

Equality For Women: The Attack On The Family

I wrote this article in 1982. The original title was *The Defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment*.

It gives an account of the little known history of the **Women's Liberation Movement**

with **later notes** of 2024

At the end its supporters were reduced to tears, to fasting, and to praying for a miracle. But it would have taken more than one miracle to prevent the final defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Since 1977, the proposed amendment had been stalled at 35, three states short of ratification, and the 3-year extension of the deadline--to June 30, 1982--only prolonged the frustration of a major political defeat. Even if ERA supporters could have picked up three more states, they would still have had to overturn both parts of Judge Callister's ruling, which said that the extension of the time limit was unconstitutional and that states can rescind their ratifications--as five of them did. If the second part wasn't overturned, the ERA would have needed eight more states for ratification.

How did such a sure winner as the Equal Rights Amendment become such a hopeless loser ? The amendment was ratified by an avalanche of states in its first few years. And the Gallup poll showed a larger majority favoring it in July 1981--63 % compared to 32 % opposed--than favored it in 1977, the last year any state ratified it.

Many commentators argued that the ERA was defeated only because of recalcitrant state legislators, unresponsive to the wishes of those that elected them. If people could have voted directly on the ERA, it would have won, they said.

But, actually, if the ERA had been voted on directly, in a national referendum, the evidence is that it would have lost. There is a basic difference between an opinion poll and an election: the election is preceded by several months of debate that bring out many aspects of the issue that otherwise remain obscure.

The 1980 elections were in effect a referendum on the ERA, after the Republican Convention refused to endorse it again in the party platform. If it turned out to be less than a major issue, that was mostly because its supporters failed to make it one. Republicans won rather handsomely in 1980, despite their repudiation of the ERA--or partly because of it more likely.

New York defeat

When state ERAs were put directly to the voters of New York and New Jersey in November of 1975, they were defeated by a substantial margin--despite the predictions of the Gallup and Harris polls that they would win. The defeat was even more surprising in that New York and New Jersey, two of the more liberal states in the union, had both already ratified the federal ERA. But all of the ERA successes had come from skillful lobbying efforts aimed at legislators, which the anti-ERA lobby, organized by Phyllis Schlafly, had begun to effectively counter. This was the first time the voters had a chance to vote directly on the ERA and it became an unprecedented occasion for a full scale debate.

The Gallup poll itself shows what would happen in a referendum on the ERA. They also polled people on the issue of drafting women in July 1981 and a substantial majority--59 % to 36 % -- supported the Supreme Court decision against registering women for the draft. The Gallup people didn't put both questions to the same set of people nor press them as to how they would reconcile "giving women equal rights and equal responsibilities" with continuing to have a men-only draft. But that is what would happen in a referendum.

Some ERA advocates like to put drafting women in the same class with coed bathrooms as too ridiculous to discuss, but its more sophisticated supporters don't deny that the issue is basic to the whole debate. ERA sponsors in Congress in 1972 defeated a number of attempts to add an explicit statement that women could still be exempt from the draft and from combat. Since the decision was overturned which put the onus of drafting women onto the Fifth Amendment, the whole weight of the issue is once again on the Equal Rights Amendment. Actually, coed bathrooms are still a live issue, at least at the University of Massachusetts, where students were protesting a decision to return to having separate facilities in the spring of 1981.

Neither the Gallup poll nor the original decision on registering women for the draft made it clear whether it would lead to women in combat or not. Some of those who favor registration of women seem to have in mind an army in which 50 % of the generals but none of the combat soldiers are women. I think it is safe to say that if people understood the ERA to require that women be placed in combat along with the men, it would be overwhelmingly defeated, and more by the women than the men, as the Gallup poll indicates. Women were 64 % to 29 % in favor of the decision against drafting women.

The usual Gallup formulation of the ERA--"which would give women equal rights and equal responsibilities" certainly suggests that women would have an equal military obligation. However, the Gallup wording is an interpretation rather than a literal statement. The ERA says nothing about "equal responsibilities." Its exact wording (section one) is that: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

deprivation of rights

Getting drafted is hardly a right. If anything, it is a deprivation of rights. In a debate with Stephen Douglas, Abe Lincoln, commenting on what was meant by the statement in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal," offered a basic definition of equal rights: The signers "did not mean to declare all men equal in all respects," he said, but "they defined with tolerable distinctness in what they did consider all men created equal--equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." (Lincoln-Douglas debate at Alton Illinois on October 15 1858)

But drafting a man into the army deprives him of his liberty in a very basic way, deprives him of his life often enough, and seriously curtails his pursuit of happiness--unless your pursuit of happiness is normally confined to bars and brothels anyway. So to force women into military service is to give them, not an equal right, but an equal deprivation of rights.

However, the ERA doesn't mention women either. "On account of sex" could mean that men might insist that drafting them and not the women was a denial of equal rights to men. That was more or less the basis of the 3-judge decision that women should be registered too--otherwise men were being denied "equal protection" of the laws. That might explain why more men than women support the ERA. The draft isn't the only issue that would defeat the ERA however.

later note Monday, February 25th 2019 a federal district judge in Texas ruled that a military draft of men only is unconstitutional, contra the 1981 Supreme Court decision, because the Pentagon abolished the restrictions on women in combat in 2015. How strange it is that such a major change in American life is being achieved by subversion, by Pentagon fiat, without people ever having voted for it--despite their having voted against it. It shows the extent to which American society has become a **manipulated democracy** in which major change is brought about by a minority that subverts *the will of the majority* = the half-hearted and ineffectual wishes of the majority--by sneaking in there and getting hold of the machinery of government.

As a verbal proposition the Equal Rights Amendment is irresistible. Who can be against *equal rights*? A large majority of all Americans would surely endorse the proposition that *equal rights should not be denied to anyone for any reason!* You know it is right without even thinking about it--until you start thinking about it.

Some ERA supporters seem to assume a minimalist interpretation of the amendment. **Equal Rights** is a noble idea that deserves to be enshrined in the Constitution and what argument can there be against the women having the same basic political rights as the men?

But the women who pushed the ERA through Congress in 1972 and many of its more determined supporters in the decade since then have intended it to have a **maximalist** interpretation. In this view, the ERA would be a national mandate for bringing about a state of equality between the sexes in all areas, in economics as well as politics, in sports, in the military, and in ways that the idea of *rights* would never suggest to the average voter.

equal rights versus equality

Most people have the hazy notion that *equal rights* and *equality* are the same thing. But equal rights don't produce equality. Conversely, the determination to achieve equality may require the abrogation of equal rights.

Perhaps the most pertinent illustration of this is the difference between banning "discrimination" and enjoining "affirmative action" in the area of equal economic rights or "equal opportunities" as they are usually called. The difference in terms of a polling question would come out like this: "Should an otherwise qualified woman be denied admission to law school because she is a woman?" (Discrimination) versus: "Should law schools be required to admit women on a preferential basis, even if some of them are less qualified than competing applicants until there are 50 % women in the law schools?" (Affirmative Action)

Gallup used an alternative question in its July 1981 poll without any difference in the response compared to its old question about "equal rights and equal responsibilities." Are you in favor of the ERA "which would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex ?" they asked, and again 63 % to 32 % were in favor.

That interpretation of the ERA would not survive a debate. The idea of banning discrimination on the basis of sex or race has long since been replaced by a federal policy of requiring affirmative action until a percentage is reached which is equivalent to the percentage in the population. The policy has never been fully implemented, because it has encountered increasing resistance, but it has been the clearly stated policy of the federal government.

The rule which the Democratic Party adopted for its 1980 Convention which required that 50% of the delegates be women foreshadows the 50% interpretation as a national policy, or would have if the Democrats had won.

If you really wanted to test voter reaction to the "mandate for sexual equality" position--which is the position of many ERA supporters--you might ask: "Are you in favor of the amendment which would require that 50% of all government positions should go to women? And you could test reaction to the extreme forms of the position by also asking: "Do you think this 50% requirement should apply to police and fire departments ?" Of course women already occupy about two thirds of government jobs, exclusive of police and fire departments. Few men are to be found in many government and university and health care bureaucracies.

You can argue that ratifying the ERA wouldn't necessarily lead to the "50 % via affirmative action" policy and point out that affirmative action lawsuits have become successful anyway, under other legislation. It is similar to the argument about the ERA and the draft--the ERA may not require it and the Fifth was interpreted to require it anyway.

affirmative action

But without the ERA, the policy of affirmative action for women is almost sure to be drastically curtailed (the Republican victory seems to be already having that effect) and perhaps abandoned altogether. Like other laws, amendments mean what people want them to mean, if they know how to make their desires politically effective. The judicial interpretations of amendments follows politics more than it does logic. The men who drafted the Fifth Amendment could hardly have imagined that it prohibited a men-only draft. And so it doesn't, as it has turned out. But three federal judges thought it did, when the prevailing political winds were coming from a different quarter than they are now. If nothing else, the ERA is needed as a national political endorsement of the policy of 50 % equality for women in the economy.

