

# What's Wrong With "Equal Rights" for Women?

.....

Of all the classes of people who ever lived, the American woman is the most privileged. We have the most rights and rewards, and the fewest duties. Our unique status is the result of a fortunate combination of circumstances.

1. We have the immense good fortune to live in a civilization which respects the family as the basic unit of society. This respect is part and parcel of our laws and our customs. It is based on the fact of life -- which no legislation or agitation can erase -- that women have babies and men don't.

If you don't like this fundamental difference, you will have to take up your complaint with God because He created us this way. The fact that women, not men, have babies is not the fault of selfish and domineering men, or of the establishment, or of any clique of conspirators who want to oppress women. It's simply the way God made us.

Our Judeo-Christian civilization has developed the law and custom that, since women must bear the physical consequences of the sex act, men must be required to bear the other consequences and pay in other ways. These laws and customs decree that a man must carry his share by physical protection and financial support of his children and of the woman who bears his children, and also by a code of behavior which benefits and protects both the woman and the children.

## The Right NOT To Take A Job

Passage of the Equal Rights Amendment would open up a Pandora's box of trouble for women. It would deprive the American woman of many of the fundamental special privileges we now enjoy, and especially the greatest rights of all: (1) NOT to take a job, (2) to keep her baby, and (3) to be supported by her husband.

How have the proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment been so successful that it passed the House of Representatives in 1971 by a large margin? There are three reasons. First, most people mistakenly believe that "equal rights" means simply "equal pay for equal work," and we are all in favor of this. But this goal has already been practically achieved by legislation, and the remaining violations can also be wiped out by legislation. Only 12 states still have obsolete discriminatory laws.

Second, Equal Rights Amendment literature lists many women's organizations as supporters. Most of these organizations probably gave their endorsement after being told that this Amendment will bring better jobs and more pay for women, but were never told what basic rights women would give up. That is the way, for example, that it happened at the October 1971 Convention of the National Federation of Republican Women, where the tight little clique running things from the top presented speaker after speaker to promote the Equal Rights Amendment, but gave no "equal rights" to delegates who wanted to speak against it. The 1971 officers of the NFRW even published intemperate attacks on the Republican Congressmen who voted for an amendment to the Equal Rights Amendment which would exempt women from the draft and permit states to enact "reasonable" laws based on sex differences.

Thirdly, the women's lib agitators caught the Congressmen badly off-guard and they felt they could not risk being labeled "anti-women". The Congressmen simply didn't hear from the millions of happily married women who believe in the laws which protect the family and require the husband to support his wife and children. They only heard from the few but noisy unhappy women.

## Equal Rights in Russia

At women's lib rallies, some of the fiery speakers cite Russia as an example of a country where women have equal rights. The Soviet Constitution guarantees: "Woman in the U.S.S.R. is accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, public and political life."

"Equal rights" in the Soviet Union means that the Russian woman is *obliged* to put her baby in a state-operated nursery or kindergarten so she can join the labor force. Under Soviet law, a woman (as well as a man) can be jailed for refusing to engage in "socially useful labor" or for leading a "parasitic way of life."

"Equal rights" in Russia means that the women do the heavy, dirty work American women do not do -- but men are still the bosses. Russian women have "equal rights" to mine coal, load cargo ships, work in heavy construction, and labor in the fields. A typical garbage pickup team consists of two women hauling the garbage and a man driving the truck. A typical road construction "brigade" consists of a dozen women digging ditches while a male "brigadier" supervises. Of course, the women still do all the housework (without electrical appliances) and all the standing in line to buy food for their families.

A Russian woman journalist recently wrote this in a report called "Unbearable Burden," about women's employment in heavy construction work: "The years given over to a 'male' occupation can rob her of the main thing: her happiness as a woman, the joy of motherhood." Abortions are available for the asking and the average Russian woman has had several, while limiting herself to one or two children.

Under Soviet-style "equal rights," the men still hold all the top jobs. Nine out of every ten plant managers are men. Three out of four school principals are men. There is no woman member in the all-powerful Politburo or Party Secretariat.

