



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 10, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1977

What's At Stake in The SALT Negotiations?

Civil Defense

A 374-page book that sells 500,000 copies is a best-seller in any language. A book that sold that many copies inside Russia was published this year in the United States. I wonder if it will sell even 1,000 here. The book has no sex appeal. The people pictured in the book are covered with many layers of clothing.

The book is entitled, simply, "Civil Defense." For the Russians, it is a how-to-do-it manual on how to survive a nuclear war. For Americans, it is a manual to dispel the four myths that our government and people have swallowed during the last decade.

1. "Nuclear war is unthinkable." While Americans have engaged in the mass delusion that they could cram the nuclear genie back into the bottle by NOT thinking about it, the Soviets have been doing a great deal of imaginative thinking about it. They think about how to fight a nuclear war, how to win it, and how to survive it.

2. "Detente and disarmament are the key to peace." The Soviets don't buy that American myth at all. The Soviets believe and proclaim that nuclear superiority of one nation is the key to peace -- on their terms, that is. The top Russian military strategist and Marshal of the Soviet Union, A. Grechko, stated shortly before he died: "The greater the combat ability of the armed forces of our country, the more powerfully they are equipped, and the better the personnel are trained, the more peace there will be on earth."

3. "Nuclear war will be deterred by mutual assured destruction." The theory of this myth is that each country will be deterred from striking the other by the knowledge that the other will strike back. The civilian population of each side is, thus, hostage to the other. The trouble is, the Soviets haven't the slightest intention of cooperating in this mutuality, and their book on civil defense proves it. The Soviets believe that one side can carry out a preemptive first-strike so massive that it will preclude the other from striking back at all.

4. "Nuclear war would be so destructive that, once one side pushes the button, it will be the end of the human race." This was the message of such popular books and movies as *On The Beach* and *Dr. Strangelove*. The Soviets reject this theory in toto. Their book on civil defense shows how they plan to save lives in the event of nuclear war.

Dr. Leon Goure of the Center for International Studies at the University of Miami has said that "the United States might lose as many as 100 million people

in the event of a Soviet attack; . . . the Soviet Union, on the other hand, might lose less than it did in World War II." General Daniel James, Jr., Commander-in-Chief of NORAD, recently explained why the United States stands to lose so many: "We have NO [antiballistic missile] defense against ballistic missiles."

The best-selling Soviet book on civil defense explains why substantially all the Russian population will survive. Their civil defense plans are detailed, comprehensive, and expensive. They include urban evacuation, shelter construction, the training of civil defense units and of the general population, and the protection of industry, services, and agriculture.

Civil defense in the United States is best described in one forceful four-letter word: a joke.

The underlying theory of the Soviet civil defense program is that, as Grechko emphasized, "the winning of victory in a war depends in the final analysis on the standard" of the country's preparation for defense against a nuclear attack, and that it "must have the same organized and planned character as the training of the army and navy."

If the Soviet manual on civil defense could become a best-seller in the United States, we might have a chance to replace the false myth of mutual assured destruction with the safety of mutual assured survival.

Paul Warnke Nomination

It's probably a good thing that Paul C. Warnke was appointed our chief arms negotiator for the SALT II Agreements. His record of opposition to our building strategic weapons is so clear that it makes suspect any agreement he might conclude and provides an excellent basis for the Senate's rejecting it out of hand.

Although at the Senate hearings on his nomination Warnke said he rejected the "concept of unilateral disarmament," his published writings clearly prove the contrary. In the spring of 1975, Warnke wrote an article for the magazine *Foreign Policy* called "Apes on a Treadmill." In it he argued that we should go beyond "formal agreements" with the Soviet Union on arms control and "try a policy of restraint, while calling for matching restraint from the Soviet Union."

At the Senate hearings this year, Warnke restated his notion of "reciprocal" or "parallel" restraint in weapons building.

When the Senators questioned Warnke about such statements, as well as about his opposition to most of our major nuclear weapons including the B-1 bomber,

the cruise missile, MIRVs, the ABM, the Trident, and improvements to our Minuteman, he arrogantly replied: "I cannot defend today everything I may have said in the past, and I won't try."

