. Everyone stand up and vote yes. / The question arises on the adoption of the resolution: all those in favor would you please rise. / Snake dance through the hall [background chanting] ERA! ERA! / We support the U.S. Supreme Court decisions, which guarantee reproductive freedom to women / The resolution on reproductive freedom is adopted. / Madam Chair, I move the following resolution on sexual preference. Congress, state, and local legislatures should enact legislation to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sexual and affection preference in areas including, but not limited to, employment, housing, public accommodations, credit, public facilities, government funding in the military. This is a feminist issue because discrimination against woman begins at the basis of sexuality. There are double standards: one standard for males, another for females; one standard for heterosexuals, another for homosexuals. And all these double standards in the issue of sexuality work to keep women in their place. Human rights are indivisible, and all women, when we march together in equality, we will march as heterosexuals and homosexuals, minority women and majority women, rich and poor; we will all go together as full human beings. >*

Phyllis: A couple of months later, a reporter asked the governor of Missouri, “Governor, are you for ERA?” He replied, “Do you mean the old ERA, or the new ERA? I was for equal pay for equal work, but after those women went down to Houston and got tangled up with the abortionists and the lesbians, I can tell you ERA will never pass in Missouri.”

The governor was right; IWY was the turning point in the battle over ERA. By the time IWY was over, we had the proof that the ERA agenda includes tax-funded abortions and gay rights. Since IWY in Houston in 1977, ERA has been voted on about twenty-five times in state legislatures, in committees, in Congress, and in several statewide referenda, and it has never had another victory. The reason I’m telling you this story tonight is that you and I have to make sure that it stays that way.

But the media didn’t show the worst of the IWY. Even worse were the displays at the booths in the halls where you could pick up booklets on what lesbians do. These pictures give you a real flavor of the kind of people who attended this feminist convention. These pictures somehow never made it onto the network news, and much of it is too obscene to talk about. One of the official IWY publications was called *A Lesbian Guide*. The most popular buttons worn by these delegates were “A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle”, and “Mother Nature is a lesbian”. We in Eagle Forum originally called ourselves the “alternative to Women’s Lib”. We knew we had to make the country know that these radicals and lesbians did not speak for women. To counteract this tax-funded IWY atrocity, our Eagle Forum board took another hall in Houston across town called the Astro Arena, and simultaneously set out to urge pro-family men and

women to come at their own expense. Lottie Beth Hobbs gave us the name “Pro-Family Rally”, and the name stuck. November 19, 1977 was the day the expression “pro-family movement” came into the political vocabulary. Looking back, I don’t know how La Niel Spivy had the nerve to contract for a hall that seated fifteen thousand people; we didn’t have taxpayers’ money to pay travel expenses, and Houston isn’t exactly centrally located. But we knew we had to make a statement against ERA. Shirley Curry went to churches and motivated women to ride twenty hours on a bus, come to our Pro-Family Rally, and then return on the bus without ever going to bed. And the buses came and came and came. It was thrilling to see the thousands of people arriving. We filled the Astro Arena to overflowing. They rode hours and hours on the bus and never went to bed, came to our rally, and rode home again. The *Houston Post* reported that we had an attendance of twenty thousand people in a hall that was built to hold only fifteen thousand. We looked a bit different from the other crowd. I remember Bob Dornan standing on the platform with me and saying, “Look at those exit doors crammed body-to-body with people. The fire marshal must have gone home and figured that God will protect this crowd.”

< [Video clip] *Phyllis: In order to have held the line for the last five years against the tremendous odds of White House lobbying, federal government expenditures, prominent people, and big money, we had to have somebody on our side who was more powerful than the President of the United States.* >

Phyllis: Of course, our rally didn’t get much media coverage, but the publicity the ERA-ers got for their tax-funded IWY showed the world that they are a bunch of anti-family radicals and lesbians who want big brother government to solve their personal problems. IWY media coverage dealt a body blow to the feminist movement.

In 1978, the battle in Illinois heated up even more. We had rallies and demonstrations every month, more speeches, more debates. By now I was carrying my bullhorn to give directions to the crowd. I kept sending out what people called “Phyllis’s rotunda letters”—meet me in the rotunda of the Illinois State Capitol on Wednesday at 10:00. And we kept thinking of different ways to publicize our message. One day, a preacher rented a monkey suit and joined our demonstration, walking around with a sign that said, “Don’t monkey with the Constitution”. He almost lost his church over that. But we got good press, and there were more votes and we won them all narrowly.

On June 19, we had another huge, noisy Stop Era rally at the capitol in Springfield. That was the day I carried the two-step ladder I use in my kitchen to get into my top cabinets, planted it in the center of the rotunda, climbed up on it, and accused President Jimmy Carter of calling Chicago legislators to force them to vote for ERA by threatening a cutoff of federal funds. Some of my friends were nervous about that accusation, but nobody ever denied the truth of it. We then won another narrow victory.

It was not just in Illinois that the Carter Administration was trying to pressure legislators to vote for ERA; he did it in Florida too.

< [Video clip] *Yes, I've had a letter from the President of the United States; this morning, I had a talk with Vice President Mondale. Weather's fine in Washington; does that cause pressure? It may cause for some, but it doesn't for me. / Lewis voted no.* >

Phyllis: All our Illinois votes were by fewer than five-vote margins, some just one- or two-vote margins. We always had to win with a changing mix of conservative and liberal representatives, conservative and liberal Democrats, downstate rural guys, Chicago machine Democrats, and the guys who voted yes but secretly lined up others to vote no. One of our best friends was the AFL-CIO spokesman in our legislature, whose arguments were very different from mine. I remember how I cringed the day he called the ERA-ers “a bunch of brainless, bra-less broads”.

The one who kept all these politicians in line was Kathleen Sullivan. We could not have won in Illinois without her extraordinary political smarts. She was somehow able to manage all those different factions in the Illinois legislature.

In 1978, I went to Salt Lake City to meet with the VIPs in the Mormon Church, including Barbara Smith. The help of the Mormons was essential to our cause. I didn't actually meet with Mormon President Ezra Taft Benson, but he sent me letters of support and encouragement.

When ERA was voted out of Congress in March 1972, it was given the specific deadline of seven years. In 1978, the feminists woke up to the fact that they might not get their thirty-eight states by the deadline of March 22, 1979, so they devised a plan to get Congress to vote a time extension. I went to Washington to testify against this and spent all summer lobbying members of Congress. In September, we had a lobby day, and hundreds of members of Eagle Forum came to Washington to lobby against the extension. Public opinion was opposed to this unfair time extension. Political cartoonists had a field day, calling it “three extra innings in a ballgame that was not tied up”. But we lost. The crooked extension passed the Senate on October 6. The extension was the most peculiar time period in any piece of legislation in history. Congress gave ERA an additional three years, three months, eight days, and seven hours—just long enough to catch the Illinois legislatures' mandatory adjournment on April 30, 1982. So Illinois actually had to vote every year for 11 years.

It was a raucous day at the U.S. Capitol. After the vote, Ted Kennedy led the feminists out on the grass outside the Capitol, and to the cheering crowd of obnoxious feminists he cried out, “Phyllis Schlafly, where are you now?”