## What "Women's Lib" Really Means

Many women are under the mistaken impression that "women's lib" means more job employment opportunities for women, equal pay for equal work, appointments of women to high positions, admitting more women to medical schools, and other desirable objectives which all women favor. We all support these purposes, as well as any necessary legislation which would bring them about.

But all this is only a sweet syrup which covers the deadly poison masquerading as "women's lib." The women's libbers are radicals who are waging a total assault on the family, on marriage, and on children.

The most pretentious of the women's liberation magazines is called *Ms.*, and subtitled "The New Magazine For Women," with Gloria Steinem listed as president and secretary.

Reading the Spring 1972 issue of *Ms.* gives a good understanding of women's lib, and the people who promote it. It is anti-family, anti-children, and pro-abortion. It is a series of sharp-tongued, high-pitched whining complaints by unmarried women. They view the home as a prison, and the wife and mother as a slave. To these women's libbers, marriage means dirty dishes and dirty laundry. One article lauds a woman's refusal to carry up the family laundry as "an act of extreme courage." Another tells how satisfying it is to be a lesbian. (page 117)

The women's libbers don't understand that most women want to be wife, mother and homemaker -- and are happy in that role. The women's libbers actively resent the mother who stays at home with her children and likes it that way. The principal purpose of *Ms.*'s shrill tirade is to sow seeds of discontent among happy, married women so that *all* women can be unhappy in some new sisterhood of frustrated togetherness.

Obviously intrigued by the 170 clauses of exemptions from marital duties given to Jackie Kennedy, and the special burdens imposed on Aristotle Onassis, in the pre-marriage contract they signed, *Ms.* recommends two women's lib marriage contracts. The "utopian marriage contract" has a clause on "sexual rights and freedoms" which approves "arrangements such as having Tuesdays off from one another," and the husband giving "his consent to abortion in advance."

The "Shulmans' marriage agreement" includes such petty provisions as "wife strips beds, husband remakes them," and "Husband does dishes on Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday. Wife does Monday, Wednesday and Saturday, Friday is split..." If the baby cries in the night, the chore of "handling" the baby is assigned as follows: "Husband does Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday. Wife does Monday, Wednesday and Saturday, Friday is split..." Presumably, if the baby cries for his mother on Tuesday night, he would be informed that the marriage contract prohibits her from answering.

Of course, it is possible, in such a loveless home, that the baby would never call for his mother at all.

Who put up the money to launch this 130-page slick-paper assault on the family and motherhood? A count of the advertisements in *Ms.* shows that the principal financial backer is the liquor industry. There are 26 liquor ads in this one initial issue. Of these, 13 are expensive full-page color ads, as opposed to only 18 full-page ads from all other sources combined, most of which are in the cheaper black-and-white.

Another women's lib magazine, called *Women*, tells the American woman that she is a prisoner in the "solitary confinement" and "isolation" of marriage. The magazine promises that it will provide women with "escape from isolation... release from boredom," and that it will "break the barriers... that separate wife, mistress and secretary... heterosexual women and homosexual women."

These women's libbers do, indeed, intend to "break the barriers" of the Ten Commandments and the sanctity of the family. It hasn't occurred to them that a woman's best "escape from isolation and boredom" is -- not a magazine subscription to boost her "stifled ego" -- but a husband and children who love her.

The first issue of *Women* contains 68 pages of such proposals as "The BITCH Manifesto," which promotes the line that "Bitch is Beautiful and that we have nothing to lose. Nothing whatsoever." Another article promotes an organization called W.I.T.C.H. (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy From Hell), "an action arm of Women's Liberation."

In intellectual circles, a New York University professor named Warren T. Farrell has provided the rationale for why men should support women's lib. When his speech to the American Political Science Association Convention is stripped of its egghead verbiage, his argument is that men should eagerly look forward to the day when they can enjoy free sex and not have to pay for it. The husband will no longer be "saddled with the tremendous guilt feelings" when he leaves his wife with nothing after she has given him her best years. If a husband loses his job, he will no longer feel compelled to take any job to support his family. A husband can go "out with the boys" to have a drink without feeling guilty. Alimony will be eliminated.