In fact, the policy of affirmative action would never have been developed without the pro-ERA political pressure that also stretched an anti-discrimination provision into an aggressive affirmative action policy. The original provision affecting women is Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. As passed, this section made it illegal to discriminate in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

But because of the political influence of first the black movement and then the "women's movement," the principle of not discriminating against an individual was replaced by the idea of "affirmative action" in favor of a group. To justify affirmative action you don't have to prove that the particular individual who will benefit has actually been denied the job or promotion because of sex or race, you only have to show that the category is under-represented compared to its percentage in the general population. The school or the company must then actively recruit blacks or women until that percentage is reached.

On paper, the policy of affirmative action applies to all the categories listed in Title VII and some that are not. For instance, an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission directive (No 703 of Dec 6 1979) notes that the "handicapped who are able to work" are an estimated 5.95% of the work force and recommends this percentage in setting federal agency goals for hiring and promotion. But nearly all affirmative action suits have been brought on behalf of women and blacks, not the other groups. Professional schools have felt the pressure to admit 10% blacks and 50% women but not to have 25% Catholics. The effect of an ERA mandate for 50% equality for women would be at the expense of other categories included in Title VII but not in the ERA (which could have included race, age, religion etc.) It is a matter of political pressure rather than legal logic. Affirmative action for women seems now to have eclipsed affirmative action for blacks in some areas--the larger law firms have reportedly increased their percentages of women but not their percentages of blacks.

Percentage Justice

However, if affirmative action were undertaken rigorously on behalf of all the categories included in Title VII, the result would be unmanageable. Suppose a company was enjoined to recruit 50% women, 10% blacks, 12% Spanish origin, 25% Catholic, 8% German and so on. You've run out of positions--you are already at 105% of your work force--and you still have to accommodate the percentages of all the other groups with an equal right to be included. The only way to do it is to somehow find a group of employees that accurately mirrors the statistical portrait of the population. You could wind up with an ad like this: "wanted: Computer programmer with minimum of 3 years experience in Fortran. Must be black, female, Polish and either a Mormon or a Jehovah's Witness. An Equal Opportunity Employer."

But affirmative action bogs down long before it reaches the logical results of its mandate for statistical equity. The surface fairness of allocating positions on the basis of percentages is belied by the actual workings of the policy. Affirmative action requires what is euphemistically called *positive* or *reverse* discrimination. But discriminating in favor of one person on the basis of sex or race necessarily discriminates against some other person on the basis of sex or race. As was successfully argued in the Alan Bakke case, meeting the affirmative action quota requires that a better qualified applicant be rejected because he is the wrong sex or race.

The principles implied by affirmative action are untenable. One is that two wrongs make a right. An unfair discrimination against someone today makes up for an unfair discrimination against someone else in the past. The other principle is representative atonement--favoring

someone, like a black Ph D who has already made it to the top, pays off those who are still stuck at the bottom. To justify affirmative action, you don't need to go into the situation behind the statistical injustice you mean to remedy, you just need to show that there is one. If blacks are less than 10% of the faculty, the university must recruit blacks until they are 10% of the faculty. The result was that a handful of black Ph D's from middle class families were given an enormous advantage over their classmates. In fact, they were swamped with offers. But the children of illiterate lower class black families, whose academic drop out rate is what produces the statistical injustice, receive no benefit. They still don't learn to read in elementary school and then they drop out of high school. They might get some inspiration out of reading about the unearned success of the black Ph.D.--if they could read. Affirmative Action is like an insurance company mailing out checks to those that escaped injury in a train wreck, while it ignores those that were injured.

political pay offs

Affirmative action for women has arbitrarily helped some few women who were already in a position to take advantage of it. As with affirmative action for blacks, the policy favors those whom fortune has already favored and justifies it by citing the unfortunate who are nominally in the same category. Under a new name, affirmative action is the old political practice of pacifying a large group by granting political favors to its more vocal and aggressive members. It is a policy of political pay off disguised as an anti-discrimination policy.

Without a victory for the ERA, the policy of affirmative action to achieve 50 % equality for women will be pushed desultorily, if at all. They both depended upon the political energy of the women's liberation movement, which promoted them along with many other sexual equality initiatives in the early 1970s.

You can't understand the rise and fall of the Equal Rights Amendment without relating it to the rise and fall of the **women's liberation movement**. Without the women's liberation movement, the ERA would never have gotten out of Congress in 1972, where it had languished like a genie in a bottle for 49 years. The energetic politicking of the **wlm** is what gave the ERA its early success. And it has been the decline and disintegration of the **wlm** from about 1975 on that has caused the ratification of the ERA to come to a halt. The negative reaction to the ERA which began around 1975 wasn't a reaction to the simple and attractive wording of the ERA, it was a reaction to the highly controversial meaning the **wlm** attached to the ERA as well as to other sexual equality measures.

An analysis of the ERA defeat in New York in 1975 showed that it had lost mostly because of the women, 62 % of whom voted against it. (New York Times Magazine of April 11 1976) They voted against it because of unconvincing assurances on issues like alimony and child custody, but mainly they voted against it because they perceived the so-called *women's movement* behind the ERA as anti-family and as basically antagonistic to women who were housewives and mothers. These women were deceived, the ERA supporters insisted. As Betty Friedan, the President of the National Organization of Women, put it, the day after the election, they had believed the *lies of our enemies*. (New York Times November 5 1975)

the women's [~~liberation~~] movement

It was about this time that *the women's movement* began to be used to describe those supporting the ERA. The term now usually refers to the many organizations which have officially endorsed the ERA, however much or little their members are actually doing to promote it. And there are as many men as women in these organizations. But it is a movement only by grace of the loose usage that allows staid old organizations and conventional politicians to refer to themselves as part of a *movement*. In the real sense of the word, there has only been one *women's movement* behind the ERA and that is the **women's liberation movement**. Calling it the *women's movement* is a public relations euphemism which chops down the sign post that pointed to the origins of the **wlm** in the new left of the late 1960s. It is part of the attempt that has been made by ERA supporters to obscure the basic link between the Equal Rights Amendment and the **women's liberation movement**. But it doesn't take much of a maternity suit to establish that the one was the mother of the other as it emerged reborn in 1972. The New York / New Jersey area was a major stronghold of the **WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT** in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The women who voted on the state ERA in 1975 had seen a great deal of this movement, and it isn't surprising that they identified it with the ERA or that they saw it as an anti-family and anti-old style woman movement.

The **women's liberation movement** was--and is where it still survives--an anti-family movement and it was permeated with disdain for the old-style woman. It wasn't just implicitly or partly anti-family, it was blatantly, thoroughly and extravagantly anti-family. Being against the family is the cornerstone of the **wlm** ideology. It is the position they all agree on, when they can't agree on what the alternatives are to the family or on much of anything else. Opposition to the family was an important part of **new left ideology** which the **women's liberation movement** took and developed to an exotic degree. The manifestoes, books and newsletters of the new feminists abound with alternatives to the family. The most common idea is that unrestricted sexuality should replace the monogamous, heterosexual couple and that the whole society must take responsibility for raising children, instead of the individual mother.

In accordance with the original 19th century ideology, child care centers where children may be left indefinitely were established in many Communist and Socialist countries as pilot programs to change the way that children are raised. The pioneer Zionists, who were radical Socialists, established children's quarters on the *kibbutz* where children lived apart from their parents.

red diaper babies

That is essentially what Marx and Engels proposed. Their mandate to abolish the family, neglected and mostly abandoned by the *Communist* rulers of the Soviet Union, was revived by the *New Left* of the 1960s, by kids--**red diaper babies**--whose parents had once believed in the Marxist faith and the Russian Revolution and belonged to the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in the 1920s and the 1930s.

When the Bolsheviks first came to power they legislated easy divorce and unrestricted abortion and launched a program of government child care centers to facilitate **careers for women** = push them out of the home and into the factories. "On the 16th of November 1924 the Comintern in plenary session proclaimed: *The Revolution is impotent as long as the notion of family*

and of family relations continues to exist. The respect thereupon accorded to free unions, the facility of divorce, and the legalizing of abortions assured woman's liberty with relation to the male. Laws concerning maternity leave, day nurseries, kindergartens, and the like alleviated the cares of maternity." [Simone de Beauvoir *The Second Sex* page 127 Modern Library 1968] But, these policies were reversed with the approach of World War II in which Russia lost 12 million soldiers. In 1936, abortion of a first pregnancy was outlawed. In 1944, all abortions were made illegal. Mothers of large families were honored. The penalty for homosexuality was re-introduced in March 1934. It had been allowed in 1919. Strict anti divorce laws were passed in 1944.