< [Video clip] *Ah, Phyllis Schlafly, where are you now?* >

Phyllis: That wasn't really Kennedy's voice; that was Bob Dornan mimicking Kennedy.

The feminists were convinced that the three years would give them plenty of time, and we would be so demoralized by the extension that we would give up. Not on your life; the next Eagle Council, we determined to press on. And at the end of 1978, I received my law degree.

In 1979, we started the same routine all over again. I had to testify again before the Illinois House and Senate Committees and we won again; we also kept rescission efforts alive; I even went to Dover, Delaware. The original seven-year deadline set by Congress for ERA was March 22, 1979. We considered that date the constitutional termination of ERA, and we decided to have a party proclaiming that we had won, that ERA was dead constitutionally. It took a lot of nerve to do that, because the crooked extension had already passed. Would anybody come to our party? Well, one thousand, five hundred did. We packed the ballroom of the Shoreham Hotel in Washington for our gala to celebrate what we called “the end of ERA”. Those who were there will never forget that evening. In the middle of our program, the hotel manager came to the platform to announce that he had received a bomb threat and we would have to evacuate. Fifteen hundred people trooped out of the ballroom, went to the restroom and, after the dog sniffed out the place, amazingly, fifteen hundred people returned for the rest of the program. We made fun of the women’s libbers and sung some cute parodies that I wrote for the occasion.

For me, the most memorable part of that first burial of ERA was the hostility of reporters at my news conference, whose attitude was, “How *dare* you say you’ve won? How *dare* you say ERA is dead? You haven’t won! You’re not supposed to win, and you’re not going to win. Era *will* become part of the U.S. Constitution.” They repeated the chant of the ERA-ers: Failure is impossible.

< [Video clip] *We will not fail; we did not get in this fight to lose, and we do not intend to lose. We will ratify the Equal Rights Amendment for the United States of America.* >

The title of our gala, “The End of ERA”, was a double play on words. We knew it wasn’t really the end of ERA because the extension loomed ahead of us. But it was the end of an era, the era of conservative defeats. In the 1960s and ‘70s, conservatives were so used to losing all their political and legislative battles that they never even contemplated the possibility of winning. When we proclaimed that we had beaten ERA, we taught conservatives the lesson that it is possible to win after all. 1979 was truly the end of the era of conservative defeats. One year later, conservatives won a smashing victory with the election of Ronald Reagan as President and a Republican Senate. In 1980, the ERA-ers realized they hadn’t won a single state since the extension passed; indeed, since IWY in Houston. They realized what a powerful argument we had in stating that ERA would require the drafting of eighteen-year-old girls. So they devised a two-part plan of action to take this argument away from us. Part one was to get President Carter to propose drafting women immediately; part two was to support a lawsuit to get the U.S. Supreme Court to rule that exempting women was sex-discriminatory under the present Constitution.

Now it would be nice to think that we defeated ERA because we were smarter than the feminists, but sometimes I have to admit that it might have been because they were so dumb. You can imagine that Carter's announcement opened up dozens of interviews for me to tell people what a terrible idea that was. All during January, February, March, and April, I gave a steady stream of interviews and news conferences on Carter's plan to draft women. Congress even held the hearing on it. I gave speeches in Chicago, Washington; Columbia, South Carolina; Greensborough, North Carolina; Michigan, Mississippi, and Kansas. Finally, Speaker Tip O'Neill had to tell Carter it was a dumb idea.

On April 30, I had to testify again in Illinois. To combine this with a demonstration, we organized fifty-nine draft-age girls to come to the hearing, one from each legislative district. The feminists were so nasty to those girls; the ERA-ers tried physically to bar those darling eighteen-year-old girls from entering the hearing room and to make their life miserable after they came in. Just recently, I ran into a beautiful young woman who said to me, "Mrs. Schlafly, I was one of your draft-age girls in Springfield back in 1980." I said, "You remember how ugly they were to all of us?" She said, "Yes; they spit on me."

The ERA-ers had their biggest rally in May in Chicago led by Bella Abzug, Phil Donohue, and Marlo Thomas. But we matched them the following day on May 11, 1980, when the Baptists came out in force to support our cause. We had another memorable, thrilling Stop ERA rally at the state capitol in Springfield, and with the Baptists swelling our ranks, we had a body count of twelve thousand people on the steps of the Illinois Capitol building. Our California Eagles, of course, had been bypassed by the whole ERA fight because California ratified early and never really debated ERA, so they held a fundraiser for us at Disney Land. The next day was important. I met with Ronald Reagan in his Los Angeles office, and he promised me he would never support ERA. He also promised me that he would never appoint Henry Kissinger to any office, and Reagan kept both promises after he became President.

Over the ten-year period, the Illinois state legislature voted a couple of dozen times on ERA and on the rules to bring it to the floor. The most dramatic and decisive vote came on June 18, 1980. NOW President Eleanor Smeal had been practically living at the capitol for a month, and tension was very high. She announced she had the votes to pass ERA, so all the national media showed up in Springfield with their TV cameras. President Jimmy Carter was telephoning Democratic legislators and promising them federal housing projects in their districts if they would vote yes on ERA. Governor James Thompson was phoning Republican legislators and promising them dams, roads, and bridges in their district for a "yes" vote. Mayor Jane Byrne was phoning Chicago legislators and forcing them to vote yes under threat of firing them and their relatives from their city patronage jobs. Democratic legislators who were beholden to the Chicago machine wept openly as they apologized to me for having to vote yes so their relatives wouldn't lose their jobs. Cash bribes were flowing and the media were gloating. Our own vote count showed that we were a couple of votes short, and we were worried. The House debated all afternoon. It was a very dramatic few moments as the votes climbed electronically on the board

in front of the House chamber, and then a great shout went up as it became clear we had defeated ERA again. The feminists needed one hundred and seven votes, and they got only one hundred and two.

I was standing in the gallery of the Illinois House when *ABC Nightline* sat Eleanor Smeal in front of the camera and said, “Mrs. Smeal, you said you had the votes. What happened?” She replied, “There is something very powerful against us, and it’s certainly isn’t people.” Smeal didn’t know what the power was, but we knew: prayer, and the truth. We had done all we could, and the Lord brought us two votes from Chicago legislators who had never voted our way before.

The following month, I went to Detroit for the 1980 Republican National Convention. Support for ERA had been part of the Republican Platform for many years. We tried to take ERA out of the Platform at the 1976 Convention, but we failed. In 1980, it was do-or-die because we didn’t want Ronald Reagan to be embarrassed by having to defend a Platform plank in favor of ERA. The media made ERA the hot Convention issue, covering everything the feminists said and did, such as the street demonstration led by Congresswoman Margaret Heckler and the threats of the Michigan governor.

< [Video clip] *Michigan Governor William Milliken: It would be a serious mistake to abandon this Party’s support of the Equal Rights Amendment. If we repudiate our 1976 position, then we would be repudiated by a large segment of America’s population, and deservedly so.* >

Phyllis: That was 1980, remember. While the ERA-ers were prancing around in front of the TV cameras, we were working quietly in Committee. We had a big victory when the Platform Subcommittee voted to take ERA out of the Platform and got ready to adjourn about 6:00 p.m. Some of our Subcommittee votes were Eagles who had gotten themselves on the Committee, but some others were very flaky, and I knew the pressure would be intense to get them to renege before morning. I rushed out in the hall and found an old friend who knew his way around town, Jimmy Lyons of Houston. I said, “Jimmy, don’t you have some exchange privileges at a club in Detroit where I can take the Subcommittee to dinner?” He said, “I don’t know, but let me make a call.”