If the women's libbers want to reject marriage and motherhood, it's a free country and that is their choice. But let's not permit these women's libbers to get away with pretending to speak for the rest of us. Let's not permit this tiny minority to degrade the role that most women prefer. Let's not let these women's libbers deprive wives and mothers of the rights we now possess.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report FEBRUARY, 1972

# Congressional Record

March 22, 1972

STATEMENT

The proposed Equal Rights Amendment reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE--

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

"SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."

The history of the proposal, the need for an Equal Rights Amendment, and the effect of the Amendment are discussed in detail in later sections of this Report. The basic principle on which the Amendment rests may be stated shortly: sex should not be a factor in determining the legal rights of men or of women. The Amendment thus recognizes the fundamental dignity and individuality of each human being. The Amendment will affect only governmental action; the private actions and the private relationships of men and women are unaffected. And the Amendment only requires equal treatment of individuals; it does not require any State or the federal government to establish quotas of men or women in, for example, admission to State supported schools.

Both major political parties have repeatedly supported this proposal in their national party platforms. It has received the endorsement of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. Both the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, created by President Kennedy, and the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, created by President Nixon, have recommended in strongest terms approval of the Amendment. At least eleven states (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania) have taken official action in support of the Amendment. The House of Representatives on October 12, 1971 approved the Amendment 354 to 23. And S.J. Res. 8, which is identical to H.J. Res. 208, is cosponsored by over half the Senate.

Moreover, an impressive list of organizations have recorded their support of the Equal Rights Amendment. Among them are the following:

- American Association of College Deans.
- American Association of University Women.
- American Association of Women Deans and Counselors.
- American Association of Women Ministers.
- American Civil Liberties Union.
- American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs.
- American Home Economics Association.
- American Jewish Congress.
- American Medical Women's Association.
- American Newspaper Guild.
- American Nurses Association.
- American Society of Microbiology.
- American Society of Women Accountants.
- American Society of Women Certified Public Accountants.
- American Women in Radio and Television.
- Association of American Women Dentists.
- B'nai B'rith Women.
- Church Women United.
- Common Cause.
- Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.
- Council for Women's Rights.
- Ecumenical Task Force on Women and Religion (Catholic Caucus).
- Federally Employed Women.
- General Federation of Women's Clubs.
- Intercollegiate Association of Women Students.
- International Association of Human Rights Agencies.
- International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades.
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters.
- International Union of United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers UAW.
- Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women.
- Ladies Auxiliary of Veterans of Foreign Wars.
- League of American Working Women.
- National Association of Colored Women.
- National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
- National Association of Railway Business Women.
- National Association of Women Lawyers.
- National Coalition of American Nuns.
- National Education Association.
- National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
- National Organization for Women.
- National Welfare Rights Organization.
- National Woman's Party.
- National Women's Political Caucus.
- Professional Women's Conference.
- St. Joan's Alliance of Catholic Women.
- Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.
- United Automobile Workers.
- United Methodist Church--Women's Division.
- Women's Equity Action League.
- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
- Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights.
- Women United.

THE NETWORK OF PATRIOTIC LETTER WRITERS, BOX 2003D, PASADENA, CA. 91105  
4¢ EA., 50/\$1.75, 100/\$3.  
SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00 PER YEAR.



# The Fraud Called The Equal Rights Amendment

If there ever was an example of how a tiny minority can cram its views down the throats of the majority, it is the Equal Rights Amendment, called ERA. A noisy clique of women's lib agitators rammed ERA through Congress, intimidating the men into voting for it so they would not be labeled "anti-woman."

The ERA passed Congress with big majorities on March 22, 1972 and was sent to the states for ratification. When it is ratified by 38 states, it will become the law of the land. Within two hours of Senate passage, Hawaii ratified it. New Hampshire and Nebraska, both anxious to be second, rushed their approval the next day. Then in steady succession came Iowa, Idaho, Delaware, Kansas, Texas, Maryland, Tennessee, Alaska, Rhode Island, and New Jersey. As this goes to press, 13 states have ratified it and others are on the verge of doing so.