Communist parties in the west dutifully followed the lead of the Soviet Union. In 1935, the French Communist newspaper *Humanite* declared that Capitalism destroys the family and Communism must save it. But the Communist / Feminist anti family movement persisted among other Socialists and was revived by the New Left of the 1960s. In her 1975 interview with Betty Friedan, Simone de Beauvoir declares: *as long as the family and the myth of the family and the myth of maternity and the maternal instinct are not destroyed, women will still be oppressed.* [Betty Friedan *It Changed My Life* 312]

the Communist Manifesto

The Communists of 1850 were determined to abolish families along with religion, private property and the class structure. They saw them as linked together so that families would be no more, when capitalism was no more. Karl Marx, who had a large family, and who was initially outraged at the *Communist* idea of sharing his wife with other men, doesn't explain his views on families very clearly in part II of the Communist Manifesto. Instead, he mocks the imaginary objections of his opponents: *Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists . . . But you communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie in chorus!* **COMMUNITY OF WOMEN** means sexual sharing--having wives in common. The idea was originally set forth in Plato's *Republic*.

The call to abolish the family and the agenda of sexual liberation, including homosexual liberation, was perpetuated down through the centuries by secretive societies, some of them camouflaged behind the nominal celibacy of religious orders. The **Freemasons** of the late 18th century was one such secret society whose membership came to include the most important men of France and England and America. They played a key role in the American Revolution and the financing and arming of that Revolution by the French. And they were substantially responsible for the scandalous libertinism which came out into the open during the French Revolution, when the *Goddess of Liberty* was enthroned in Notre Dame Cathedral amidst the most indecent revels. [as gingerly described in Thomas Carlyle's history] The secret creed of the 18th century Freemasons is symbolized by the obelisks they erected which invoke the Egyptian phallus cult associated with the worship of Osiris the sun god and his consort Isis. The antiquated ideology has mostly disappeared but the *sexual revolution* it promoted has become the norm in American life.

Although Karl Marx was not faithful to his wife when he went carousing with Engels, his wife had been his true love, and he was naturally repulsed by the Communist dogma of **wives in common** which he was forced to swallow. That probably accounts for the over wrought exposition he gives of this doctrine in the *Manifesto*.

The Feminist Bible

Frederick Engels explains the mandate for the abolition of the family at length in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. He sets forth some "scientific" evidence that the primitive human community held both wives and property in common. One piece of evidence is that the children call all the men *father* in one primitive tribe. When capitalism has collapsed and the communism of the primitive human community has been restored, sex and child-raising will also be communal he believes.

This book was the basic scripture for the feminist writers of the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the golden (= iron pyrite) age of modern feminist tracts. Germaine Greer, Kate Millett and Shulie Firestone all make the attempt to dust off Engels and set him straight by way of developing their own weird ideas about the family.

A bogus *anthropology* which validates unrestricted sexuality--*free love*--and children raised by the whole tribe has been published by anthropologists like Margaret Mead who were influenced by the Marxist ideology of left leaning universities.

Betty Friedan and the other old left feminists go to some trouble to avoid giving the Communist Movement any credit as the original source of their feminism. In fact, that is a major problem in researching the women's liberation movement. Even when the anti-family idea is plainly stated, the leftist upbringing or lesbian orientation of the writer is usually concealed. If **women's liberation through abolishing the family** was an idea you learned as part of your grandfather's "old time religion" and / or you find yourself incapable of forming and maintaining a monogamous heterosexual bond, it helps to explain where your antagonism to the family comes from.

red diaper babies

I am indebted to an unusually honest feminist historian who discovered--to her own surprise--that the women who started the women's liberation movement were *red diaper babies* when she interviewed them for her book. That is, their parents or grandparents had belonged to the Communist Party. See pp 116-125 of *Personal Politics* by Sara Evans.

The **New Left** and the **Women's Liberation Movement** of the late 1960s revived the *abolish the family* mandate which the **Old Left** had abandoned. The Soviet Union under Stalin abandoned the basic principles of radical feminism in the 1930s and the Communist Party of the U.S. followed orders from headquarters. Then the Communist Party was devastated and discredited in the 1950s by the Korean War, by Krushev's revelations about Stalin and by the crushing of the Hungarian revolution against the Soviet Union.

Most of the world became aware of *Communism* after some of its adherents captured the government of a major power, when the Bolsheviks seized control of the revolution in Russia in 1917. But the Communist Movement is much older than that. It can be traced back through the French Revolution and the 18th century Freemasons all the way to Plato's *Republic*. The modern Communist movement emerged from the ferment of the French Revolution and soon became an international movement.

the early communists

Abolition of the family was one of the main ideas of the early 19th century Communists and Socialists, before the movement began to focus on class structure and a belief in the working class and the labor movement. At the time when he founded New Harmony Indiana in 1825, the English capitalist **Robert Owen** denounced **marriage** as one of the *trinity of the most monstrous evils*, along with **private property** and **religion**, which would disappear from his new societies. He truly believed that he had designed the society of the future and he tried to persuade other capitalists to invest their money in his colony with the hope of rich returns. It was not a good investment.

The Frenchman **Charles Fourier**, circa 1808, a brilliant and somewhat crazy founder of the Communist Movement, advocated essentially the same sexual liberation ideas that emerged again in the 1960s. Actually, most of his non-economic, sexual revolution writing was never published until the anything-goes 1960s. His advocacy of homosexuality was withdrawn from later editions of his work. It remained a half-hidden tendency within the Communist Movement until modern times. Fourier argued that the restrictions of the family were incompatible with the *emancipation of the passions* in the *new world of love* he called for.

Henri Saint-Simon's writings don't spell out what he had in mind in advocating equality for women, but part of his followers interpreted his ideas as sanctioning promiscuous sexuality. They somewhat disgraced Saint-Simonism as an economic movement by a winter of *voluptuous revels* in 1832 in a large house on the Rue Monsigny. His disciple **Enfantin** proclaimed *free love* and *equality for women* in place of marriage.

In a fundamental way, the women's liberation movement is an ideological throwback to the early Communists who made the family the main target of their program to change society. Although some within the movement continued to regard abolition of the family as a subordinate part of the revolutionary transformation of society, the more ardent feminists saw it as the essential aim of socialist revolution, the key to everything else. It may seem strange to most people, but, since the family is the basic unit of society, it is the obvious place to start a radical reform of society.

And those who feel they were neglected or mistreated by the families in which they were raised may be susceptible to an ideology which promises to somehow replace *The Family* as the basis of society. That is especially true of those who fail to establish families of their own.

In the Communist tradition, the idea of "equality for women" became equivalent to the idea that the family must be abolished and this is the position that was revived by the new left and elaborated by the women's liberation movement. The Communist view was that a woman is exploited and oppressed in marriage just as workers were exploited and oppressed by employers in the Capitalist system. Both must be liberated. So women's liberation means liberating women from family responsibilities.

For the radical feminists, "equality" has the absolute or mathematical meaning of "the same in all respects." If men and women are to be the same in all respects, all differences must be eliminated, especially and at once the difference in roles which arise from the traditional division of labor in raising families--a very unfair division in their eyes. The basic feminist attitude is:

eliminate the difference ! There is no difference ! Down with the difference ! This attitude, in various guises, in moderate or extreme form, regularly appears in the various sexual equality proposals.

The complete women's liberation position is:

I women must be equal to men and

II this equality requires the elimination of the difference in roles, which is characteristic of the traditional family so

III the family must be replaced by new social forms--by a new kind of "family"

What happens in a political debate is that the III rd, and often the II nd part of the position is denied or equivocated. But logically they all go together, just as they are found in feminist literature.

There is another major aspect to the ideology which has to do with methods rather than goals. It might be put this way: Society conditions women to accept the traditional feminine role, so we have to aggressively attack this conditioning process and we must re-condition ourselves and others even if we have to use forceful means to do it. This "women must be reconditioned" idea is implicit in many feminist proposals.

What pretends to be a more moderate feminist position on the family is really the same position less plainly stated. Betty Friedan, the first President of the National Organization of Women, who has been the main spokeswoman for the moderate feminists, said in a 1973 article:

The changes necessary to bring about that equality [between the sexes] were, and still are, very revolutionary indeed. They involve a sex role revolution for men and women which will restructure all our institutions: child rearing, education, marriage, the family, medicine, work, politics, the economy, religion, psychological theory, human sexuality, morality and the very evolution of the race. (New York Times Magazine March 4 1973, page 30)

Ms. Friedan, who had the politician's habit of making different-sounding speeches to different audiences, often denied that she was anti-family, but, through the years, she has consistently advocated that "sex-role revolution" of which she here spells out the consequences. What she and other moderate feminists argue in effect is that a sex-role revolution will not destroy the family, rather it will *liberate the energy locked up in those obsolete masculine and feminine roles.* (same article, page 37)

Clearly she means that the old style family in which men and women have different roles is obsolete and must be replaced by a new-style "liberated" family. The assurance that the family would survive and profit from the "revolutionary changes" she wants is not very convincing. **Liberation** has turned out to be a synonym for destruction more than once in the 20th century, and that seems to be the case here. Her position on the family is really the anti family position of the radical feminists with a wrapping of rodomontade. She isn't against the family as she envisions it,

she is only against it in the form in which it actually exists. It isn't hard to understand why voters in the 1975 election, in which Ms. Friedan was active, were deceived "by the lies of our enemies" into thinking that the women's liberation movement is an anti-family movement.

political disguises

In imitation of Ms. Friedan, the moderate feminist stance is to argue for I sexual equality via II a sex-role revolution while ignoring or denying III the drastic effects on the family. Conventional politicians usually just support the demand for sexual equality and say nothing about the "revolutionary changes" or the sex-role revolution which Ms. Friedan insists are necessary to bring about sexual equality. But she is right in insisting that I requires II just as the radicals are right in insisting that II requires III.

