women have differing strengths. The Equal Rights Amendment can never do for women what needs to be done for them. Women need to know Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior and be under His Lordship. They need a man who knows Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior, and they need to be part of a home where their husband is a godly leader and where there is a Christian family.

The Equal Rights Amendment strikes at the foundation of our entire social structure. If passed, this amendment would accomplish exactly the opposite of its outward claims. By mandating an absolute equality under the law, it will actually take away many of the special rights women now enjoy. ERA is not merely a political issue, but a moral issue as well. A definite violation of holy Scripture, ERA defies the mandate that “the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church” (Ep. 5:23). In 1 Peter 3:7 we read that husbands are to give their wives honor as unto the weaker vessel, that they are both heirs together of the grace of life. Because a woman is weaker does not mean that she is less important.

I deeply respect Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly. Mrs. Schlafly is a conservative activist. She is a lawyer and has an extensive background in national defense. At services in the Thomas Road Baptist Church, Lynchburg, Virginia, Mrs. Schlafly made these comments: “The more I work with the issue of ERA, the more I realize that the women’s liberation movement is antifamily. The proof came in November 1977 when the conference on International Women’s Year met in Houston. It passed twenty-five resolutions which show very clearly what the feminists are after. They are for the Equal Rights Amendment, which would take away the marvelous legal rights of a woman to be a full-time wife and mother in the home supported by her husband. They are for abortion on demand, financed by the government and taught in the schools. They are for privileges for lesbians and homosexuals to teach in the schools and to adopt children. They are for the government assuming the main responsibility for child care because they think it is oppressive and unfair that
society expects mothers to look after their babies. All their goals and dogmas are antifamily. They believe that God made a mistake when He made two different kinds of people.

“They believe that we should use the Constitution and legislation to eliminate the eternal differences and the roles that God has ordained between men and women. They want to require all laws and regulations and all schools to treat men and women exactly the same. They want to do it with federal control. That is what Section 2 of the Equal Rights Amendment would do. Another dogma of the women’s liberationists is that you have no right to make a moral judgment between what is right and what is wrong. They want to give the homosexuals and the lesbians the same dignity as husbands and wives. They want to give the woman who has an illegitimate baby the same dignity as the one who has had one in holy matrimony. The Equal Rights Amendment, uses the word ‘sex,’ not the word ‘woman.’ ERA puts sex into the Constitution—a mandate that one could never make a reasonable common-sense difference of treatment between male and female, or between good sex and bad sex. ERA would do this with the power of the federal government. Moral Americans have beaten ERA forces for seven years. Then the proponents passed their unfair time extension. They are trying to use the power of the federal government to force the unratified states to switch from no to yes. Meanwhile, they are trying to use the courts to deny states the right to switch from yes to no. We must continue to fight against the ERA and to win this battle for God, for the dignity of women, and for the institution of the family.”

Phyllis Schlafly, one of the most knowledgeable people I know, continued to outline the ERA movement. The next several paragraphs are a synopsis of her presentation.

The Equal Rights Amendment offers women nothing in the way of rights or benefits that they do not already have. In the areas of employment and education, laws have already been enacted to protect women. The only thing the Equal Rights Amendment would do would be to take away rights and privi-

ileges that American women now have in the best country in the world. Let us look at some of the women who are the leaders in the feminist and ERA movements.

Betty Friedan, founder of the National Organization for Women (NOW), made this statement in a NOW-ERA fundraising letter: “The ERA has become both symbol and substance for the whole of the modern women’s movement for equality. . . . I am convinced that if we lose this struggle we will have little hope in our own lifetime of saving our right to abortion. . . .” Betty Friedan states that a feminist agenda for the eighties must call for “the restructuring of the institutions of work.” As she already stated, Gloria Steinem, editor of Ms. magazine, made this statement: “By the year 2000 we will, I hope, raise our children to believe in human potential, not God. . . .” Dr. MaryJo Bane, associate director of Wellesley College’s Center for Research on Women, made this statement: “We really don’t know how to raise children. . . . The fact that children are raised in families means there’s no equality . . . in order to raise children with equality, we must take them away from families and raise them. . . .”