He disappeared into a phone booth and came out a few minutes later with the good news that he had set us up for dinner at the Detroit Athletic Club. I took the whole hungry Subcommittee to the club and wine and dined them all evening. Nobody knew where we were; nobody could reach us by phone. Thank goodness we were in the pre-cell phone era! I learned later that Platform Committee Chairman John Tower spent all evening trying to contact Subcommittee members one by one but never reached anybody.

The full Platform Committee met at 9:00 a.m. the next morning and approved the deletion of ERA by the stunning vote of 90-9. That was the end of Republican Platform support of ERA.

In 1981, the most important things that happened were two court cases, and we won both of them. The U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case brought by the feminists and the ACLU to force the military draft to be sex-neutral. The Court ruled in *Roster v. Goldberg* that it is perfectly constitutional for our government to draft men and not women. This was a tremendous victory for girls and for society and for our campaign to stop ERA because it was clear that if ERA were in the constitution, the result would have been the opposite. The other court case involved two issues: whether the crooked time extension voted by Congress to give ERA three extra years was constitutional, and whether the rescissions of ERA by five state legislatures were constitutional. The case was tried in federal district court in Idaho, one of the five rescinding states. The others were Nebraska, Tennessee, Kentucky, and South Dakota. A wonderful judge in Boise gave us a Christmas present on December 23, ruling that the time extension was illegal because it attempted to change the rules in the middle of the game, and that it is constitutional and okay for a state to change its mind and rescind, so long as it is before an amendment is locked into the Constitution by three-fourths of the states. The ERA-ers appealed this decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, which sat on the case until after the extension time expired in 1982, and then issued a ruling stating that the Court didn't have to decide those issues because ERA was dead regardless of whether it died in 1979 or 1982.

When 1982 opened, everybody sensed we were running the last lap of the race. The ERA-ers announced they had raised \$15 million for a television blitz in key states with celebrity endorsements. We knew we would have close votes, and pitched battles in the four most hard-fought states. We knew we had done everything humanly possibly, and we just had to count on the good Lord to do his part too. That's why we had the nerve to plan our second burial of ERA when the time extension ran out on June 30th.

On January 19th, Oklahoma defeated ERA for the last time, 27-21. On June 4, North Carolina defeated ERA for the last time, 27-23. The pro-ERA-ers then sent bags of chicken droppings to the twenty-three senators who voted no in North Carolina. On June 21st, Florida defeated ERA for the last time, 23-17. Thank you Shirley. The knock-down, drag-out pitched battle was in Illinois. Throughout the spring, we had to keep facing more ERA votes on procedure and rules, and we kept winning. The ERA-ers were getting desperate. In April, the ex-communicated Mormon Sonia Johnson started a hunger strike on the first floor of our state capitol. When the press came to me for a comment, I said I thought that was a good idea, since most of them ought to go on a diet. But after a couple of days, it wasn't funny anymore. The air in the state capitol was so tense you could cut it with a knife. We began to be afraid there might be some kind of collapse or accident, and that a motion would bring about passage. In May, a "chain gang" of pro-ERA-ers chained themselves to the door of the Senate chamber on the third floor. They stayed for weeks; the state police never removed them. Take a good look at them.

On May 4, we had one more big Stop ERA rally in Springfield, when we had speeches, songs, and delivered our famous homemade bread to every legislator. On June 8, I gave my testimony on ERA to a state legislative hearing for the forty-first time. This time it was in the House

chamber with the TV lights glaring. Again, I rebutted the pro-ERA-ers arguments. This time, my eighteen-year-old daughter Anne was our star speaker against the draft. She told how she didn't want to be forced into the Army because, when growing up, her big brothers used to have fun tying her up, and she just wasn't physically strong enough to tie them up.

The next day, we had another rule thrown. Things got progressively tenser and uglier at the state capitol. On June 25, ERA supporters went to the local slaughterhouse, bought plastic bags of pig's blood, and came back and wrote on our capitol's marble floors the names of the legislators they hated the most. Legislators found these tactics not persuasive, and Illinois voted down ERA one final time. On June 30, 1982, fifteen hundred battle-weary-but-triumphant Stop ERA volunteers gathered again in the ballroom of the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, DC, to savor our victory that the Equal Rights Amendment would die at midnight. A giant rainbow made of balloons rose high over the dais, and many political prestiges from President Reagan on down paid tribute. The heroes of the day were the women who came from the fifteen states that never ratified ERA, plus the five states that bravely rescinded their previous ratifications.

In the middle of the program, the hotel security guard rushed up to MC Bob Dornan to report that the hotel had received a phone call that a bomb had been placed in the ballroom. I made the decision to ignore the threat and not evacuate because, anticipating that a bomb threat would be the feminists last tacky insult, I had arranged for the police dogs to sniff out the room beforehand and secure it.

< [Video clips] *Phyllis: We have the people with the strength of character, and this battle we have waged has proved it. Thank you for being here.* >

Phyllis: The evening closed with Bill and Prudence Fields singing the appropriate themes for our gala celebration: "The Impossible Dream" and "Great Day". And our most favorite Eagle Forum singers, the talented and wonderful Christian couple Bill and Prudence Fields, are now going to give us a repeat performance of those songs.

APPENDIX E. SPEECH 5

Title: "Doing the Impossible: Defeating the Equal Rights Amendment"

Date: March 2, 2007

Location: Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Format: Speech

Length: 43 minutes, 12 seconds

Phyllis's Speech Time: 37 seconds – 43:30

Thank you wonderful friends for being here tonight.

I consider it a great honor to be part of Dr. Kennedy's Conference. I have admired him and been his friend since we were together on the public platform in the exciting year of 1980. And it is great that you are caring on his work. Thank you for being here.

Tonight we're going to talk about a little bit of history. Doing the impossible: defeating the equal rights amendment. It's been about 25 years since we celebrated the final burial of the Equal Rights Amendment, known as ERA.

The proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution that was advertised as a great benefit to women. Something that would rescue women from second-class citizenship. And for the first time, put *women* into the constitution. The ERA was passionately debated across America from 1972 to 1982. And then, the ERA was rejected by the American people. And the big lesson we learned from this is that in the marvelous process of self-government by given to us by our founding fathers, it *is* possible for the people to defeat the entire political and media establishment. And to win despite incredible odds.

ERA passed Congress with only 23 out of 435 members of the House voting no. And passed the Senate with only eight out of 100 Senators voting no. And then it was sent out to the states on March 22, 1972. Within the first 12 months it was ratified in 30 states, and under our constitution they only needed eight more.

ERA has such a righteous name. Who could possibly oppose equal rights? And supporting ERA were all those who had pretensions to political power, from left to right, from Ted Kennedy to George Wallace, and three presidents of the United States Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and Jimmy Carter

< [Video clips] *President Nixon said today that he favors passage of the Equal Rights Amendment for Women. / The Equal Rights Amendment, which I wholeheartedly endorse, has not yet been ratified by the number of states necessary to make it a part of our Constitution. / We will not fail. We did not get in this fight to lose and we do not intend to lose. We will ratify the Equal Rights Amendment for the United States of America.* >

ERA was actively supported by most of the pushy women's organizations, a consortium of 33 women's magazine, numerous Hollywood celebrities, and 99 percent of the media. But a little band of unflappable stop ERA ladies in red had cornered in my kitchen on the bluffs of the Mississippi River in Alton, Illinois, sent out to challenge all the big guns of modern politics.