The reason Warnke cannot defend his statement about "restraint" is that no informed person could rationally believe that unilateral military restraints by the United States will result in reciprocal restraints by the Soviet Union.

In the fall of 1958, the United States adopted a major weapons restraint. We unilaterally announced a moratorium on all nuclear tests and stopped our nuclear development. We continued to negotiate in good faith in Geneva to reach a formal agreement.

In September 1961 the Soviets abruptly terminated the nuclear test ban talks and began the largest series of nuclear tests in history. They cheated "big" and ultimately exploded more than 90 bombs, including one that former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said would "weaponize" at 100 megatons. Since it took at least six months to prepare for these explosions, the Soviets were obviously cheating during the moratorium, and the Geneva talks were a farce and a trap.

Or, take the restraint shown by the Kennedy Administration in the months preceding the Cuban Missile Crisis in suspending our U-2 surveillance of Cuba. The Soviets did not respond with reciprocal restraint. Instead, the Soviets devoted that year to manufacturing nuclear missiles, transporting them by land and sea halfway around the world, and setting them up on launching pads in Cuba where they were targeted at most major U.S. cities.

Or, take the restraint the United States tried again during the negotiations for SALT I. For two and a half years, we maintained a policy of voluntarily and unilaterally remaining in a weapons freeze while we negotiated in good faith in Helsinki and Vienna. We did not add a single ICBM or a single nuclear-firing submarine to our forces during those years.

The Soviets used those same years to build their margin of superiority over the United States so that, when SALT I was finally signed in 1972, the agreement froze the superior Soviet numbers then existing, namely, 1,618 ICBMs to our 1,054, and 62 nuclear-firing submarines to our 41.

Anyone who truly believes that a U.S. "policy of restraint" will result in "reciprocal restraints by the Soviet Union" is of too limited intelligence or has too little knowledge of history to be entrusted with a post of responsibility.

There remains the possibility that those who ignore the Soviet 30-year record of aggressive response to our unilateral restraint simply do not want the United States to be stronger than the Soviet Union.

Soviet Treaty Violations

Americans should rejoice, not mourn, at the collapse of the strategic arms negotiations in Moscow. It is unlikely that any agreement that could have been reached would have been advantageous to us militarily, and it is almost certain that any agreement would have been disadvantageous psychologically.

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance would not have been so surprised at the Kremlin's abrupt rejection of our proposals if he had kept on his desk a quotation from a great American phrasemaker, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: "A page of history is worth a volume

of logic."

Our diplomats were apparently relying on their own logic that "the Soviets want an arms control agreement just as much as we do" and "it's in the Soviets' self interest to sign a treaty limiting nuclear weapons." "A page of history," plus Al Smith's still-valid maxim "let's look at the record," would have braced our State Department for their verbal confrontation with Soviet negotiators.

Reliance on nonaggression treaties with the Soviet Union is the most fatal mistake any country can make. In 1964 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee completed a lengthy study of the Soviet record of treaty violations. The conclusion was that the Soviets have violated every major agreement they ever entered into, except the August 1939 agreement they signed with Adolf Hitler which started World War II.

A separate research study was made by the distinguished historian Dr. Anthony Bouscaren. He listed 93 major treaty violations committed by the U.S.S.R.

Soviet doctrine is wholly in harmony with Soviet practice. As Lenin stated the principle, "Promises are like piecrusts, made to be broken." Stalin's description was just as colorful: "Good works are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The speed record for treaty-breaking was set on August 20, 1968 when the Red Army invaded Czechoslovakia with 600,000 troops. The Soviets had signed a treaty guaranteeing Czechoslovakia's "independence" and "freedom" only 17 days before.

Soviet treaty doctrine reached its most sophisticated implementation in the SALT I Agreements of 1972. They were cleverly crafted one-way loopholes that only the Soviets could exploit.

First, the SALT I Agreement restricted only *new fixed-base* ICBM launchers. The Soviets adamantly refused to include *mobile* ICBM launchers. Within several months of the SALT I signing, the Soviets began testing their new SS-16 mobile ICBMs. The United States has no mobile missiles, not even under development.