Humanist Manifesto II, signed by Betty Friedan, contains this statement: “No deity will save us, we must save ourselves. Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful.” In the notes from the Second Year Women’s Liberation we find these comments: “We must destroy love . . . love promotes vulnerability, dependence, possessiveness, susceptibility to pain, and prevents the full development of woman’s human potential by directing all her energies outward in the interests of others.” In the document Declaration of Feminism, we find this: “Marriage has existed for the benefit of men and has been a legally sanctioned method of control over women . . . the end of the institution of marriage is a necessary condition for the liberation of women. Therefore, it is important for us to encourage women to leave their husbands and not to live individually with men . . . we must work to destroy it [marriage].” In her speech in Houston, Texas,
Gloria Steinem made this comment: ". . . for the sake of those who wish to live in equal partnership, we have to abolish and reform the institution of legal marriage."

The Equal Rights Amendment sounds deceptively simple. It contains only three sentences: "Section 1: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. Section 2: The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. Section 3: This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification." When ERA went to the floor of the House and Senate, a number of congressmen and senators tried to insert amendments. When ERA went to the floor of the Senate, Senator Sam Ervin proposed nine separate clauses as amendments to ERA. Every one of these clauses was defeated on a roll-call vote. They included such provisions as, "Except it won't require us to draft women. Except it won't require us to send our young women into military combat. Except it won't take away the rights of working women. Except it won't take away the rights of wives, mothers, and widows. Except it won't take the right to privacy of men or women, boys or girls. Except it won't interfere with laws which are based on physiological differences." Every one of these clauses was defeated.

ERA came out of Congress on March 22, 1972, and went to the states with a clause setting a time limit of seven years for ratification. In the first twelve months, thirty states passed it, most of them without any hearings or debates on the issue. When concerned women became involved and went to their state legislators and ERA was thoroughly examined, states began to realize that they had made a mistake in passing the ERA. In the next six years, five more states passed ERA, but five others rescinded passage. As the time limit neared expiration, proponents of the ERA asked Congress for a time extension. This was exactly like a losing football team demanding a fifth quarter in order to give them time to catch up, and furthermore providing that only the losing team may carry the ball. We are now in the three-year extension, which is actually ille-

gal. The power move evidenced by this extension has been unprecedented in the history of our Constitution.

Let us examine the Equal Rights Amendment. In the first section we find that the word "sex," not "women," is put into the Constitution. It is not clarified what meaning of sex is ascribed here. "Equality of rights" is an undefined term. There is no judicial history for that term. ERA applies only to governmental action, laws, and regulations. Their terms are vague and undefined. Thus one of the major defects of the ERA is that it is a blank check to the U.S. Supreme Court to tell Americans what it means after it is ratified. It is probable that the ERA would require sex-neutral words to be put in all our laws--words like person, taxpayer, spouse, and parent. If we look at our Constitution today we find that it is the most beautiful sex-neutral document ever written. It does not talk about men and women, male and female. The U.S. Constitution uses only words such as person, citizen, resident, inhabitant, etc. Women have every constitutional right that men have. Employment laws are already sex-neutral. ERA has nothing to do with equal pay for equal work.

Our country has fought in nine wars, and has had a draft for thirty-three years of this century. No woman in America has ever been drafted or sent into military combat. The draft act has always read: "Male citizens of age eighteen must register." This is an example of a sex-discriminatory law. There is an exemption to females. This is the American way. We have laws that exempt women from military combat duty. There is one for the Army, one for the Navy, and one for the Air Force. In November 1979, the House Armed Services Committee held four days of hearings on the women's liberation proposal to repeal the laws that exempt women from military combat duty. There were women who held jobs in the Pentagon who said, "Women want their career advancement to be generals and admirals and to be assigned to combat duty." Men like Admiral Jeremiah Denton, who spent seven years in a POW camp in Vietnam, spoke about what it means to be in combat. Should the ERA pass, the Constitution would compel us to force women to serve
in the military and to go into combat zones. The ERA is an amendment to the Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, and if ERA goes into the Constitution it would immediately wipe out the laws that exempt women from military combat. The military would have to obey the Constitution.