We had no big names on our side. No presidents. No Governors. The Governors of North Carolina and Florida publicly demonstrated against us. There was only one lone senator of 100 who was willing to speak out against ERA, Watergate Senator Sam Mervyns. And only three House members out of 435 dared to say a good word for our cause: Henry Hyde, George Hanson, and Bob Dornam. None of the conservative magazines, journalists, and columnists we read today wrote helpful articles. We didn't have any friendly TV, radio, or talkshow host. Everyone was hostile. There was no Rush Limbaugh talking about the feminazis. There was no FOXNews to give balanced news and let the audience decide. There wasn't any no spin zone. From the gecko, we had to fight the semantics and the momentum.

Now ERA does not mention women. ERA calls for equality of rights on account of *sex*. Yet all of the reporters consistently called the ERA the equal rights for *women* amendment. Something to give *women* equal rights.

< [Video clips] *The House today by the overwhelming vote of 354 to 23 passed a proposed constitutional amendment to guarantee equal rights for women. / In other news, in a historic decision, the Senate voted 84-8 today to approve a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights to women. The proposal goes to the states for ratification.* >

Well, as Walter Cronkite would've said, that's the way it was.

Well, to get around big media, we didn't have any Internet, we didn't have fax machines. We only have the telephone and The Phyllis Schlafly Report. And our campaign was started with the February 1972 Phyllis Schlafly Report, called "What's Wrong with Equal Rights for Women?" Over the 10 years I wrote about 100 issues of my newsletter about ERA. And those reports staked out the battle ground on which we engaged our adversaries. Mainly, the legal rights that women would lose if ERA were to ever ratify. And that strategic decision forced the feminists to spend their time attacking *me* and trying to answer the arguments in my newsletters.

We showed that ERA was a fraud. While pretending to benefit women, it actually would be a big take away of rights that women then possessed, such as the right of an 18-year-old girl not to be drafted and sent into military combat. And the right of a wife to be supported by her husband. We got our facts straight from the writings of the pro-ERA legal authorities: Yale Prof. Thomas I. Emerson's on article in the Yale Law journal, and ACLU lawyer Ruth Bader Ginsberg's federally financed book called "Sex Biased in the US Code." These documents confirmed our arguments that ERA would draft women into combat, and abolish the presumption that the husband should take care of his wife and also take away the Social Security benefits of wives and widows. The ERAers could not show any benefit to women, not even in employment, since employment laws were already sex neutral.

The ERAers said their amendment would put women into the Constitution, but we showed that the Constitution doesn't mention men or women. It uses only sex neutral words, such as we the people, person, citizen, Senator and President.

Now another document we used was “Revolution: Tomorrow is Now.” This was a publication of the National Organization for Women that set forth NOW’s radical pro-abortion and anti-Christian agenda. We reprinted NOW’s booklet and we sold it to raise funds for STOP ERA. We told people to be sure and read both sides of the story.

Well, we showed that ERA would give enormous power to the federal courts to define the words sex and equality of rights. And Section 2 of ERA would give vast new powers to the Federal Government for all of the laws that make any differences of treatment between men and women on account of sex: marriage, property, divorce, alimony, adoptions, abortion, homosexual laws, sex crimes, private and public schools, boy and girl scouts, prison regulations, and insurance.

Now in September 1972, I invited 100 subscribers to the Phyllis Schlafly Report to meet me in St. Louis. We adopted the name STOP ERA and we selected our insignia, the stop sign. And then we all rode a bus down to the St. Louis Riverfront, where we dined on the Goldenrod Showboat. And I climbed up on the stage where so many melodramas have been performed, like my favorite one Showboat. And I give a speech on leadership and I invited these women not only to go home and defeat ERA, but also to become leaders in the conservative cause. And they did. All of the women were volunteers; we had no staff at that time. We recognized the worthy achievers with an Eagle Award and we presented them these awards for thanks for their volunteer work.

The women’s liberation movement, which was then led by Gloria Steinem and Betty Freidan, was at the peak of its influence and enjoyed unparalleled access to the media. Betty Freidan started the women’s liberation movement with her book, “The Feminine Mystique,” which whined about the alleged sad state of feminine wives. She founded the National Organization for Women, called NOW, to encourage women to be liberated from the home, husband, and children. The feminists favorite word became liberation.

My book called “Feminist Fantasies” is a wonderful refutation of feminist nonsense, about how American women are oppressed, a minority. My book ought to be used in these women studies courses as an antidote to all those tiresome tirades by the feminist.

While the media are solidly hostile to our cause, we knew the ERAers didn’t have any solid arguments. We engaged them in debate whenever possible. Now in the 1970s, Phil Donahue had the biggest audience of anyone on television. He was even bigger than Oprah. So I went on the Donahue show to expose the liberation nonsense.

< [Video clip] *Phil: Your daughter, then, is not going to be, sort of, trapped in a house.
Phyllis: Well, the house isn’t trapping. Are you trying to tell me that it’s “liberation” for a woman to go out and sit at a typewriter all day, or stand at a factory machine all day, instead of being in her own home where she can plan her own hours? You know, Phil, the Army has some new ads, some new billboards, out around, and the big headline says the Army has openings for cooks, and then they show a man and a woman standing in front of a big stack of potatoes in an Army kitchen. Now you’re going to tell me it’s “liberation” for a woman to leave her nice kitchen, with her stove and her sink and her refrigerator that her ever-loving husband bought for*

her, and go out and cook in an army kitchen and peel potatoes under the direction of some sergeant (and perish the thought if the sergeant is a woman!), and you tell me that's liberation? Why, that isn't liberation; liberation is in the home. >

Well, the feminist began to put me up against all of their heavy weights. In 1973, I did my first debate with Betty Freidan at Illinois State University. That's the one where Freidan famously said she'd like to burn me at the stake. She said other things that are two indecent to tell in mixed company. Over the years, I debated almost every prominent feminist and lectured on over 500 college campuses. It has been an experience.

Tom Snyder of *The Tomorrow Show* made a big effort to stage a TV debate with two couples facing off against each other. He had a terribly hard time finding any ERA advocate who had a husband, but he finally found one that we had never heard of, Brenda Figen Fasto. And we had a debate on television.

< [Video clip] *Phyllis: The Equal Rights Amendment would impose a doctrinaire equality on men and women, and that's why we think it is a fraud because it will actually take away from women some of the important rights they now have by law. For example, it will take away women's right to be exempt from the draft and to be exempt from combat duty; it will take away the right of a wife to be supported by her husband in a home provided by her husband and her right to have her husband support her minor children. >*

Take a good look at her. After the debate she left her husband and went to live with her lesbian girlfriend.