Second, the SALT I prohibition against a more-than-15-percent enlargement of ICBM silo dimensions was supposed to be a "safeguard" against converting "light" missiles into "heavy" missiles. Immediately after the SALT I signing, the Soviets started testing three new types of ICBMs, all far more powerful than the older missiles they replaced.

Third, SALT I restricted merely the number of *launchers*, not the number of missiles, thereby putting no restraint on reloads. Immediately after SALT I was signed, the Soviets unveiled their new "cold-launch" or "pop-up" technique which makes reloads practical to stockpile. Since we have no cold-launch-type ICBMs and are not developing any, we cannot use reloads.

The Soviets are obviously stalling on SALT II until they can devise a new series of one-way loopholes to bind us, but not them.

Vance's Mission to Moscow

Those who read the Communist press have long been accustomed to the extravagant rhetoric, such as "imperialist capitalist fascist reactionary warmonger," that Soviet writers hurl at American leaders. It came as a surprise, therefore, to hear a brand new charge leveled at U.S. officials by the Soviet newspaper *Izves-*

tia after the Moscow strategic arms negotiations collapsed. The Soviets accused Secretary of State Cyrus Vance of trying to "outwit" the Soviet Union by proposing an agreement that is advantageous to the United States.

That's really a new charge! Amid all the impossible crimes, such as "germ warfare" during the Korean War, that the Soviets have accused us of over the last 30 years, they have never made that accusation before! Maybe that is because none of our previous U.S. negotiators ever did -- either outwit the Soviets, or even try to outwit them.

A good example of how the Soviets have customarily outwitted U.S. negotiators from Franklin Roosevelt to Henry Kissinger was the SALT I Agreement signed by Richard Nixon in 1972. SALT I put a limit on the number of missile launchers, but no limit on the number of missiles. U.S. negotiators apparently thought this was not a significant difference because, when our missiles are fired, the blast off burns out the silo and the launcher is not reuseable.

Immediately after SALT I was signed, however, the Soviets unveiled their new "cold-launch" or "pop-up" technique which makes it practical to reuse their launchers and to stockpile reloads. We have no cold-launch-type ICBMs and are not even developing any, so we cannot use reloads. The Soviet negotiators outwitted us and conned us into signing an agreement cleverly crafted with one-way loopholes which only the Soviets could exploit.

Congressman Jack Kemp has urged Secretary Cyrus Vance to make public the mounting evidence about Soviet refire capability and how it makes a mockery of the limits supposedly agreed upon in SALT I. Congressman Kemp is also urging Secretary Vance to make sure that the Soviets do not circumvent any SALT II ceiling on strategic nuclear delivery vehicles by the subterfuge of building an unlimited number of reloads.

Salt Secrecy and Advisers

Will the American people find out the truth of what is really going on during the SALT II negotiations? Will reporters have the courage to tell us what they discover?

When William Beecher, then a senior military reporter for the *New York Times*, accurately reported what was going on during the SALT I negotiations on the front page of his paper of July 23, 1971, the White House retaliated by wiretapping his telephone. "National security" was the grand rationale for this and the other illegalities connected with Watergate.

But Mr. Beecher didn't give away any designs or blueprints of how our nuclear weapons were made. He merely published a truthful account of what kind of deal our SALT diplomats were offering the Russians. It wasn't what he revealed to the enemy that made Henry Kissinger press the panic button, but what Mr. Beecher revealed to the American people.

I can personally testify to the paranoid secrecy of those SALT I negotiations. In Vienna, when I tried to interview anyone connected with SALT, I found that the entrance was sternly guarded by an American soldier armed with a gun and a host of evasive answers that gave no information whatsoever. When he noticed that my eyes lingered on a floor plan of the building posted in the vestibule, he asked me to wait outside in the cold for my taxicab, instead of in the building paid

for by the American taxpayers.

The first good look the American people had at the SALT I Agreement was when the television cameras photographed the trays of champagne carried in to celebrate the signing on May 26, 1972.