The women's liberation movement is seeking to require sex integration of every aspect of all school systems. This would mean that there could be no more all-men's or all-women's schools or colleges. All classes and dormitories would have to be coed. All sports programs would have to be coed. There could be no single-sex fraternities or sororities, no Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, YMCA,YWCA, or Campfire Girls. There could be no Girls State or Boys State. There could be no mother/daughter and father/son school events. Under ERA it would be unconstitutional to have any of these things because they “discriminate on account of sex.” ERA not only would apply to public schools, but it would also extend to all private schools and colleges whether or not they receive public money.

The Founding Fathers who established our great nation separated the power of government between the federal government and the states, and then again between executive, legislative, and judicial branches. We have maintained great freedom under this system. Under this distribution of power between the states and the federal government, a large area of law has been retained at the state level. Many of the laws at the state level have traditionally made differences of treatment based upon sex, and they are the type of laws that would be subject to ERA. These laws include: marriage, divorce, child custody, adoptions, homosexual laws, incest laws, prison regulations, and insurance rates. These are all laws that traditionally have made some type of difference of treatment based on sex. Section 1 of ERA would prohibit any common-sense difference of treatment based on sex. Section 2 would shift the total decision-making power over these laws to the federal government. Under Section 1 of the ERA they would be forced to make these laws sex neutral. There could never be a law that says a husband should support his wife. Laws such as this were not designed to discriminate against one's sex. They merely defined responsibilities designed for the purpose of keeping the family together. Not only would ERA make state laws sex neutral, but it would also shift the final decision-making power to the federal government.

In summary, we conclude that there are no exceptions to Section 1 of the Equal Rights Amendment. ERA proponents voted down and eliminated all clauses that would have preserved women's exemption from the military, draft, and wartime combat duty; that would have preserved the rights of wives, mothers, and widows to be financially supported by their husbands' benefits; that would have preserved protective health and safety laws for working women; that would have preserved the right of privacy in school and public restrooms, hospitals, and prisons; that would have preserved the rights of legislatures to pass laws against abortion, and homosexual and lesbian privileges. Section 2 of the Equal Rights Amendment would mean federalizing vast powers that states now have, including marriage and divorce, child custody, prison regulations, and insurance rates. Section 2 would mean that federal courts and the federal bureaucracy would make all final decisions regarding marriage, divorce, alimony, abortion, homosexual and lesbian privileges, and sex integration of police and fire departments, schools and sports, hospitals, prisons, and public accommodations.

It is ironic that ERA and feminist proponents do not talk about the display of printed or pictorial materials that degrade women in a pornographic, perverted, or sadistic manner. In fact, Playboy magazine hosts ERA parties and contributes heavily to their campaigns. In Illinois alone, Playboy gave five thousand dollars to help ratify ERA. The check was personally presented by Christy Hefner, the daughter of the magazine's publisher. In Florida a fund-raising event was held for the ERA. The honored guest was Marague St. James, President of COYOTE (Call Off Your Old Tired Ethics), an organization of prostitutes. Margaux St. James said, "Give me two weeks and a dozen girls in any state capital, and I will deliver ERA on a silver platter."