At State Legislative hearings all during 1972, 73, 74, and 75 we presented legislators with a powerful arguments and documentation provided by the Schlafly report. I ultimately trecked around to testify at 41 State Hearings: in Little Rock, Arkansas; Richmond, Virginia; Jefferson City, Missouri; Atlanta, Georgia; Raleigh, North Carolina; Phoenix, Arizona; Columbia, South Carolina; Springfield, Illinois; Nashville, Tennessee; Tallahassee, Florida; Augustine, Maine; Montpelier, Vermont, Providence, Rhode Island; Denver, Colorado; Frankfort, Kentucky; Austin, Texas; Pierce, South Dakota; Bismarck, North Dakota; Carson City, Nevada; Dover, Delaware; Boise, Idaho; Indianapolis, Indiana; Topeka, Kansas; Lincoln, Nebraska; Columbus, Ohio; and Salt Lake City, Utah. I had to learn my state capitals. Those were experiences.

The draft was one of our best arguments in the early years because we were just coming out of the Vietnam War. The ERAers, most of whom were well over draft age, claimed that girls wanted to be drafted. Their leader Betty Friedan was emphatic about this.

< [Video clip] *Freidan: I have always felt and it seems to me the Americans must feel the equality of rights must mean the quality of responsibility and if there's ever a need for a draft again and there's no reason for women to be exempt on the basis of sex. >*

They even got female members of Congress, such as Congresswomen Pat Schroeder, to assure us that ERA would definitely draft women into military combat.

< [Video clip] *Phyllis: The point is that under the Equal Rights Amendment, Congress will no longer have the option; congress will be constitutionally required to draft women on the same basis as men.*

Host: Do you agree with that, Congresswoman Schroeder?

Pat: I agree that we have the power, and whether or not we will continue to use it depends on the state of emergency.

Host: Do you agree that you will have no option if the Equal Rights Amendment passes?

Pat: That's right, we'll have to put laws in that apply both to males and females equally, and that—

Phyllis: Do you want to draft women?

Pat: —and that you can only draft women for combat duty if they can perform the same functions, and men and women would have to be equal.

Host: Do you think that's desirable?

Pat: Yes, I think that's all right. >

We made so many trips to the state capitals, and I gave directions with my bullhorn. One day a preacher rented a monkey suit and joined our demonstration walking around with the sign that said “don't monkey with the constitution.” He almost lost his church over that.

The feminist were usually belligerent towards the legislators, whereas we were always ladies. We sent them Valentines and Easter cards, and messages like this, “for recognizing the difference you are terrific, fabulous, sensational, fantastic, and marvelous.” Every year, our ladies baked a loaf of homemade bread and took it to every one of our 236 state legislators. The feminist called that our dirty trick. Of course most feminists were not capable of baking a loaf of bread.

In 1976, I led a group of STOP ERA women to do something that none of us had ever done before. We picketed the White House to protest Betty Ford lobbying for the ERA.

< [Video clip] *First Lady Betty Ford has been actively campaigning for the constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for women, even to the point of telephoning state legislators. About thirty-five pickets showed up at the White House today to protest her activity, but Mrs. Ford told reporters she's sticking to her guns. >*

Well, the next year I lead a picket line in front of the White House to protest Rosalynn Carter lobbying for ERA.

< [Video clip] *Rosalynn: Time is running out, and we, we just have to get the Equal Rights Amendment ratified; it's too important to just let it drift away. >*

But media and political pressures in favor of ERA were so powerful that hardly anybody believed ERA could be defeated. Legislators were intimidated by the constant drumbeat, the razzmatazz of celebrities, such as Alan Alda and Betty Ford, and by big money, and by the loud mouth feminists such as Eleanor Smeal.

< [Video clip] *Song: “ERA! ERA! – We Want it Now! We Want it Now!” >*

That was an intimidating to legislators.

Illinois was a frontline of the battle. And the ERAers had all the big political guns on their side: the governor, Illinois Senate and House leadership, and the media. And we desperately needed an event something spectacular to convince the legislators that American women really opposed ERA. I prayed we could bring 1,000 people to our state capital to rally against ERA; something that had never been done before happened in Springfield, Illinois.

I sent out the message to all the Churches: the Protestants and Evangelicals, the Catholics, the Mormons, and the Orthodox Jews. And April 27, 1976 was the day that changed to the face of politics forever. A thousand people did come to Springfield, from all over Illinois. Many riding on buses that read “Joy” and “Jesus Saves.” I gave directions on my bullhorn in the rotunda. Many of our people carry babies in their arms or homemade signs, and we hand-delivered our homemade bread to every legislator.

That thrilling STOP ERA rally in Springfield, 1976 turn the tide against ERA in Illinois. On that momentous day, we invented the pro-family movement by persuading believers of all denominations to do things that most of them had never done before. They came into the political process for the first time and they began to work together with other religious faiths for a political goal they shared, mainly protection of the family in the United States Constitution. Against the radical feminist. We did not have one single big political name at our rally, but that rally, nevertheless, morphed our STOP ERA committee into the nucleus of the mighty pro-family movement that is so powerful today.

Now, the pro-ERAers responded with their own rally. And these are pictures taken of that pro-ERA rally; pictures that showed their ranks were filled with lesbians, abortion activists, socialist workers and party members, radicals of all kinds, and other unkempt persons.

Nevertheless, most of the prominent Illinois politicians attended *their* rally, not ours. The ERAers displayed their radical streaks in other states too. In Virginia, the ERAers spit on the Speaker of the House, staged a sit down at the state capital in Richmond, and had to be carried out by the police.

< [Video clip] *ERA supporters were arrested after they protested defeat in the committee of the Virginia Legislature.* >

Among other nasty tactics, the ERAers hired a professional pie thrower, who hit me in the face with an apple pie when I was at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City receiving an award from the National Republican Club.

Now in the fall of 1977, our cause appeared hopeless. Especially because the feminists were able to use government offices and taxpayers money to promote ERA. The ERA campaign was run right out of the war room of Pres. Carter’s White House, and lady state legislators were invited to the White House to be lobby personally by the Carter’s. Bella Abzug was a member of Congress, and she got Congress to appropriate \$5 million for a tax funded feminist convention in Houston

in November 1977, called International Women's Year. It was designed to be a massive media event that would help to ratify ERA in the remaining states. The International Women's Year Convention opened in Houston. They had three first ladies on the platform: Rosalynn Carter, Betty Ford, and Ladybird Johnson. That's the kind of power they were able to put out for their event. And every feminist you've ever heard of was there at that November 1977 convention in Houston. They tell me there were 3,000 members of the media on hand to give them massive press and television coverage.

But after they cheered and resolved for ERA, they locked ERA into their other demands: taxpayer funding of abortions and the entire gay-rights agenda. You see the ERAers believed that since abortion is something that happens only to women, it is sex discrimination to deny taxpayer funding for abortions. And since the word used in ERA is not women but is sex, ERA would require us to grant same-sex marriage licenses. So, the famous Bella Abzug presided at that ruckus convention, and you'll see you see Betty Freidan shouting from the floor.