Three states have rejected it: Oklahoma, Vermont and Connecticut.

What is ERA? The Amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Does that sound good? Don't kid yourself. This innocuous-sounding amendment will take away far more important rights than it will ever give. This was made abundantly clear by the debate in Congress. Senator Sam Ervin (D., N.C.) called it "the most drastic measure in Senate history." He proved this by putting into the *Congressional Record* an article from the *Yale Law Journal* of April 1971.

The importance of this *Yale Law Journal* article is that both the proponents and the opponents of ERA agree that it is an accurate analysis of the consequences of ERA. Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, a leading proponent of ERA, sent a copy of this article to every member of Congress, stating that "It will help you understand the purposes and effects of the Equal Rights Amendment. . . . The article explains how the ERA will work in most areas of the law."

Another leading supporter of ERA, Senator Birch Bayh, inserted a copy of the *Yale Law Journal* article in the *Congressional Record*, declaring it to be a "masterly piece of scholarship."

Senator Sam Ervin, the leading opponent of ERA, agrees that the *Yale Law Journal* article is accurate. It is probably the definitive analysis of what the consequences will be. The following quotations are from this *Yale Law Journal* article and are identified as YLJ.

**1. ERA will wipe out the financial obligation of a husband and father to support his wife and children -- the most important of all women's rights.**

"In all states husbands are primarily liable for the support of their wives and children. . . . The child support sections of the criminal nonsupport laws . . . could not be sustained where only the male is liable for support." (YLJ, pp. 944-945)

"The Equal Rights Amendment would bar a state from imposing greater liability for support on a husband than on a wife merely because of his sex." (YLJ, p. 945)

"Like the duty of support during marriage and the obligation to pay alimony in the case of separation or divorce, nonsupport would have to be eliminated as a ground for divorce against husbands only. . . ." (YLJ, p. 951)

"The Equal Rights Amendment would not require that alimony be abolished but only that it be available equally to husbands and wives." (YLJ, p. 952)

**2. ERA will wipe out the laws which protect only women against sex crimes such as rape.**

"Courts faced with criminal laws which do not apply equally to men and women would be likely to invalidate the laws rather than extending or rewriting them to apply to women and men alike." (YLJ, p. 966)

"Seduction laws, statutory rape laws, laws prohibiting obscene language in the presence of women, prostitution and 'manifest danger' laws. . . . The Equal Rights Amendment would not permit such laws, which base their sex discriminatory classification on social stereotypes." (YLJ, p. 954)

"The statutory rape laws, which punish men for having sexual intercourse with any woman under an age specified by law . . . suffer from a double defect under the Equal Rights Amendment." (YLJ, p. 957)

"To be sure, the singling out of women probably reflects sociological reality. . . . But the Equal Rights Amendment forbids finding legislative justification in the sexual double standard. . . ." (YLJ, p. 958)

"Just as the Equal Rights Amendment would invalidate prostitution laws which apply to women only, so the ERA would require invalidation of laws specially designed to protect women from being forced into prostitution." (YLJ, p. 964)

"A court would probably resolve doubts about Congressional intent by striking down the [Federal White Slave Traffic -- Mann Act]." (YLJ, p. 965)

**3. ERA will make women subject to the draft and to combat duty equally with men.**

"The Equal Rights Amendment will have a substantial and pervasive impact upon military practices and institutions. As now formulated, the Amendment permits no exceptions for the military." (YLJ, p. 969)

"Women will serve in all kinds of units, and they will be eligible for combat duty. The double standard for treatment of sexual activity of men and women will be prohibited." (YLJ, p. 978)

"Neither the right to privacy nor any unique physical characteristic justifies different treatment of the sexes with respect to voluntary or involuntary service, and pregnancy justifies only slightly different conditions of service for women." (YLJ, p. 969)

"Such obvious differential treatment for women as exemption from the draft, exclusion from the service academies, and more restrictive standards for enlistment will have to be brought into conformity

There is no doubt that the effects of the ratification of ERA on the already weakened structure of American family life would be profound. Destruction of the family is one of the foremost goals of the Communists in taking over a country.