Brigadier General Andrew J. Gatsis, who is now retired, entered the military in 1939 as a private. He was a professional
combat infantryman for thirty-six years. A West Point graduate, he served in several wars, including the Korean War, where he personally led a counterattack on Christmas Day 1952. He also served in the Vietnam War. He is one of the most highly decorated officers in the United States armed forces. Speaking to an Eagle Forum workshop on March 23, 1979, he made these comments about the drafting of women into combat: "I have served as an infantry commander in three separate combat tours, all at the fighting level. I have personally participated in hand-to-hand combat and have seen men fight and die on the battlefield. I have had women in my command, have observed their performance firsthand, and have had to contend with the disruptive effect on military discipline and combat efficiency brought about by the women's liberation movement, a movement fully supported and promoted by the top echelons of our government."

Proponents of the ERA are continuing efforts to reduce combat effectiveness through the goals of ERA by preparing the American public to accept the idea of drafting women and placing them into combat units. They are using the all-volunteer force as a mechanism for misleading Americans into thinking war and combat roles are natural to women.

"I would like to say there are some women, certainly in the minority, who like the military, who like to live and work with men, and have given an excellent performance in certain non-combat positions such as clerks, telephone operators, computer technicians, supply supervisors, nurses, and the like. World War II is ample proof of this. However, these rules do not satisfy the objective of the women's movement, which is to make women equal with men in all sectors of military activity regardless of the damage and effect it has on fighting spirit or combat efficiency. In fact, avid supporters of ERA have little concern for our defense posture and are willing to weaken or sacrifice it if it conflicts with the goals they seek."

"I must tell you that the top command structure of our military forces, the Pentagon, is saturated with ERA proponents, and under the complete control of avid supporters of the women's liberation movement. Members of various women's organizations such as NOW (National Organization for Women) have been placed in key manpower positions of authority who formulate and direct policies concerning U.S. military readiness posture. The result and outflow is that U.S. readiness revolts more around enhancing the women's liberation movement than it does meeting the military capability of a potential Army."

"In spite of the effort to propagandize the American public with the great success of the all-volunteer force and its large component of women, the plan has backfired. The myth that women do as well as men, and even better in some cases in the all-male traditional roles, is beginning to show up for the falsehood it is. The military services are unable to get sufficient soldiers to enlist or stay in the jobs that require those skills. Women are finding out how tough this training is and that they will spend considerable time in the fields. As a result, they are avoiding glamorous career management fields such as air defense, artillery, paint mechanics, linepole climbing, and the like, causing large overstrength in the medical and administrative fields."

"In a desperate attempt to overcome this shortage in the combat support areas, the Army is now experimenting with the program that offers special bonuses, free education, and a reduced time of service from three to two years, to encourage them to accept unnatural roles. In addition, just recently, they began to lower the score for entrance into the military from a score of 50, which is the national average, to 31 for women. This approach is also failing, for approximately 50 per cent of women enlistees are not finishing their tour of service."

"To convince the American public that women could perform all jobs in the military as well as men, one of the greatest psychological-warfare efforts ever devised was launched through the national and major news media. The first step was to order a series of tests and evaluations to substantiate predrawn conclu-
sions that women are fit to fight on the battlefield. When the studies came back showing that women as a whole were inadequate in this area, the studies were sent back for re-evaluation.

"The next move was to have senior civilian defense officials and military leaders hail the sex-integrated all-volunteer force as a great success. Today even top defense officials have to admit it is a dismal failure, as they cannot meet recruiting goals and the quality is low. Having seen their plan shattered within the last year, these same officials have begun to redirect their efforts to a strategy that calls for the draft of women. Recently, the Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, asked the House Armed Services Committee to register women as well as men for the draft. Very shortly thereafter, all chiefs of the four military services—Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force—went before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee for personnel and manpower and recommended that women be required to register for the draft.

"If the draft is ever implemented, and ERA is ratified, all barriers will be removed from placing women in combat roles. The proponents of ERA will tell you that this will never happen and only a very few women will be put in combat, since all military assignments are based on the soldier's physical profile and his trained skill. Even though these are the rules, anyone who has ever been in combat knows a large number of people are always improperly assigned, due to the fact that pipeline replacements do not flow even—it's a very complex system—replacements never arrive when needed, and the nature of casualties is never so predictable that one can requisition the proper type and exact number to fill the job vacancy required. The normal procedure is to reach into the locally available noncombat resources for replacing combat shortages.