< [Sound clip] *Madam Chairperson, I move the adoption of the following resolutions: the Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified. / I would like to ask this body to give the most resounding and urgent vote demanding the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment within the coming year! Because, otherwise, the enormous expenditure of energy and money and effort that has brought us to this point will be in vain, and these ten years of movement will be in vain. / The question arises on the adoption of the resolution: all those in favor would you please rise. / Snake dance through the hall [background chanting] ERA! ERA! / We support the U.S. Supreme Court decisions, which guarantee reproductive freedom to women. / The resolution on reproductive freedom is adopted. / Madam Chair, I move the following resolution on sexual preference. Congress, state, and local legislatures should enact legislation to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sexual and affectional preference in areas including, but not limited to, employment, housing, public accommodations, credit, public facilities, government funding in the military. >*

They published a book setting forth their demands. But after the feminists released their balloons and pranced around with their lesbian placards, the whole country realized why they were pushing so hard for the ERA, and who was doing the pushing. Here are some pictures from the booths and signs at that feminist convention. And the most popular buttons worn at the feminist conference were the ones that said, "a woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle," and "mother nature is a lesbian." At booths you could also pick up booklets on what lesbians do.

A couple of months later, a reporter asked the governor of Missouri, "Governor, are you for ERA?" And he replied, "do you mean the old ERA or the new ERA? I was for equal pay for equal work, but after those women went down to Houston and got tangled up with the abortionist and the lesbians, I can tell you ERA will never pass in the Show Me state."

Houston gave us the proof that ERA's real agenda is taxpayer-funded abortions and gay rights. And since that feminist convention, ERA has been voted on about 25 times in state legislators, Congress, and several statewide referendums, and it has never had another victory.

Nevertheless, the fight went on. To counteract that tax-funded atrocity our Eagle Forum Board took another call in Houston at the same time in the Astroarena. We urged our people to come from all over the country (at their own expense, of course). We called it the pro-family rally and looking back I don't know how we had the nerve to make a contract for a hall that seeded 15,000 people. We just knew we had to make a statement.

From all over the country, our women road on buses up to 20 hours each way. They came to our pro-family rally and then returned home on the buses without ever going to bed. The buses came and they came and they came. And we filled the Astroarena to overflowing. November 19, 1977 was the day the expression pro-family movement went into the political vocabulary. The Houston Post reported, "and attendance of 20,000 people in the whole they could only see to 15,000." Bob Dornam was the only national celebrity who dared to come to our rally.

< [Sound clip] *Phyllis: In order to have held the line for the last five years against the tremendous odds of White House lobbying, federal government expenditures, prominent people, and big money, we had to have somebody on our side who was more powerful than the President of the United States.* >

When ERA was voted out of Congress in 1972, it was given a specific deadline of seven years. When the ERAers realized they were running out of time, Pres. Carter and Congress gave them a crooked three-year time extension. The political cartoonists had a field day describing the extension as giving three more innings to a baseball game that was not tied up. Now we considered the original seven-year deadline the constitutional termination of the ERA. So, in 1979, we loudly proclaimed that we had won. That the ERA was dead.

< [Video clip] *Host: What's the problem with the ERA, Mrs. Schlafly? In your view, what bothers you the most about the possibility of its passing?*
Phyllis: The Equal Rights Amendment is a big takeaway of women's rights. When the seven year deadline given to the ERA past without ratification, this was the greatest victory for women's rights since the women suffrage amendment of the 1920s because this means that women will be able to defend you and your daughters from being drafted and sent into combat. >

We had to make magnificent burial party at the Shorum Hotel in Washington, D.C. on March 22, 1979. To celebrate, we named the title of our gala "The End of the ERA," and that was a double play on words because it was also the end of an era; the era of conservative defeats. We proclaimed that we had actually won; that we had beaten ERA. We gave life to the conservative movement and taught conservatives the lesson that it is really possible to win political battles. And the key to winning was to combine the fiscal conservatives with the new social conservatives; the people who cared about pro-life and about ERA. Who we brought out of the churches. And then year later, in 1980, this new conservative pro-family coalition won a tremendous victory by electing Ronald Reagan, our President.

But the fight went on in the three extended years. And the ERAers staged huge media events with celebrities, such as Phil Donahue, Marlo Thomas, and Alan Alda, who came personally to Springfield, Illinois.

< [Video clip] *For the past 5 years, the fight over the Equal Rights Amendment has been increasing in pitch and has become one of the volatile issues in the US today. / How long can we stand by and watch qualified people denied their fair share in the economy and the political strength of the nation, JUST because they're women.* >

Well, during the extension period, the ERAers staged huge media events with these kinds of celebrities—you saw that impressive demonstration. All our Illinois votes were cliffhangers. We won with the changing mix of conservative and liberal republicans and democrats. Downstate rural guys and Chicago machine Democrats. The most dramatic Illinois vote came on June 18, 1980. Tension was very high and all the national media showed up with their cameras. Pres. Jimmy Carter was telephoning Democratic legislators and promising them Federal housing projects in their district if they would vote yes on ERA. Republican Gov. James Thompson was telephoning republican legislators and promising dams, roads, and bridges in their districts if they would vote yes. Mayor Jane Burn was telephoning Chicago legislators and forcing them to vote yes under threat of firing them and their relatives from city patronage jobs. Democratic legislators who are beholden to the Chicago machine went publicly as they apologized to me for having to vote yes so their relatives wouldn't lose their jobs. And then there were even cash bribes blowing. One feminist was finally later convicted of offering a cash bribe to one of the legislators for a yes vote.

It was exciting on that day when the vote climbed electronically on the panel in the House Chamber. A great shout went up when it became clear that we defeated ERA again. I was standing in the gallery of the Illinois House when ABC Nightline put NOW President, Eleanor Smeal, in front of the cameras and said, "Ms. Smeal, you said you had the votes. What happened?" And she replied, "there's something very powerful against us and I certainly don't mean people." Smeal didn't know what that power was, but we knew. It was prayer and the truth. We had done all we could... but the punch line is we had done all we could and the Lord brought us two votes from Chicago legislators who had never voted our way before.

One of the biggest battles in our ERA fight was the Republican National Convention in Detroit in 1980. ERA had been in the Republican platform for many years and I was determined to take it out so that Ronald Ragan would not be embarrassed by the feminists. But that wasn't easy. The ERAers were organized and noisy. They had all the media and most important Republican officials on their side. Their spokesman was Congresswoman Margaret Heckler.

<The Equal Rights Amendment, about 5,000 of them, marched outside of the convention hall threatening to paint lines of discord across the picture of harmony the Reagan forces want to portray here. ERA supporters have not given up. In fact, they are working on a new strategy to add ERA to the party's platform. A strategy that calls for lining up six votes for majority support for ERA. / Just judging from the enormous outpouring of amazement and shock and dismay, across American, over the Republican party's refusal to reaffirm the ERA, I would say that millions of votes are at stake on this issue. >

Well, indeed, millions of votes were at stake. And they voted for Ronald Reagan. And Ronald Reagan assured me that he was against ERA.

Well, on January 3, 1982, Oklahoma defeated ERA for the last time. On June 4, North Carolina defeated the ERA for the last time. And the disgruntled pro-ERAers been sent disgusting bags of chicken manure to the 23 senators voted no.

Time was running out for ERA, but the ERAers never ran out of money. In the last weeks they spend \$15 million on the TV advertising campaign featuring Hollywood celebrities, such as Ed Aznar and Archie Bunker. Now since they didn't have a single good argument for ERA, you can see how stupid their ad was.