Revised ERA polling question: *Are you in favor of the amendment which would help the women's [[liberation]] movement bring about a revolution in the roles of the sexes so as to achieve complete equality between men and women ?* That is a fair representation of what the ERA has meant to many of its supporters. Gallup wouldn't get 62 % in favor of that one--more like 6 point 2 per cent, and from the rest some serious questions as to just what is meant by a "sex-role revolution." And just what do they mean ?

Among the original Americans there is a clear difference in sex roles. He is a warrior and a hunter, she is a mother and a camp cook. He rides into battle while she stands out of the way and urges him on with various trills. He slaughters the game and leaves it where she can find it. A century later, among the unoriginal Americans you find similar roles. He is the protector and the provider, she is the mother and the homemaker. The army, the police and the football team are only for men. She stands on the sidelines and leads the cheering as he charges the opposing team.

No good, say the feminists. There must be a thorough change in these traditional sex roles. Some attack only the man-as-hunter / provider role and say nothing--for the moment--about the man-as-warrior role. But women should all have careers and not have to depend upon men, they insist.

The radicals were interested in revolution rather than careers and so they focused as much on the warrior role. Throughout the women's liberation movement there was a strong emphasis on women learning to fight.

The radicals are not typical of the sexual equality movement, but they are representative in a way. The radical version of an idea is often the same as the more respectable version without the political masks that conventional politics requires. And it can be illuminating to take a look at even the extremists in a movement because they are naive enough to do directly and at once what others are trying to do indirectly or plan to do someday.

days of rage

The women who formed the nucleus of the younger half of the women's liberation movement separated from the Students for a Democratic Society just before it fragmented. But all of the fragments retained a position on the liberation of women--everyone was going to be *liberated*

in those days--very similar to the **wlm**. The most extreme of the SDS fragments became the Weatherman faction. But they were extreme in their actions rather than in their ideas. They had the same ideas as the others, but they were courageous and / or crazy enough to actually try and carry them out. In 1969, they started a *women's militia*--an all women revolutionary fighting force, which staged several actions during the spring and summer of 1969. The main action of the women's militia took place during the SDS-sponsored *Days of Rage* demonstrations in Chicago in October of 1969. The turn-out was disappointingly small, but about 75 of the women's militia showed up. Armed for a kind of truncheon warfare with helmets, clubs and shields, they also had a menacing war chant done in a staccato two part harmony which went: **OINK ! OINK ! BANG ! BANG ! DEAD PIG !** On the second day of rage, October 10 1969, they charged a line of policemen that outnumbered them about 5 to 1 and they were soon on their way to jail. But they made the point that women can fight like men, if they want to. (Village Voice, page 64, Oct 16 1969; Susan Stern *With the Weathermen* page 140)

In a foolhardy, straightforward way, they were challenging the idea that fighting is a role for men, not women. The same idea shows up among ERA supporters in other forms. Some want women in combat. Most want women in the army on some basis. Getting women police officers was one of the basic victories for this position. A court in Pennsylvania ruled--on the basis of the Pennsylvania Equal Rights Amendment--that girls must be allowed to *practice and compete with boys in interscholastic athletics*--that is, on the same teams with the boys. The court specifically included football and wrestling in the order.

Title IX has been used extensively to mandate equality in sports between the sexes and feminists have stressed the competitive team sports rather than the personal, recreational sports. What is behind this, except the idea of challenging the male monopoly of the warrior / protector role ? There is a basic connection between sports and war as suggested in Sir William Fraser's saying that *The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton*. In a world where war is the decider, men will continue to dominate if they are the warriors. The logic of the sex role revolution means that women must be fighters like men, must leave off cheer leading and get out on the football field. In a more general way, this idea has had an impact on the whole society, where it has the effect of encouraging women to be aggressive and outspoken--to be psychologically pugacious at least.

After they went underground, the Weatherman faction continued to religiously pursue the logic of women's liberation. A majority of the leaders were women. Along with planning attacks on the police, they set out to **SMASH MONOGAMY!** (*smash* was a favorite new left verb.) The several books about the Weather underground recount marathon, all night and all day, **criticism-self-criticism** sessions in which **monogamous** couples were relentlessly criticized by the whole group. A **monogamous** couple was one that had an exclusive relationship with each other. Some of the couples left the group rather than break up, but some of them, under this pressure, consented to join the promiscuous practices that were actually enjoined as the orthodox morality. Homosexual sex was also endorsed, at least in theory. (Susan Stern *With the Weathermen* 114 f, 168 f, 180, 186-202, 236; Larry Gratwohl *An FBI Informer with the Weathermen* 92, 118, 160) Aside from the fanatical sincerity with which they attacked *monogamy* what is worth noting is the method of forcible persuasion aimed at reconditioning people.

You would expect a supposedly liberal group like the ERA supporters to have taken a strong stand against conscripting either sex, especially considering how much the issue of conscripting women hurt the ERA's chances. But mostly they equivocate, and the real feminists are obviously intrigued with the prospect of women conscripts. In fact, the army is just what they need to effect the reconditioning of women. It is one of the few institutions in a democratic society that has the legal right to put an individual through involuntary changes with no way out of the process.

Putting the women into the army is part of the original program found in Plato's *Republic*. It is a common feature of Communist and Socialist nations. Modern Israel conscripts women into the army. And pays for their abortions.

In the original movie version of *Private Benjamin*--which betrays the hand of a feminist script writer throughout--an old style woman, addicted to marriage and home decorating, inadvertently joins the army and it makes a man out of her--that is, a new-style woman who has achieved sameness with the men. The rigors of basic training transform her from a feminine moron into a tough new woman. In the climactic scene, she punches out her bridegroom, throws away the bridal headdress, and, turning her back on her parents, she strides purposefully off down the tree-lined road of a liberated future. Thanks to the reconditioning she received in the army, she has learned to fight like a man, has *smashed monogamy*, and has finally turned her back on the conditioning that made her an old style female.

reconditioning women

The most sophisticated feminists have understood all along that the conscripting of women could take them further in the direction they want to go than any other government measure. That is why they have to favor it, despite its political unpopularity, which rubs off on the ERA.

That is why the ERA sponsors in Congress were so determined not to allow an amendment to the ERA which would have exempted women from conscription and combat. That was a clear indicator of their real agenda. In fact, the army now provides a kind of haven for lesbians who have joined it in disproportionate numbers.

Both the *smash monogamy* and the *you need reconditioning* ideas show up persistently in the sexual equality movement. In the women's liberation movement, there was a general antagonism towards monogamous couples. The Feminists in New York limited the membership of women who had husbands or who were living with men. The *consciousness-raising* session, which became the basic institution of the women's liberation movement, was a sustained group effort through which women tried to break down the conditioning which pushed them into the traditional feminine role. In a very thorough way, they attacked those attitudes which incline women to be primarily interested in marriage and motherhood. So they ridiculed the arts which women use to attract men, anathematized the habitual feminine acceptance of housekeeping tasks, and tried to remodel themselves and others into a new type of woman.

In some cases, they were all too successful. Quite a few of them not only reconditioned themselves not to want husbands but not even to want heterosexual relationships. After they had worked out of the social conditioning they had grown up with, they discovered they were lesbians at heart. One of the main reasons for the decline and disintegration of the movement was that in many places it became indistinguishable from a lesbian liberation movement. Many heterosexual women found themselves confronted with a choice of conforming or leaving.

A Lesbian Speaks for *Women*

Kate Millett belatedly revealed her "bisexuality" several years after she was presented on the cover of *Time* Magazine on August 31st 1970 as representing all those normal heterosexual women who were supposedly fed up with the oppression they suffered in their marriages. Millett later publicly owned up to being a lesbian. Neither Kate Millett nor *Time* Magazine ever apologized for the dishonesty of presenting her as representing *women*. We belatedly learn that Simone de Beauvoir was fired from a teaching job for an affair with one of her female students. After they used her to present a half-way normal heterosexual face as President of the National Organization of Women, Betty Friedan came to realize that she was surrounded by lesbians who were basically hostile to heterosexual women. [See *Scary Doings in Mexico City* in *It Changed My Life*.]