"For example, after my company had been thrown off of its positions by a large Communist Chinese attack one early morning, we were left with only 42 men out of 197. Since there were no combat-type replacements at hand, I was forced to muster my noncombat-type personnel, such as clerks, cooks, and vehicle drivers for the counterattacking force needed to eject the enemy from Hill 266. The point to be made is that, when the situation is critical, noncombat qualified women who are locally available in support units will be used.

"Let me comment what placing women in combat roles will mean to them and to military combat effectiveness. The combat environment is an ugly one. For the ground soldier, it is characterized by drudgery, indignity, and anonymous horrors. It calls for a toughness that women do not normally possess, for battle is primitive, vicious, brutal, and exhausting. It is coupled with depression and crippling fatigue, which together create terror in the soldier's heart and make him wonder as he sees the night coming down if he will see the edge of dawn. His feelings fluctuate from despair to extreme hate and bitterness, which tend to bring forth his most animal instincts.

"If he is fighting in the Mekong Delta, he must endure living in mosquito-infested paddies, immersed in filthy waters up to his waist and armpits for continuous periods of twenty-four to forty-eight hours, where he is subjected to fungus, bacterial infections, and immersion foot. The skin breaks out with tiny red scale vesicles on the foot and other parts of the body. The feet become swollen and top layers of dead white skin come off in silver-dollar patches. These conditions are aggravated by body leeches, which the soldier must also endure. The less rate for male casualties in this kind of operation averaged 50 per cent in my command.

"If he is fighting in the hills of Korea, he is subject to bitter cold, frostbite, and diseases such as the plague resulting from living in rat-infested bunkers. If his mission turns to the Middle East or Africa, he suffers from filth, relentless heat, and the dryness of the desert. In the highlands of Vietnam, he's plagued by bamboo vipers, snakes, torrential rains, jungle rot, malaria, and the like. In Europe it is the deluge of mud, the slime of dripping dugouts, and the weariness of continuous marches along the hot, dusty road.

"These are only some of the daily environmental living conditions of the ground combat soldier, let alone the nightmares of mortal combat. These are not the kinds of conditions in which we wish to place anyone. But can we, as civilized people, even
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begin to entertain the thought of sending our women into such an environment against their will?

"To survive these conditions and to function effectively at the same time against a determined enemy, it is mandatory that the individual soldier be in top physical condition with the long-term inborn stamina that will not wane after long grueling hours of trudging toward the objective. It is a kind of strength that keeps the soldier fit to fight after he reaches the enemy, regardless of the obstacles he must overcome before contacting them.

"The concerted drive to convince the public that women can do as well as men in combat is at its height today. Listen to the statement made by our Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, who has never been in combat and has only had six months of active military service in the Army National Guard as a private first class: 'There are few things that men can do that women can't. By law, they don't fight. My personal opinion is contrary to what the law says.' The Army chief of staff says, 'I see no reason why women cannot serve effectively in combat roles further to the rear.'

"All kinds of tests—field tests, training tests, and readiness tests—have been conducted over and over again showing conclusively that women are not fit for combat and that by nature they are smaller, physically slower, physically weaker particularly in upper-body strength to throw a grenade effectively, dig a foxhole, hack a path through the thick jungle with a machete, fight an enemy soldier with a rifle butt and a bayonet, pull oneself through a long, narrow tunnel with heavy demolitions to flush an enemy sniper out of his hiding place. Yet the power of the women's liberation movement prevails in the U.S. Army, and these results are not accepted. They counter by saying, 'Women may be weak in these areas, but they are better educated and score better in aptitude tests.' There is some truth to this since all females must have a high-school education to qualify for the service. But the difference lies in the fact that education is not the ingredient that wins battles for the combat soldier. It is sim-

ple tactical plans, guts, stamina, and brutal physical force that bring victory.