Keeping the American people in the dark about U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreements has long been standard operating procedure for our State Department. Senator Margaret Chase Smith, then the senior Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, gave this warning in 1972 about the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963: "The American people *still* have not been told the whole story about how the Treaty worked to the Russians' tremendous advantage and to our own vast detriment. . . . In reality, it was a disaster for the American people and a great victory for the Russians who, with their superior nuclear technology, were soon embarked on a military buildup that has no parallel."

If you were negotiating an agreement on medicine, it would seem only logical to have doctors present. If you were negotiating an agreement on construction, it would be essential to have some engineers advising you. If you were negotiating an agreement on legal practice, you surely would need some lawyers at your side.

But somehow, in our military and weapons negotiations with the Soviet Union from 1969 to 1977, U.S. officials never had a military adviser present. Henry Kissinger would not permit it. The Joint Chiefs and their representatives were "included out," to borrow a favorite Sam Goldwynism.

For the drama of the strategic arms negotiation on SALT II, the cast of characters on the Soviet side is substantially the same as in previous conferences. On the American side, however, something new has been added -- a military adviser representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This appears to be one concession that the Carter Administration made in order to win confirmation of Paul Warnke as our chief SALT negotiator. The double confirmation of Warnke for two jobs (U.S. disarmament chief and arms control negotiator) may represent two steps backwards for national security, but the presence of a military adviser is at least one step forward.

Who's Ahead In The Arms Race?

"How Do We Know Who's Ahead?" was the title of the editorial in the *Washington Post* commenting on the exchange of views on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. strategic balance between Major General George J. Keegan, Jr. and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If the editors of the leading newspaper in our nation's capital can't figure out which statement should be believed, it is no wonder that the American people are confused.

Neither side revealed its sources of information but, since General Keegan recently retired as head of Air Force Intelligence, his current military information is obviously just as reliable as that of the Joint Chiefs.

Newspaper headlines indicated that the Joint Chiefs refuted some of General Keegan's charges, but he replied that the Joint Chiefs really corroborated most of his statements. Instead of concentrating on the differences between the two statements, let us focus on the areas of agreement between them.

1. General Keegan said that, while U.S. military strategy is premised on war-avoidance, Soviet strategy is premised on war-winning and the belief that success in war, even nuclear war, is attainable. The Joint

Chiefs agreed.

2. General Keegan said that the 1972 SALT Treaty was based on the theory of mutual vulnerability to retaliatory attack, which in turn was dependent on our 1972 assumption that the Soviets would not engage in any major civil defense effort. The Joint Chiefs agreed.

3. General Keegan described the tremendous civil defense program of the Soviets since 1972. They have hardened about 35,000 installations including 75 underground command posts in the Moscow area, some of them several hundred feet deep and capable of withstanding 1,000 psf. of blast pressure. General Keegan claimed that the Soviets have built enough mass shelters collated with manufacturing plants to protect more than 60 million people from nuclear attack. The Joint Chiefs questioned only "some of the details."

4. General Keegan estimated that, in case of a nuclear exchange between the United States and Russia, we would lose 35 to 40 Americans per single Soviet fatality. The Joint Chiefs' estimate is 10 U.S. fatalities per one Soviet fatality. It is difficult to see how anyone could call the Joint Chiefs' statement reassuring.

5. General Keegan asserted that the Soviets have hardened 10,000 surface-to-air missile defense sites and are now hardening 4,500 battlefield early warning and ground control intercept radars. The Joint Chiefs said these statements "are essentially correct but overstate the case somewhat."

6. The Joint Chiefs agreed with General Keegan that the Soviet Union has attained superiority over the United States in missile throw-weight and missile megatonnage. While the Joint Chiefs claimed that the United States is still ahead in other things, all experts agree that throw-weight is the best measure of nuclear power.

7. General Keegan concluded that the U.S.S.R. has already achieved military superiority over the United States. The Joint Chiefs agreed that "the U.S.S.R. is engaged in a program designed to achieve such superiority," but said "they have not attained this goal." In other words, the Joint Chiefs believe the Russians are coming, and General Keegan believes the Russians are here.

Whichever version you choose to believe calls for immediate U.S. action to shore up our deficiencies because of the long lead-time required to research, develop, and produce nuclear weapons. As Admiral Hyman Rickover has aptly said, "it's better to sweat in peacetime than to bleed in war."