That was a major reason why those supporting the ERA tried to put some distance between it and the women's **liberation** movement. Many women who once belonged to the **wlm** continued to support the ERA after they had given up on the movement. So the ERA collected a support group who had severed connections with the **wlm**. And the ERA has had many endorsements from respectable types that no one would label as new left, or even as liberated. But despite these cleansing endorsements, the fingerprints of the women's liberation ideology are still to be seen all over the ERA.

The basic brief for the ERA was the majority report of the Senate Judiciary Committee (Senate Report No 92 689 March 14 1972) which accompanied it when the Senate approved it in 1972. The report first tries to show that the ERA is needed as a legal weapon against the denial of rights to women in the limited sense in which most people understand **rights**. But it really shows the weakness of the case:

Difficult as it is to believe, the record shows that women are sometimes denied even the basic rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the United States today. Until 1966, for example, three States excluded women from juries altogether. And today there is still at least one State which requires women, but not men, to register specially to be eligible to serve on juries.

right versus privilege

In other words, the last barrier to women serving on juries went down some years before the ERA was revived. What you are left with is one provision in one state that is a privilege rather than the denial of a right, aside from the inconvenience of having to register twice. A woman has the option of being a registered voter without being liable for jury duty.

In the area of unequal treatment under criminal law, they cite three legal provisions in four states:

One State has a statute allowing women to be jailed for three years for habitual drunkenness, while a man can receive only 30 days for the same offense. In two States, the defense of passion killing is allowed to the wronged husband, but not to the deceived wife. And in another State, female juvenile offenders can be declared "persons in need of supervision" for non-criminal acts until they are 18, while males are covered by the statute only until age 16.

The statute on habitual drunkenness certainly suggests unequal treatment, but when was the last time any woman in that State got more than 30 days for habitual drunkenness? Obviously it is an archaic law that would be overturned if it were ever enforced. This handful of trivial and unenforceable discrepancies is supposed to show that there is widespread discrimination in the area of criminal law, which can only be rectified by **Amending the Federal Constitution**. The law which provides for supervision of female offenders until they are 18 could be justified as protecting them from the risk of unwed and under age pregnancy. But the feminists, in their zeal for absolute equality, attack all laws which treat women differently from men, even when they were clearly intended as necessary protective measures. The National Organization of Women has pursued a number of lawsuits against laws which limit the weights that women workers can be required to lift or the overtime hours they can be worked--laws which were won by the labor movement many years ago to protect women workers from the harsh conditions typical of the time.

later note: female alcoholics, who persist in drinking while pregnant, give birth to babies afflicted with *fetal alcohol syndrome*, a life ruining mental and physical debility. Because of the obvious implications for restrictions on abortion, the ACLU and other radical feminist organizations have intervened in cases where an alcoholic pregnant woman was put in jail to keep her from drinking until the baby was born. That happened in a Wyoming case where the woman had previously given birth to a child with *fetal alcohol syndrome*.

In other areas, the case rests upon evidence preserved from the 19th century: *The [Supreme] Court has upheld many laws which plainly discriminate against women.* The first example is *Bradwell versus Illinois* in which the Court upheld the refusal of the Illinois Supreme Court to allow women to practice law. The case was decided in 1872--100 years before this Senate report was written. The next case cited is from 1874 when the Court ruled that the 14th Amendment did not give women the right to vote--a good argument for the 19th amendment which was ratified in 1920, 50 years before this revival of the Equal Rights Amendment, which would accomplish the same thing--were it not already accomplished.

The Senate report goes on to the real case for the Equal Rights Amendment--the ERA is needed because *there is overwhelming evidence that persistent patterns of sex discrimination permeate our social, cultural and economic life.* The *overwhelming evidence* is various sets of figures which show statistical inequalities between men and women:

In 1968-69, women received only 37 percent of the Masters degrees, only 13 percent of the Doctorates and only 4 percent of the professional degrees. . . . While 75 percent of the teachers in public elementary and secondary schools are women, only 22 percent of the elementary school principals and only 4 percent of the high school principles are women.

Similar sets of figures have been used throughout the past decade as the major argument for the ERA. Here are some figures in the area of jobs and income which Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder of Colorado included in an article she wrote for a newspaper (*La Mujer*) in July 1981:

Economics . . . is what the ERA is all about. Women have been riding in the back of the economic bus for too long. If you don't know by heart the litany of facts, here's a refresher: Women earn 60 % of what men earn; Unemployment rates are higher for women than for men and highest of all for minority women; Women constitute the fastest growing poverty group in America; The median income for college graduate women is \$12,300; for college graduate men, it is \$ 20,324.

Such figures then, show the result of the *patterns of sex discrimination* which *permeate* our whole society.

Actually, what these figures show, is the result of the traditional patterns of human society in which men are providers and women are mothers. Is that the same thing as *discrimination* ? It is in a strange new expanded sense of the term.

the long brief

The Senate report on the ERA, refers back to what might be called the **long brief** for sexual equality legislation--two volumes titled *Discrimination Against Women* which came from congressional hearings in June of 1970 before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. These hearings were a forum for the new feminists, and they gave a meaning to *discrimination* which came directly from the ideology of the **women's liberation movement**.

The younger and more radical feminists came out of the **new left** in the late 1960s. The older and seemingly more moderate group which started the **National Organization for Women** in 1966 were mostly government bureaucrats, both State and Federal, employed by the various **Commissions on the Status of Women**, which met in Washington in 1966. It is a curious example of a subversive group which was paid by the government.

The conviction of these feminists is that they have an historic mandate to recondition other women and that they must use the force of the law to do it. Here is one of the more comprehensive statements, by Wilma Heide, who was a behavioral research scientist, the Chairwoman of the board of directors of the **National Organization for Women**, and Commissioner of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission:

Unless women have, from the moment of birth, socialization for, expectations of and preparation for a viable significant alternative to motherhood as their chief adult occupation, women will continue to want and reproduce too many children instead of producing ideas, art, literature, leadership, inventions and healthier social relationships. . . .

The second imperative for changed laws and practices is the women's rights liberation movement. Compared to other social movements of humankind, this may be the most profound social movement the world has ever known. It poses a fundamental challenge to attitudes and frank mythologies about sex caste divisions of labor and the subservient status of women. It demands basic structural changes in all of our social institutions in ways that are affecting every woman, man, girl and boy. It promises the eradication of sexism, the creation of an androgynous society to replace our androcentric culture, and finally a viable democracy to replace male supremacy values. (Vol I, page 122)

What they mean by *Discrimination Against Women* is all of the customs, attitudes and beliefs which cause women to choose marriage and to neglect careers. And they don't acknowledge that women voluntarily make this choice. In their view, women are forced into marriage, because society conditions them to choose it. So they are justified in using the force of the law to undo this conditioning.

This is the idea of *Discrimination* upon which the case for the ERA depends. The new ERA reported out in 1972 wasn't needed as a weapon against the faint traces of legal discrimination against women. It was needed as the legal basis for a feminist social revolution. It was a way of aiming the force of the government at the traditional pattern of society in which men and women have different roles, and in which the family is of primary importance to both.

statistical inequality

It is only from the perspective of the feminist ideology that those statistical inequality figures prove something. Does the fact that women made up "only 22 percent" of elementary school principals in 1968 show the existence of legal barriers to women becoming principals which quite a few of them got around somehow? No, it doesn't. It only shows the result of men and women following different roles, just as they always have.

A woman teaches a few years before she marries. After that, she teaches part time or intermittently because she is busy raising children. The man she marries sticks with teaching because he has to get serious about supporting a family. Since it takes years of teaching before anyone can work up to be a principal, it will mostly be men who become principals.

Can a woman who sticks with the job make principal? Obviously, that is just what many of them do. So where is the discrimination? It isn't there at all in the old legal sense of the word. It is there only in the new feminist sense--the situation shows discrimination because it shows that so many women give up teaching to raise families, instead of making a career of teaching. That is wrong, that is the "pattern of sex discrimination." They are victims of discrimination, because they are victims of the social conditioning that causes them to choose marriage and to neglect their careers.

"Women received only 37 percent of the Masters degrees . . ." Meaning what? That the missing 13 percent were discriminated against? So why didn't they discriminate against the 37 percent too while they were at it? No, the figure proves nothing except that the women's liberation mandate for 50 / 50, eliminate-all-differences sexual equality influenced every line of that Senate report which was written to show why the ERA was needed.

The primary reason that women get such a small percentage of the Ph D's and the professional degrees is that they marry Ph D's instead of getting the degree themselves. No excuse. Society is responsible for them making this deluded choice, and society must see to it that women don't make this kind of choice in future. Men will spend the best part of their lives mastering the narrow field of technical knowledge that will admit them to a profession and their main reward is that they can provide very well for their families. Why should a woman who wants a family spend her child-bearing years to get into this demanding occupation? So she can support the man?