"What is so ironic about all of this is that most of the motivated volunteer female soldiers do not want to go into combat; it is the women liberationist leaders who will never have to go who are pushing so hard for this.

"I only wish those who push for placing women in combat could see it as I have. Are they ready to see their daughters and wives exposed to the wrath of the enemy because they could not dig in the hard ground in time for protection? Should they have to hear the screams of burning human torches trapped in the entanglements of barbed wire after napalm cans are exploded along the main line of resistance? Must they become the victims of suffocation in a covered position resulting from bunked-out oxygen due to white phosphorus? Are we really ready to have them face the cold, steel bayonet of the male enemy soldier? Or be horribly mangled in a trapped minefield that no one can penetrate? Think of that young eighteen-year-old moist-eyed girl with homesickness, looking at the faded twilight; she believes the sky is lost forever. Do they need to hear that dreaded noise of incoming artillery beating like a kettle drum, which is like two steel needles pressing on the ear drums? Have they thought about what our women would suffer as prisoners of war at the hands of the enemy who uses the pressure water-hose technique of blowing one’s stomach up like a balloon to gain military information? And what a trump card our enemy would have in blackmailing the United States while holding a large number of women prisoners! How can we reconcile our moral perceptions of women with these immoralities of war? No one who has seen real combat could believe that our congressmen and governmental leaders would talk about drafting women and placing them in combat, yet they are doing this very thing today."

Hidden away throughout all the bureaucracies there are hundreds of little advisory committees that are supposedly there to represent the view of the people. One of them within
HEW is called the Secretary’s Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women. This is a panel that directly advises the Secretary of HEW on what women of America want. The panel is made up of twelve very aggressive, self-proclaimed feminists. The head of this group was asked if there were other viewpoints in America besides the feminist viewpoint, to which she replied, “Oh no. I’m confident we represent all American women.” The input of those twelve women is recognized by top government.

Need I say that it is time that moral Americans became informed and involved in helping to preserve family values in our nation? Now it is not too late. But we cannot wait. The twilight of our nation could well be at hand.
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When the dust of this present age has settled, and our present turmoil becomes a subject for recollection in tranquility, let us imagine that some gifted young historian has set for himself the task of accounting for the attitudes and behavior of the affluent bourgeoisie in the fateful later decades of the twentieth century. Surely he will find (perhaps in deference to my subject, I should say “he or she” will find) that not least among the puzzles of the period is the passion with which a group of the freest, most vital and energetic—and most economically and physically privileged—young women in the history of the race rose up and proclaimed themselves to be the victims of intolerable oppression.

Perhaps even more puzzling in retrospect will have been the willingness of their contemporaries to affix to their uprisings the name of feminism. For feminism properly understood is a view summed up in the simple proposition that women are the equals of men: that they are as intelligent, as competent, as brave, and above all, as morally responsible. It was this proposition, for example, that earlier in the century secured for women the right to vote, to educate themselves, to have and to spend their own money, and in general, to take upon themselves a share of the burden of civic responsibility. And yet easily the single most salient and unifying feature of the movement that erupted in the 1960s and that claimed to speak exclusively both to and for the problems of women—the movement that formally dubbed itself Women’s Liberation—was its characterization of the condition of women as that of a pervasive and nearly universal inferiority. Despite any illusory appearances to the contrary, declared this movement, women everywhere were to be found mindless, helpless, cowering in the face of masculine power, their lives held in thrall to the whims and fashions of a manipulative culture. When their mothers, prior victims of male dominance, told them to marry, they married. When the needs and exigencies of a capitalist economy decreed that they must consume, they devoted their lives to a mad, spiralling round of consumption and to the breeding of a vast cohort of new consumers. When men, through the