Chile's Gift To The West

The government of Chile, which has taken some brickbats from the world's press during the past year, is entitled to our thanks for working out the deal under which Vladimir Bukovsky was granted his freedom from imprisonment in the Soviet Union. Bukovsky has important messages for the West, based on his ten years in Soviet prisons and mental asylums, and it is good to know that President Carter and Vice President Mondale are listening.

If the Chilean government hadn't had the foresight to prevent an important Communist named Luis Corvelan from leaving the country, the Soviets never would have been willing to make the trade and let Bukovsky go free. Corvelan's importance to the Kremlin was shown by the fact that, as soon as he arrived in Russia, he was presented with the Order of Lenin by President Nikolai Podgorny.

Although the Chilean government could never redeem itself in the eyes of the left-wing media for the unforgiveable sin of overthrowing a Communist government, there probably is no other way for Chile to recover from the disaster of the Allende years except through a vehicle such as the present junta.

Life under Allende was intolerable for nearly everyone, especially in the last months of his regime. The annual inflation rate was pushing 1000 percent, and Chile suffered severe food shortages for the first time. Many items could not be bought at any price. Housewives had to spend up to six hours a day standing in line for food and other essentials.

During the Allende regime, citizens could not turn on the radio or television without hearing a political speech. Industrial and agricultural production fell off substantially as the Allende government channeled the energies of the workers into political rallies. His comrades would encourage factory workers to strike, and then use the strike as a pretext to take over the factories.

Newspapers that published the truth were closed for weeks and their reporters jailed. Government corruption was everywhere. There was a flourishing black market.

At the end, it was the women who initiated the overthrow of Allende. On December 3, 1973, while Castro was visiting Chile, they staged an impressive demonstration called the March of the Empty Pots. Thousands of women marched through the streets of Santiago beating with spoons on their empty pots and pans. The first demonstration was followed by other Marches of the Empty Pots, during which the women were harassed by tear gas thrown by Allende's police and with potatoes stuck with razor blades hurled by the Communists.

After it became too dangerous to march in public, the women retaliated by leaning out of their windows every evening at ten o'clock and beating on their pots and pans to make a deafening clatter.

The women kept up their demonstrations until, finally, the men had the courage to act and, in a nearly bloodless coup, took control away from Allende, who then committed suicide. The coup came just in time to prevent Allende from sending all the anti-Communists "to the wall" as his buddy Castro had done.

The Chilean people who lived through the economic chaos and political terror of the Allende regime, and who watched how the non-Marxist politicians stood back and did nothing to stop his Communist consolidation of power, are understandably distrustful of all politicians and political parties. They have no desire to return to a political free-for-all at the present time. They prefer the justice and order of today's Chile to the poverty and injustice of a Communist Allende or Castro dictatorship.

The more Bukovsky and Solzhenitsyn talk about life in the Soviet Union, the happier the Chileans will be about their timely decision, and the more we should renew our resolve to make sure that Communism does not take over any more countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmont, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 10, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1977

Federal Financing of a Foolish Festival For Frustrated Feminists

\$5 million of the Federal taxpayers' money will be spent during 1977 on some 50 state conferences where, according to Chairman Bella Abzug, women will come together "to air their frustrations." The state conferences will be followed in the fall by one big national "consciousness-raising session" in Houston.

The spending of the \$5 million will be under the control of the Commission on International Women's Year with Bella Abzug as Chairman. President Carter recently appointed the Commission members, who are 41 pro-ERA and one con-ERA. The Commissioners include many of the most militant women's libbers in the country: Gloria Steinem, editor of MS magazine; Jean O'Leary, co-executive director of the National Gay Task Force; Eleanor Smeal, the new president of the National Organization for Women (NOW); Audrey Row Colom, president of the Women's Political Caucus; Martha Griffiths, sponsor of ERA in the House of Representatives; Elizabeth Athanasakos, immediate past chairperson of the Commission on International Women's Year; and Liz Carpenter, co-chair of ERAmerica.