Obviously it is a far more suitable position for the woman who never marries and / or never has children. But is it really an adequate compensation for a childless woman? And do we want so many of the best paying positions to go to those that support no one except themselves?

Congresswoman Schroeder's "litany of facts" which show why the ERA is needed, points out that "Women earn 60 % of what men earn." Even going to college doesn't help--"The median income for college graduate women is \$12,300 or 60.5% of the \$ 20,324 median for men.

College graduate men includes all the doctors, lawyers, professors, engineers and business executives. College graduate women includes all the women who are married to doctors, lawyers, professors, engineers and business executives. So the one figure includes the lawyer who earns \$60,000 a year and the other figure includes his wife who earns \$6,000 a year. The way the figures are presented implies that she has to get by on \$6,000 a year while he lives on \$60,000. In real life, the whole income is spent on both of them and their children.

an exercise in deception

Women professionals are included in the figure also. What sense does it make to use a median figure between high-salaried professional women and low-salaried housewives who are married to high-salaried men? The figure then gives a distorted picture of the economic situation of both women, and makes both appear to be much poorer than they are. From a common sense point of view, using figures this way is an exercise in deception.

But from the women's liberation perspective--and only from that perspective--the figures are valid. The college graduate woman should never have given up her chance at a career which would have given her as much earning power as her husband. The figures do show that even most college graduate women neglect their careers. Which is wrong, isn't it? The feminists believe so.

Unemployment rates are sometimes slightly higher for women overall because the figure includes a high unemployment rate among married women with working husbands, who must register as unemployed to collect benefits. Among women who are single, divorced or widowed--that is, among women who really have to work--the unemployment rate is always lower than it is for men in the same categories (and that is even truer of minority men and women.) But feminist statistics refuse to recognize a valid difference in situation between husbands--who have the lowest unemployment rate, and wives--who have the highest.

In fact, women hold a disproportionate share of the good jobs in our society. Real equality between men and women has to take into account the millions of women who absent themselves from the job market to raise children. Then if women make up (roughly) 37 % of any group of

employees, that is effectively parity, just on a statistical level, without considering any other factor, considering how many more men than women are really in the job market. And, actually, many of the good job situations are dominated by women who outnumber men 2 to 1 in many occupations. It is a fact that women find it easier to find good jobs than men, and especially than minority and lower class men who have the highest unemployment rate--it is in effect off the charts because so many of these men have effectively disappeared from the official statistics, by no longer even registering as "unemployed."

Later in her "discrimination" testimony, Commissioner Heide says that "actually the problems of poverty are the problems of women . . ." The subsuming of every basic social problem into the feminist perspective is characteristic of the feminist movement.

Feminist spokeswomen use figures to show that families "headed by males" have twice the income of families "headed by females." The remedy they call for is more and better jobs for women.

The non-feminist way of looking at that comparison is that you are really comparing a lot of two-parent (= "headed by men") middle class families with a lot of one-parent (= "headed by women") poor families, which are mostly black or Hispanic. So you are comparing families of different compositions--two parents versus one--which are typical of different classes.

The remedy from the non-feminist perspective is more and better jobs for lower class men who are unable to find decent jobs and ineligible for welfare, so they are unable to maintain the role of principal provider--which is why there are so many lower class families ostensibly headed by women. (The man may in fact be around, but, if they marry the man, they lose their welfare benefits in most states.)

But the new feminist ideology doesn't see the family headed by a male provider as the desirable social norm. Instead, they are determined to push a new social norm in which the male provider is dispensable. So the plight of poor women who draw welfare or who work only because they don't have husbands able to support them--is used as an argument for having the government promote careers for women--careers which neither these women nor their men folk will have any chance to get.

Congresswoman Schroeder's figures are typical of those that are used by ERA supporters. The existence of statistical inequality proves discrimination and shows the need for the ERA--is the whole argument. They don't explain the situation behind the figures or spell out how the ERA would change it. Is there a "right to an equal income" as they seem to imply, or will women have such a right once the ERA is passed?

the *sex role revolution*

So how would the ERA reverse these statistical inequalities? How would it un-pattern that *pattern of sexual discrimination* which shows up in jobs, education, and everywhere else? How else except through the *sex role revolution* that the feminists demand ?

The mainstream political supporters of the ERA don't mention a *sex role revolution*, but all the statistical inequalities they cite come from the difference in roles between men and women. As the political and documentary history of the new ERA shows, the *pattern of discrimination* which is their avowed target is only another name for the traditional pattern of different roles. So the mainstream supporters mean to do just what the more outspoken feminists mean to do, no matter how many ways they find to re-phrase it. The Government can eliminate statistical inequalities only by eliminating the difference in sex roles which causes them.

Could the ERA really be used as a mandate for a sex role revolution--as a way of making those old roles obsolete ? Yes, it could. To a surprising degree the feminists succeeded in using other legal provisions that way, and there is hardly any limit to what they could do with the ERA, except for the limit--it has turned out to be a serious one--of their diminishing political strength.

An Amendment to the Constitution is no simple ordinance to be passed today and put into effect tomorrow. Consider what section 2 of the ERA implies: *The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.* Meaning that the ERA would be the basis of new laws as well as a guide for judicial decisions. The amendment would be only the cornerstone of what could become a sprawling edifice of law and public policy. Over a period of years, it could be used to restructure society as thoroughly as its feminist sponsors intended.

Look at how sexual equality initiatives can show up in every kind of government activity, even without the ERA. Title IX was interpreted to mean that a school in Texas couldn't hold a *father and son* dinner because it would have "discriminated" against a woman and her son. In 1976, the Justice Department, citing the Fair Housing Act of 1968, tried to pressure Brigham Young University into changing a policy which required men and women students to live in separate rooming houses. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration withheld a \$ 100,000 grant from the Aurora, Colorado Police Department after three women failed the physical agility test (which other women had passed.) The Police Department subsequently waived the test for the women.

That is a small sample of the thousands of sexual equality cases that have been pursued at all levels of government in the last decade. Imagine what they could have done with the ERA--and there are thousands of feminist bureaucrats in the government, many of them in key positions, who are ready to do it.

Suppose a school district were enjoined to promote women to be principals on a preferential basis until 50 % are women--or maybe it is 75 % as the figures imply. Obviously a man who is trying for a job as a principal would have no chance at it, but the woman who intended to marry him would be a shoo-in. It would push the woman away from the choice to quit the job and raise babies and pressure her to make the commitment to a full time career instead.

That result is just what the feminists want. They want women to pursue careers and not to depend upon men to support them, and the conviction that women must be pushed in this direction is a basic part of their belief. In this situation, a 50 % affirmative action injunction is an effective means of pushing men out of the provider role and of pushing more women into careers. It would take some years and it would take a sustained effort, but they already had the means and the ERA would have given them the legal mandate to do it.

the two income couple

Federal and State governments are already promoting careers for women, that is, careers for females--many of them are hardly "women" in the old fashioned sense. And the policy has steadily eroded the economy that the old style family depends upon. It is only women without children that can take full advantage of government-mandated opportunities for careers for women. A couple with no children who both have high-salaried careers can achieve an economic clout that directly undermines the already eroded financial strength of the family with several children that depends upon the husband's income.

Finding themselves with more money than they really need, the two-career couple invest it so as to create an even larger surplus. They buy a second house. Many of the buyers who drove up prices in the housing inflation of 1976-1979, when the average house doubled or tripled in price--were investors rather than home buyers. The result was a doubling in the price of the home that the family with children needs. The end result is that, instead of owning a home, they wind up paying rent in perpetuity to the two career couple. [See *Pricey House / No Kids*]

If government agencies continue to intervene in the economy to promote careers for women, there will be fewer and fewer women who can afford not to take advantage of it, and fewer families which can get by on just the husband's income. So women will be forced by economic pressure to work full time outside the home whether they want to or not. That kind of an economy, which heavily favors the career woman at the expense of the old fashioned woman, is what the feminists want, and they have been at least partly successful in creating it already, even without the help of the ERA.

A conviction that they have an historical mandate to create a society where women no longer stay home with their children has been a basic part of the feminist ideology. Here is a blunt expression of it, which the French radical feminist Simone de Beauvoir made in a conversation with the "moderate" American feminist Betty Friedan:

de Beauvoir: No, we don't believe that any woman should have this choice. No woman should be authorized to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different. Women should not have that choice, precisely because, if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one. It is a way of forcing women in a certain direction.