< [Video clips] *Various celebrities: "Help pass ERA."* >

Well you can see they had no arguments, and of course that was one of the things about ERA. They could never show any benefit to women whatsoever. Fortunately that \$15 million ad did not persuade any legislators to vote yes.

On June 21, Florida defeated ERA for the last time. I'm sure there's some here who helped in a battle. Illinois was forced to vote on ERA every year for 10 years, and the last year things got very ugly as the battle continued. In April, the excommunicated Mormon Sonya Johnson started a hunger strike in the state capital, and she was joined by Dick Gregory and other experienced hunger strikers, making it a big media event. And then a chain-gang of pro-ERAers chained themselves to the door of the senate chambers. There they are—the chain gang. < (*Referring to a picture*). >

< [Video clips] *ERA lobbyist tried to embarrass the Illinois legislator into a favorable vote. Seven women are into their third week of a hunger strike and 15 others have chained themselves to the entrance of the state senate since last Thursday. / Betty Ford: In the 59 year history of the Equal Rights Amendment, we've never been so close. I can't wait and I want to be there when the dream of equality becomes a reality.* >

Well, ERA supporters then went to the slaughterhouse and bought plastic bags of pig's blood and came back and wrote on our marble floors of the state capital the names of the legislators they hated the most. Fortunately, those tactics did not persuade our legislators to vote yes, and Illinois finally dealt the deathblow to ERA.

< [Video clips] *Within a year, 30 states had ratified the amendment. It seemed to nothing can stop it, but Phyllis Schlafly changed the course of ERA. Phyllis: And it would be a direct attack on our families on our morals on our culture. Host: She created and led the STOP ERA movement. Phyllis: As soon as the state legislator started to have hearings and we began to have equal time, it was obvious that the people didn't want it and that it could be defeated. Host: From her home, she mobilized fifty thousand housewives into a conservative strike force. Her women delivered flowers to legislators and closely monitored voting records on ERA.* >

So, June 30, 1982, 1,500 battle-weary, but triumphant STOP ERA volunteers gathered again in the ballroom of the Sharom Hotel in Washington to celebrate our second and final burial of ERA at midnight. A giant rainbow of balloons rose high over the dais, and then many political personages including Pres. Reagan paid tribute.

The heroes of the day were the women who came from the 15 states and never ratified ERA, plus the five states that bravely rescinded their previous ratifications.

< [Video clips] *Phyllis: We have them out there they have stood the test and we can build this into a mighty movement that can set America on the right path. We need your help in this effort and conquer we must for a cause it is just. And this be our motto, and God is our trust. And we have the strength of character and this battle we have waged has proved it. Thank you for being here.* >

The evening closed with singing the impossible dream we had truly one and impossible battle and defeated the unbeatable fold.

Thank you for coming.

NOTES

¹ Susan Douglas, "Feminism without feminism," *In These Times*. September 10, 2008. Accessed October 15, 2014.

² Hye Jin Lee and Huike Wen, "Where the girls are in the age of new sexism: An interview with Susan Douglas," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33.2 (2009): 96.

³ *National NOW Times*, Now National Era Campaign Launched, Feb. 11, 1979.

⁴ Elizabeth Erwin, "Evangelical equality: The feminism of Phyllis Schlafly," *ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. Masters Abstracts International* 50.6 (2012): 3619-3619.

⁵ "Eagle Forum – Leading the Pro-Family Movement Since 1972," accessed November 1, 2014, <http://www.eagleforum.org/>.

⁶ Patricia Tillson, "The defeat of the equal rights amendment: A propaganda analysis of Phyllis Schlafly's STOP ERA campaign," (Order No. 1380880, University of Houston). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (1996): 210-210.

⁷ Jennifer Robinson, "Feminism – What's in a name?," *Gallup*. September 3, 2002. Accessed April 1, 2015. See also: Emily Swanson, "Poll: Few identify as feminists, but most believe in equality of sexes," *The Huffington Post*. April 16, 2013. Accessed December 10, 2014; Helen Tate, "The ideological effects of a failed constitutive rhetoric: The co-option of the rhetoric of white lesbian feminism," *Women's Studies in Communication* 28.1 (2005): 1-31.

⁸ Sean Alfano, "Poll: Women's movement worthwhile," *CBS News*. October 22, 2005. Accessed April 1, 2015.

⁹ "Emma Watson: Gender equality is your issue too," *UN Women*. September 20, 2014. Accessed November 10, 2014. <http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2014/9/emma-watson-gender-equality-is-your-issue-too>.

¹⁰ Tate, "Ideological effects," 27.

¹¹ Nudd and Whalen, *Feminist Analysis*, 257.

¹² Nudd and Whalen, *Feminist Analysis*, 260.

¹³ Deb Pentecost, E-mail message to author, September 24, 2014.

¹⁴ Edward Appel and Gregory Desilet, "Choosing a rhetoric of the enemy: Kenneth Burke's comic frame, warrantable outrage, and the problem of scapegoating," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41.4 (2011): 340-362. See also: Brett Biebel, "Standing up for comedy: Kenneth Burke and *The Office*," *KB Journal* 7.1, (2010): N.p.; Beth E. Bonnstetter, "Mel Brooks meets Kenneth Burke (and Mikhail Bakhtin): Comedy and burlesque in satiric film," *Journal of Film & Video* 63.1 (2011): 18-31; Cheree Carlson, "Gandhi and the comic frame: 'As bellum purificandum,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 446-455; Cheree Carlson, "Limitations on the comic frame: Some witty American women of the nineteenth century," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (1988): 310-322; Dana L. Cloud, "Foiling the intellectuals: Gender, identity framing, and the rhetoric of the kill in conservative hate mail," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2.4 (2009): 457-479; Celeste Condit, "Framing Kenneth Burke: Sad tragedy or comic dance?," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80.1 (1994): 77-82; Brenda Cooper and Edward Pease, "Don't want no short people 'round here': Confronting heterosexism's intolerance through comic and disruptive narratives in *Ally McBeal*," *Western Journal of Communication* 66.3 (2002): 300-318; Rachel Silverman, "Comedy as correction: Humor as perspective by incongruity on *Will & Grace* and *Queer as Folk*," *Sexuality & Culture* 17.2 (2012): 260-274; Caitlin Toker, "Debating 'what out to be': The comic frame and public moral argument,"

Western Journal of Communication 66.1 (2002): 53-83; Betts Van Dyk, "From the plaint to the comic: Kenneth Burke's 'Towards a Better Life,'" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31.1 (2006): 31-53; Don Waisanen, "A citizen's guide to democracy inaction: Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert's comic rhetorical criticism," *Southern Communication Journal* 74.2 (2009): 119-143.

¹⁵ Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937), 57.

¹⁶ "100 Most Important Women of the 20th Century" (*Ladies' Home Journal* Books: Des Moines, Iowa; 1998), Ed. Lorraine Glennon.

¹⁷ Carol Felsenthal, *The sweetheart of the silent majority: the biography of Phyllis Schlafly*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981).

¹⁸ Felsenthal, *Sweetheart*, 9.

¹⁹ Felsenthal, *Sweetheart*, 32.

²⁰ "Eagle Forum – Biography," Accessed November 1, 2014, <http://www.eagleforum.org/>.

²¹ Felsenthal, *Sweetheart*, 84.