THE EVIL INFLUENCE behind Women's Lib is revealed in the fact that their very symbol is centered around the raised clenched fist of the Communists.

with the Amendment's basic prohibition of sex discrimination." (YLJ, p. 969)

"These changes will require a radical restructuring of the military's view of women." (YLJ, p. 969)

"The Equal Rights Amendment will greatly hasten this process and will require the military to see women as it sees men." (YLJ, p. 970)

"A woman will register for the draft at the age of eighteen, as a man now does." (YLJ, p. 971)

"Under the Equal Rights Amendment, all standards applied through [intelligence tests and physical examinations] will have to be neutral as between the sexes." (YLJ, p. 971)

"Height standards will have to be revised from the dual system which now exists." (YLJ, p. 971)

"The height-weight correlations for the sexes will also have to be modified." (YLJ, p. 972)

"[Deferment policy] could provide that one, but not both, of the parents would be deferred. For example, whichever parent was called first might be eligible for service; the remaining parent, male or female, would be deferred." (YLJ, p. 973)

"If the rules continue to require discharge of women with dependent children, then men in a similar situation will also have to be discharged. . . . The nondiscriminatory alternative is to allow both men and women with children to remain in the service and to take their dependents on assignments in noncombat zones, as men are now permitted to do." (YLJ, p. 975)

"Distinctions between single and married women who become pregnant will be permissible only if the same distinction is drawn between single and married men who father children." (YLJ, p. 975)

"Thus, if unmarried women are discharged for pregnancy, men shown to be fathers of children born out of wedlock would also be discharged. Even in this form such a rule would be suspect under the Amendment, because it would probably be enforced more frequently against women. A court will therefore be likely to strike down the rule despite the neutrality of its terms, because of its differential impact." (YLJ, p. 975)

"Women are physically as able as men to perform many jobs classified as combat duty, such as piloting an airplane or engaging in naval operations. . . . There is no reason to prevent women from doing these jobs in combat zones." (YLJ, p. 977)

"No one would suggest that . . . women who serve can avoid the possibility of physical harm and assault. But it is important to remember that all combat is dangerous, degrading and dehumanizing." (YLJ, p. 977)

**4. ERA will wipe out the right of the mother to keep her children in case of divorce.**

"In 90 per cent of custody cases the mother is awarded the custody. The Equal Rights Amendment would prohibit both statutory and common law presumptions about which parent was the proper guardian based on the sex of the parent." (YLJ, p. 953)

**5. ERA will lower the age at which boys can marry.**

"Physical capacity to bear children can no longer justify a different statutory marriage age for men and women." (YLJ, p. 939)

**6. ERA will wipe out the protections women now have from dangerous and unpleasant jobs.**

"There is little reason to doubt, therefore, that courts will invalidate weightlifting regulations for women under the Equal Rights Amendment." (YLJ, p. 935)

"States which grant jury service exemption to women with children will either extend the exemption to men with children or abolish the exemption altogether." (YLJ, p. 920)

A librarian at the University of California Library, Mrs. Laurel Burley, has made a deep study of the drastic consequences of ERA on labor laws which provide advantages for working-class women. She states that: "The major danger in the proposed ERA lies in the fact that it would in one fell swoop invalidate all protective legislation enacted by the States to protect working women from exploitative employers. . . . Protective legislation not only sets maximum hours and minimum wage standards, but also mandates such provisions as rest areas, toilet facilities, elevators, adequate lighting and ventilation, rest and meal breaks (including the right to eat one's meal away from the immediate work area), adequate drinking water (important for women and children who are farm workers), and protective garments and uniforms." (*Congressional Record*, March 22, 1972, p. S4577)

**7. ERA will wipe out women's right to privacy.**

Professor Paul Freund of the Harvard Law School testified that ERA would be absolute and "would require that there be no segregation of the sexes in prison, reform schools, public restrooms, and other public facilities."