Mrs. Friedan, of course, enters a ringing dissent to this totalitarian program:

*Friedan: I follow the argument, but politically at the moment I don't agree with it. The fact is, we have hardly any child-care centers in the United States. We're fighting for them, but there is such a tradition of individual freedom in America that I would never say that every woman must put her child in a child-care center. (Betty Friedan, **It Changed My Life** page 311)*

One of the main ideas of the feminists (it was Betty Friedan's major thesis in **The Feminine Mystique**) is that every woman needs a career as her principal occupation. Happiness is a career and nothing--especially not raising a family--should be allowed to interfere with your career.

Unlike being a mother and housewife, a career is challenging, exciting and glamorous, so satisfying that you may not even need a family. Many ERA supporters believe in this careerist philosophy of life and see the ERA as a mandate for careers for women.

jobs versus careers

What it ignores, among other things, is that--movie stars aside--most people have jobs, not careers. And the main satisfaction of a job for most people is that it enables them to support a family. What else could motivate a man to go to work day after day and year after year except love for his family and knowing that they really need him? In the traditional family, his role is essential.

Careers for women, the insistence that even women with families must have demanding, full-time, high-salaried occupations, begins at once to displace the male provider. His role is no longer essential. It is becoming *obsolete* as Ms. Friedan puts it.

And the woman's role as mother would become obsolete too. How can she pursue a career which would take so much of her time and energy? Answer: the child care center--another of the new woman's new rights. It would be anyway, if the feminists could get a bill passed, as they almost did a few years ago.

The modern alternative to the government-funded public child care center is abortion, which wasn't legal when BF wrote her book but she later became a founder of NARAL. Either way the woman escapes having to take responsibility for the baby, so both are pushed by modern feminists.

When Betty Friedan tells Simone de Beauvoir that there are *hardly any child-care centers* in the United States but that *we're fighting for them*, she is obviously not referring to the thousands of day care centers, nursery schools and baby sitting services, most of them private, that are found in the U. S. What she is talking about is a government run institution, free to mothers, that provides long term care.

The difference is between a place where you leave a child for a few hours and pay for it yourself, and a place where you can leave a child any time, for any length of time, and the government pays. In the one case the mother remains responsible for the child and is in constant touch. In the other, the responsibility for the child is actually shifted to the government. It is designed to fulfill a major goal of the women's liberation movement. They wanted to shift the responsibility for raising children from individual mothers to the society as a whole, which, practically, means the government.

It is an institution that is already found in Communist and socialist countries. Engels describes it succinctly in a 12 point program he prepared for the Second Congress of the Communist League in 1850: 8. *Raising all children in national institutions, at public expense.* You can kiss your baby-sitter goodbye! And you can kiss your baby goodbye too!

Creating an institution that would replace the mother was Robert Owen's aim in the nursery schools he founded, which admitted children as young as two years old. It was one of the few ways he had of trying to loosen family ties, because the residents of his factory town and his New Harmony community never really adopted his anti family creed.

children raised by the state

Plato's *Republic* was the original source for the proposal that all children should be raised in state run nurseries. The early Communists adopted it from him along with the other basic elements of an anti family program. It isn't well known because most people react to it with natural horror, and so its advocates have usually worked behind a veil of secrecy. And that has often been true of the modern feminists after the first reckless euphoria had passed.

So the feminist supporters of the ERA are not only perfectly serious about making the sex roles obsolete, but they have programs which could effectively do it. When the roles become obsolete, the family would become obsolete and so we would arrive at the post-revolutionary society the feminists envisioned and worked so hard to bring about.

However, it isn't going to happen. What is lacking is a national mandate for these feminist programs. What is lacking is ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. As of July 1st 1982, it is the ERA and the movement behind it that have achieved obsolescence.

Suppose the Gallup Poll's ERA questions were to spell out the sophisticated political meaning of the terms they use. They would cease to be a trap for the unwary:

A. Are you in favor of the Amendment which would give women equal rights and equal responsibilities, so that women would be equally responsible for supporting families and equally represented in all occupations?

B. Are you in favor of the Amendment which would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex--by which we mean the social, cultural and economic patterns that cause women to become wives and mothers instead of pursuing careers ?

follow-up question I: *Would you favor a sustained government effort to forcibly uproot these patterns of discrimination and to establish complete equality between the sexes in all areas of society ?*

follow-up question II: *Do you agree that the different roles men and women have in raising families are the result of discrimination against women and that they should become obsolete ?*

follow-up question III: *Do you agree that the traditional type of family which depended upon these different roles should also become obsolete ?*

That is the real Equal Rights Amendment. It is the one that the women of New York and New Jersey rejected in the 1975 election despite the assurances of the ERA advocates. It is an anti-family measure disguised as an equal rights measure. It has been the major focus of a partly successful attempt to impose a radically different form of society upon all of us.

Terry Sullivan 1982

Later Note February 2024

In hindsight, I was much too optimistic as to what the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment would accomplish. I had not fully realized how extra legal pressure can steadily erode what the law is supposed to mean, as witness how they have somehow pushed women into combat roles--nominally at least--despite the laws against it. Meanwhile, **Careers for Women** has become a national mandate, pushed by *rightists* as much as by *leftists*, with its devastating effect on home prices and families. The pressure comes from the so-called *conservatives* as well as from the *feminists*. It comes from all the worldly *Christians* who cling to a luxurious lifestyle and the illusory security of their investments. Long ago, they shrugged off the teaching that *The Love of Money is the Root of All Evil*. They have embraced the modern American faith in **More Money, Fewer Kids**.

Judge Kavanaugh is a *leftist*

So-called *conservatives* have bought into the modern piety that it is virtuous to support women's careers and that the government should provide child care to enable women to work. President Trump endorsed an expansion of government funded child care in one of his speeches. When Judge Brett Kavanaugh was nominated to the Supreme Court, he pointed with pride to his mother as the first *Judge Kavanaugh* and he is apparently satisfied with being an only child, which was the obvious result. At the press conference when he was nominated and in the Senate hearings, he proclaimed his support for careers for women and promised to appoint four women law clerks. Which is no help to women who marry lawyers and depend upon them for support while raising several children. One of his decisions indicates that he is likely to go along with government mandated contraception in *obamacare* because it is necessary to careers for women.

Everyone has to sympathize with him because of the atrocious treatment he received during the Senate hearings. I have been in several *kangaroo courts* in my time but I never saw any proceeding so contemptuous of *due process* as that which he received in this *august* body. *Disgusting* body is a more accurate description.

But his enthusiasm for **careers for women** is essentially the same as the **LEFTIST** position of Betty Friedan and the National Organization for Women. And that is true of most of America's *conservatives*. They have been intimidated into endorsing the major agenda of the feminists and it is required by their own lifestyles. It is now the position of most American families which want their daughters to go out and make lots of money regardless of the moral and spiritual and social cost. See the articles *Roots of Abortion II: Careers for Women* and *The Aborted American Lifestyle*.

Government funded **child care centers** are still a major program of the feminists and it is being pushed relentlessly as necessary to the mandate of **careers for women**. The knot-headed notion that children should be raised by *professionals* instead of *amateurs*--mothers who love them--has spread like a virus. I suppose it won't be long before they design robots to raise children.

In the 2020 campaign for the Democratic nomination for President, Elizabeth Warren called for *UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE for every baby in this country*. One of her mailers says it *would make high-quality child care and early education from birth to school age free for millions of families and affordable for all, and it would pay child care workers like comparable public school teachers*.

This proposal goes a long way in the direction of making babies the responsibility of the State, just as Engels advocated in 1850. In May 2019, the homosexual governor of the State of Colorado signed a bill to establish all day kindergarten at taxpayer expense.

It would be best if the government stayed out of it entirely, but, if the government is going to interfere, it should subsidize mothers so they can stay home with their kids instead of subsidizing child care centers to push mothers into going to work.

Many children do not get the attention they need from both parents which is necessary to develop that full personality they could achieve. They often go through life emotionally stunted because of that early neglect. The real Revolution in society will come about when children receive all the attention they need from a mother who gives them her full time attention and a father who is home evenings and week ends at least because he can support his family working 40 hours a week or less. [see *Adam Smith and Family Wage*] Mothers of young children should not have to work outside the home at all just to make money. It is a great injustice to their children. And they should have something to look forward to in later life, after their kids are raised, than just returning to the job market. Soldiers can retire after 20 years of service, and women who have served society well by raising their children right, should be able to do the same.