²² Felsenthal, *Sweetheart*, 83-84.

²³ "Eagle Forum – Biography"

²⁴ Phyllis Schlafly, *Feminist fantasies*, (Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 2003).

²⁵ Schlafly, *Feminist fantasies*, 3.

²⁶ J. Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1986).

²⁷ Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 5.

²⁸ Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 1.

²⁹ Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 1.

³⁰ "History, ERA," Accessed November 10, 2014.

<http://www.equalrightsamendment.org/history>

³¹ "National Organization for Women," *National Organization for Women*. Accessed November 10, 2014. <http://now.org/>

³² William F. Buckley and W. Steibel (Director), "The Equal Rights Amendment," *Firing Line* (Washington, D.C.: SECA Broadcasting Service, 1973).

³³ Phyllis Schlafly, "Doing the Impossible, Defeating the ERA," Eagle Forum Archives. (2007).

³⁴ Foss, "Two Worlds," 275.

³⁵ Phyllis Schlafly, "The Houston IWY pro-family rally," Eagle Forum Archives. (1977).

³⁶ Schlafly, "IWY pro-family."

³⁷ Foss, "Two Worlds," 279.

³⁸ Foss, "Two Worlds," 276.

³⁹ Buckley, "The ERA."

⁴⁰ Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 20.

⁴¹ Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 20.

⁴² Mansbridge, *Why we lost the ERA*, 27.

⁴³ Sonja K. Foss, "Equal rights amendment controversy: Two worlds in conflict," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979): 275-88. See also: Barbara Ehrenreich, "Defeating the ERA: A right-wing mobilization of women," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* IX (1982): 391-398; Martha Solomon, "The Rhetoric of STOP ERA: Fatalistic Reaffirmation," *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 44 (1978): 42-59; Martha Solomon, "The 'positive woman's'

journey: A mythical analysis of the rhetoric of STOP ERA,” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979): 262-74.

⁴⁴ Tillson, “A propaganda analysis,” 5.

⁴⁵ Sonja K. Foss, “Disqualification of the Debate on the Equal Rights Amendment from the Public Sphere,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 49.3 (2013): 232-233. See also: Alan Gross, “The Public Sphere and Rhetorical Criticism: A Cautionary Tale,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 49.2 (2012): 141-144; Martha Solomon, “Tilting at Windmills,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 49.3 (2013): 233-235; Sonja Foss, Karen Foss, and Cindy Griffin, “Feminist Perspectives in Rhetorical Studies,” in *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*, ed. Sonja Foss (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1998), 14-32.

⁴⁶ Tillson, “Propaganda analysis.” See also: Erwin, “Evangelical equality.”

⁴⁷ Donna Nudd and Kristina Whalen, “Feminist Analysis,” in *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, ed. Jim A. Kuypers (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 257-284.

⁴⁸ Tillson, “Propaganda Analysis,” 5.

⁴⁹ Tillson, “Propaganda Analysis,” 5.

⁵⁰ Buckley, “The ERA.”

⁵¹ Solomon, “Positive Woman,” 252.

⁵² Solomon, “Positive Woman,” 252.

⁵³ Solomon, “Positive Woman,” 273.

⁵⁴ Foss, “Two Worlds,” 276.

⁵⁵ Foss, “Two Worlds,” 277.

⁵⁶ Foss, “Two Worlds,” 282.

⁵⁷ Foss, “Two Worlds,” 282.

⁵⁸ Gross, “Public Sphere,” 143.

⁵⁹ Gross, “Public Sphere,” 143.

⁶⁰ Gross, “Public Sphere,” 143.

⁶¹ Tillson, “Propaganda Analysis.” See also: Erwin, “Evangelical equality.”

⁶² Edward Appel and Catherine L. Clark, “Burlesque drama as a rhetorical genre: The hudibrastic ridicule of William F. Buckley, Jr.,” *Western Journal of Communication* 60.3 (1996): 269-284. See also: Jane Blankenship, Edward Murphy, and Marie Rosenwasser, “Pivotal terms in the early works of Kenneth Burke,” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7.1 (1974): 1-24; Wesley Buerkle, Michael E. Mayer, and Clark D. Olson, “Our hero the buffoon: Contradictory and concurrent Burkean framing of Arizona Governor Evan Mecham,” *Western Journal of Communication* 67.2 (2003): 187-206; John J. Miller, “Argument efficacy: Evaluating the public argument of President Bill Clinton’s impeachment crisis,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 40.4 (2004): 226-245.

⁶³ Lewis, “Religious Rhetoric,” 155.

⁶⁴ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 57.

⁶⁵ Kline, “Poking fun,” 53.

⁶⁶ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 93.

⁶⁷ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 9.

⁶⁸ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 5.

⁶⁹ Carlson, “Gandhi,” 447.

⁷⁰ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 173.

⁷¹ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 41.

⁷² Christiansen and Hanson, “Comedy as a cure,” 161.

-
- ⁷³ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 341.
- ⁷⁴ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 341.
- ⁷⁵ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 342.
- ⁷⁶ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 3.
- ⁷⁷ Carlson, "Limitation," 312.
- ⁷⁸ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 57.
- ⁷⁹ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 40-41.
- ⁸⁰ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 44.
- ⁸¹ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 44.
- ⁸² Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 45.
- ⁸³ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 54.
- ⁸⁴ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 54.
- ⁸⁵ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 74.
- ⁸⁶ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 56.
- ⁸⁷ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 40.
- ⁸⁸ Jim A. Kuypers, "Rhetorical Criticism As Art," in *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, ed. Jim A. Kuypers (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 13.
- ⁸⁹ Kuypers, "Rhetorical Criticism," 17-19.
- ⁹⁰ Jim A. Kuypers and Andrew King, "What is Rhetoric?," in *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, ed. Jim A. Kuypers (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 4.
- ⁹¹ The referenced speech was transcribed from audio recordings and obtained by the author. All quotes mentioned come from the transcriptions.
- ⁹² Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 166.
- ⁹³ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 166.
- ⁹⁴ James A. Mackin, Jr., "Schismogenesis and community: Pericles of funeral oration," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 251-262.
- ⁹⁵ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 4.
- ⁹⁶ The referenced speech was transcribed from audio recordings by the author. All quotes mentioned come from the transcriptions.
- ⁹⁷ Mackin, "Schismogenesis."
- ⁹⁸ The referenced speech was transcribed from audio recordings and obtained by the author. All quotes mentioned come from the transcriptions.
- ⁹⁹ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 100.
- ¹⁰⁰ The referenced speech was transcribed from audio recordings and obtained by the author. All quotes mentioned come from the transcriptions.
- ¹⁰¹ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 54.
- ¹⁰² Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 4.
- ¹⁰³ The referenced speech was transcribed from audio recordings by the author. All quotes mentioned come from the transcriptions.
- ¹⁰⁴ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 148.
- ¹⁰⁵ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 148.
- ¹⁰⁶ Appel and Desilet, "Choosing a rhetoric."
- ¹⁰⁷ Tom Head, "Third-Wave feminism." *About News*. Accessed March 1, 2015.
- ¹⁰⁸ Head, "Third-Wave."

¹⁰⁹ Martha Rampton, “The three waves of feminism.” Pacific University, Oregon. October 23, 2014. Accessed March 1, 2015.

¹¹⁰ Burke, *Attitudes toward history*, 40.