Professor Phil Kurland, Editor of the *Supreme Court Review* and a Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and here is the colloquy:

"Senator Ervin. The law which exists in North Carolina and in virtually every other state of the Union which requires separate restrooms for boys and girls in public schools would be nullified, would it not?"

"Professor Kurland. That is right, unless the separate but equal doctrine is revived."

"Senator Ervin. And the laws of the states and the regulations of the Federal government which require separate restrooms for men and women in public buildings would also be nullified, would it not?"

"Professor Kurland. My answer would be the same."

Senator Ervin then concluded: "A few examples in our society where the privacy aspect of the relationship between men and women would be changed are: (1) Police practices by which a search involving the removal of clothing will be able to be performed by members of either sex without regard to the sex of the one to be searched. (2) Segregation by sex in sleeping quarters of prisons or similar public institutions would be outlawed. (3) Segregation by sex of living conditions in the armed forces would be outlawed. This includes close quarter living in combat zones and foxholes. (4) Segregation by sex in hospitals would be outlawed. (5) Physical exams in the armed forces will have to be carried out on a sex neutral basis." (*Congressional Record*, March 22, 1972, p. S4578)

## Do Women Want ERA?

One of the great myths put over on the politicians is the illusion that American women want the Equal Rights Amendment. The majority certainly do not want ERA.

The only detailed poll ever taken on women's opinions on the ERA was done by Elmo Roper in September 1971. Here are the results:

In the Roper Poll, 77 per cent of American women disagree "that women should have equal treatment regarding the draft." Yet, the Congressional debate and the *Yale Law Journal* article confirm that ERA will positively cause women to be drafted and to serve in combat.

In the Roper Poll, 83 per cent of American women disagree that "a wife should be the breadwinner if a better wage earner than husband." Yet, the Congressional debate and the *Yale Law Journal* article confirm that ERA will eliminate a man's obligation to be the breadwinner and support his wife and children.

In the Roper Poll, 69 per cent of American women disagree that "a divorced woman should pay alimony if she has money and her husband hasn't." Yet, the Congressional debate and the *Yale Law Journal* confirm that ERA will make women and men equally liable for alimony.

## What Can You Do?

To abolish unreasonable and unfair discriminations against women is a worthy goal which can be achieved by specific legislation and by application of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution. To resort to the Equal Rights Amendment for this purpose is about as unwise as using an atomic bomb to exterminate mice.

The ERA will not promote women to better jobs, will not elect more women to public office, and will not convince men they should help with the housework. It will cause massive disruption of our military defense and chaos in our laws. Just think, for example, of the dislocations caused by the fact that ERA will "prohibit the states from requiring that a child's last name be the same as his or her father's." (YLJ, p. 941)

Most important, ERA will deprive the American woman of her most cherished right of all -- the right to stay home, keep her baby, and be supported by her husband.

What can you do? Well, if you live in Hawaii, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Iowa, Idaho, Delaware, Kansas, Texas, Maryland, Tennessee, Alaska, Rhode Island, or New Jersey, you are too late to do anything. The women's libbers were too fast for you.

If you live in Oklahoma, Vermont or Connecticut, you can congratulate yourself that you have women who were ready for the battle when it was thrust upon them.

If you live in one of the other states, run, don't walk, to the home of your most effective and persuasive woman friend. Take this *Report* with you and discuss it with her. The February *Phyllis Schlafly Report* gives additional background information.

Then, telephone your own State Legislator. Find out if your State Legislature is in session. If it is, find out the days of the week that the Legislators are in their offices at the State Capitol (usually Tuesdays and Wednesdays are the best). Then, you and your friend, and a couple of other women should go to the State Capitol and talk personally to every State Legislator, using the arguments given in this *Report*. It would be best if you use these arguments as your own and in your own words, rather than giving them some piece of literature. You only need a handful of women to do the job because, remember, you are speaking for the majority. Good luck!

One more thing you can do is to use these arguments to request "equal time" on any television or radio program which presents the women's libbers or other advocates of the ERA. One of our readers successfully used the February *Phyllis Schlafly Report* to request equal time on the Phil Donohue Show. You can do this, too!