A mother who is raising children has a superior status which society must recognize. All the men must acknowledge it and all the childless women must acknowledge it also. She is entitled to privileged treatment, not just equal treatment. The future of our society depends upon how she raises her children--whether she can give her time to her children instead of hanging out in the bureaucracy and pursuing money. cf. Abraham Lincoln: *all that I am or ever hope to be, I owe to my angel mother.*

Runaway Inflation in the Housing Market

The runaway inflation in the housing market in the past 50 years has forced women to keep working to help pay the mortgage on these ridiculously over priced homes. [See *Pricey House, No Kids*] Making money off money by speculation, especially by *flipping* houses, and promoting *homelessness*, has become everyone's occupation. cf. Jeremiah 6.13 *from the least to the greatest of them, every one is greedy for unjust gain.* Americans can now afford every luxury except children. The result is that **the number of American women arriving at age 40 without any children has doubled in the past 40 years.**

The housing market was inflated in 2004-2006. In order to get people to buy houses at these inflated prices, the mortgage brokers gave them **interest only** or **Adjustable Rate Mortgages** and encouraged them to exaggerate their incomes in order to qualify. That enabled people who could not really afford these prices to go ahead anyway. The mortgage brokers did this because they could then *bundle* the mortgages and sell them world wide as *securities* without having any further liability. If the *sub prime* home buyer failed to pay the mortgage, they didn't care, because they already had their commission. This fraud, in which all the big investment banks participated, produced *toxic assets* which led to a world wide collapse in the financial industry. After Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns went belly up, the Federal Reserve set out to rescue the rest of these giant financial firms from the collapse produced by their own fraudulent financing. [see *The Unjust Economy*]

The Federal Government is largely to blame for the current runaway inflation in the housing market. There would almost certainly have been a bust long ago if the Federal Reserve had not pumped trillions into the financial market, much of which wound up in the hands of the housing speculators, large and small. The Fed first began doing this under the label of **Quantitative Easing** back in 2007-2009 to bail out the big banks from the collapse of the financial market which was due to their dishonest dealings in **bundled mortgage securities** based upon *liar's loans* to *sub prime* buyers. These **toxic assets**, which were bought by international banks, led to a spectacular near melt down of the financial industry world wide.

The Federal Reserve lowered their bank loan rate all the way down to 0 per cent. When that failed to jump start lending, they began buying *mortgage-backed securities* and *Treasury Bonds* at the rate of 85 billion a month--more than one trillion a year. They succeeded in propping up the banks, but they also in effect kept the housing market from dropping to where it should have been.

They compounded the felony when they resumed pumping money into the financial market in March 2020 in response to the Covid 19 epidemic and the downturn in the economy. By June, the Fed was buying \$ 80 billion a month in *Treasuries* plus \$ 40 billion a month in *mortgage-backed securities*. And it continued buying at this rate until the end of 2021. They put **1.4 trillion** into the financial market in 2021. And **the housing market inflated by 18 per cent in 2021**--an all time high.

Since 1963, general inflation has risen by 900 per cent. In the same period, the housing market, which used to keep pace with inflation, has inflated by **2300 per cent !** Just before the Fed began re-inflating the market back in 2007, house prices had dropped to a third of what they had been. And most of the speculators were pushed out of the market. That is just what should happen now. And it almost certainly would happen if the Fed would stay out of it. **House prices should fall to a third of what they are now.** That would put them back in line with the over all inflation rate. And make houses affordable to all the families who are now priced out of the market in our cities. The underlying problem is that the Government caters to those who make money off money.

enraged women

America has millions of childless women, living with **post abortion stress disorder**--nightmares about their abortions--and engaged in a power and money trip by way of trying to find some compensation for the want of a family. These **enraged women** are a major source of the poisonous politics we have seen in recent years. Having lost any connection with traditional morality, they desperately need the sanction which the Supreme Court has given to abortion. It doesn't put an end to their nightmares, but it gives them an official assurance that they didn't do something very wrong. While they know in their bones that they did do something very wrong.

Do women in Congress best represent the interests of other women ? Most of them are adversarial to the primary interests of women who are staying home to raise children and whose husbands need jobs to support the family. In the last recession, men suffered unemployment much more than women. The claim is made that women are still discriminated against in the economy. They may be under represented at the level of the 100 million dollar a year CEO, but they are heavily favored in the rest of the economy, especially in the bureaucracies, where women have most of the good jobs. In the health care industry, in the colleges and universities, and in city and county governments, men are a small minority, and young black men are very rare.

The Dobbs *dissent*

The *dissent* to the June 22nd 2022 *Dobbs* decision by Breyer, Kagan and Sotomayer says that *it curtails women's rights and undermines their status as free and equal citizens*. And that is obviously true if *free and equal* requires abortion. If women are not able to easily discard unwanted pregnancies, their sexual *freedom* is severely limited and their *equality* in respect to pursuing wealth via careers is seriously curtailed. The other side of this is that their embryo sons and daughters are given a chance at life and the women escape those nightmares that result from putting their babies in the trash. And they escape the epidemics of Sexually Transmitted Disease which have accompanied the sexual promiscuity of the modern American lifestyle.

Most abortions are now done with the pill and many of those are done at home. Which means that the woman has to handle the *products of conception* herself--has to flush down the toilet a 2 inch body which has arms and legs and a head. As if it were just another turd. And then she has to live with that memory the rest of her life. And has to live with the obvious question: if my little son or daughter was just a turd, what am I? How do I deserve to be treated? That is too high a price to pay for *equality*. A desk in the bureaucracy is not worth it.

The historical reality is that *feminism* has been pushed primarily by *women* who have lost their chance to ever have a family. Are these *women* motivated by an altruistic love of other women? Mostly they seem to be **anti-women**, driven by envy of those who have what they don't have: kids. They pursue money and power to compensate for the want of a family. The mandate for giving them the good jobs at the expense of men who are supporting families is fundamentally anti family and anti social.

Like other Americans, American Christians have become trapped in a luxurious life style which is very hard to maintain on one income. And the security which was once found in families and communities has largely disappeared. People are spending the best years of their lives trying to accumulate enough *wealth* so that they can finally live a little in their later years. They must put their faith in brokers and real estate speculating and investing in those treacherous *401ks* and *IRAs* tied to the stock market. They ignore what Jesus taught about not *storing up treasure here on earth where thieves break in*. The stock market is full of thieves.

The disappearance of the Christian community and the disappearance of the family has left us vulnerable. The accumulation of *wealth* provides **the illusion of security**. And takes the place of counting on the love of those children they never had because they were too busy making money.

What people with any sense realized a long time ago is that the idea of *Equality for Women* is fundamentally absurd. How can she compete in sports if she is pregnant, how can she compete in the economy when she has small children that depend upon her? Equality for Women has meant the destruction of the family. That was in fact the half concealed purpose of a long running historical plot, which has been aided and abetted by money loving *Christians*.

Under the pretence of **equality for women**, *Communism* set out to **abolish the family** in theory and failed to do it. But *Capitalism*--the pursuit of wealth via **careers for women and every man a real estate speculator**--is well on the way to doing it in practice.

There are women who, for one reason or another, do not have children. And they have to find something else to do with their lives. In times past many of them joined the religious orders which serve humanity by staffing schools and hospitals.

The apostasy of the modern Catholic Church, its conformity to the wealth pursuing *world*, led to the dispersal of many of these orders and we are seriously worse off because of it. The disappearance of the nursing nuns is one of the reasons for the obscene cost of medical care today. The next time they charge you \$ 80 for a pair of aspirin, remember: that is what you get for making fun of nuns. Catholic schools now charge like elite private schools and produce pro abortion *statesmen* and *stateswomen*.

What appeared with a peculiar prominence in the Women's Liberation Movement was the idea that selfishness is an ideal motive. In a published letter to her daughter, Betty Friedan insists that all she has done for women, including her own daughter, has really been done for herself. (The letter is in *It Changed My Life*.) She implies that it is wrong and dishonest to be altruistic--even towards your own daughter !

The idea that selfishness is not a vice but a virtue of the highest order appears conspicuously in Ayn Rand's novel *Atlas Shrugged*, and I suspect she was the original source of that idea as it appeared in the careerist wing of the women's liberation movement in the late 1960s. She was a childless woman, either because she did not want children, or because she was not able to have a child. She may have been sterile because of abortions. Which were common in post revolution Leningrad, where she was a student, and in the Hollywood of the 1920s where she was a screenwriter. That would explain the peculiar and extreme pro *selfishness* dogma in her novel contra refusing to *sacrifice* yourself or your career for dependent *moist-mouthed weaklings*--a phrase that keeps recurring in the novel. And that is the spirit of the modern feminist movement. Women are encouraged to pursue wealth and power and pleasure. They join the sexual revolution and put their babies in the trash at Planned Parenthood.

Mother Teresa

When Mother Teresa founded the Missionaries of Charity to serve *the poorest of the poor* in Calcutta India, she gave a conspicuous example of that spirit of dedication to the service of humanity that marked the old religious orders. And their mission has spread to many other places around the world.

The *sidewalk counsellors*, who stand outside the abortuaries every morning to try and save babies from the trash, also exemplify that spirit of dedication.

Passing out pro life leaflets, person to person, like the Nilsson photo of the 22 week embryo, is the best way to bear witness to women who will otherwise take the abortion pill at home without ever going near the Planned Parenthood abortuary.

As well as witnessing to others, Christians have to find an alternative to the money loving life style if they want to save their own grandchildren from the trash. That has to become a major priority of the pro life movement.

TJS