It is not known how many members of the Commission on International Women's Year (IWY) are members of NOW and/or the Women's Political Caucus, but certainly at least half are members, and it is possible that almost all are members. It is quite a reflection on President Carter that he appointed to the IWY Commission so many notorious women's libbers as well as the national director of the homosexuals' organization, but he did not appoint a single member of Stop ERA or Eagle Forum.

One thing is very clear. Those who talk so much about "equal rights" are not willing to give equal rights to those who are opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment!

These militant radicals are using the \$5 million of Federal money to promote ratification of ERA, Federal-financed abortion-on-demand, Federal-financed child "development" and baby-sitting services for all children, and other women's lib legislative and social goals.

Packaged Thinking

The state and national conferences will be a charade and a farce. In each state, pre-selected committees are arranging pre-planned programs which will present the participants with packaged thinking to produce pre-determined results.

The 41-to-1 pro-ERA National Commission has appointed a Coordinating Committee in each state which is similarly biased. In Illinois, for example, the Coordinating Committee is 58-to-1 pro-ERA. The Illinois chairperson is a member of NOW, as are many of the members and most of

those with active responsibility for the Coordinating Committee and the workshops. All the speakers selected for the conference are pro-ERA, headed by Bella Abzug.

All the materials selected for distribution at the state conferences support ERA, abortion, or other women's lib goals. The workbook on ERA, for example, recommends many materials put out by ERA proponents but none by ERA opponents. IWY staff person Catherine East said they did not recommend any materials put out by ERA opponents because she thinks they are "misleading" while all pro-ERA materials are "accurate."

The state meetings and the coordinating committees are in complete violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act which requires that such bodies "be fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented," and that they "NOT be inappropriately influenced . . . by any special interest." Any committee which is 41-to-1 or 58-to-1 pro-ERA is certainly NOT "fairly balanced in terms of points of view." The IWY National Commission and every one of its subgroups IS "inappropriately influenced" by a special interest, namely, ERA proponents and members of NOW.

"All in Our Capacity"

At the very first meeting that the Commission on International Women's Year held, on April 15, 1975, it unanimously adopted a resolution which reads in part:

"The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, as its first public action and highest priority, urges the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment

"As our main commitment to the observance of International Women's Year, we pledge to do all in our capacity to see that the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified at the earliest possible moment."

"All in our capacity" is quite a lot, indeed, when you have millions of Federal dollars to spend. In 1975 and 1976, the IWY Commission spent \$780,000 of the taxpayers' money which President Ford ordered diverted to the IWY from other Federal agencies. On January 13, 1977, the Comptroller General of the United States reported that the IWY Commission had improperly received and spent in the fiscal years 1975 and 1976 Federal funds totalling \$266,234 for which there was no Congressional appropriation and no proper Federal authorization. These funds were provided to the IWY Commission "without proper legal authority" and were received and spent by the IWY Commission in violation of U.S. law.

The \$5 million that the IWY Commission is spending in

1977 was appropriated by Congress in order to put on women's conferences. The way these conferences will be used to achieve radical women's lib goals can be seen by an examination of Agenda Letter # 17. This contains 16 issues on which the participants at the IWY state conferences will be asked to vote.

The Loaded "Ballot"

Agenda Letter # 17 clearly shows that each question is designed and loaded to elicit a "yes" or "agree" answer, according to results predetermined by the IWY Commission and set forth in its book called "To Form A More Perfect Union." The question itself is presented in a highly biased way, and the pages it cites from this Federally-financed book are likewise highly biased.

For example, question # 6 asks for a vote on ERA. It cites pages in the IWY book called "To Form a More Perfect Union," all of which are highly biased in favor of ERA and highly prejudicial against opponents of ERA, and against Stop ERA in particular.

The technique of the IWY "ballot" can be illustrated like this. Suppose you were asked to vote for President of the United States and, instead of being given a ballot that simply listed Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford, you were given a "bal-

lot" which stated:

"Jimmy Carter is a good man who would make an excellent President who would solve all our problems."

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

With that type of a "ballot," the result would surely be "agree." In addition, the Georgia IWY Conference held May 6-7 proved what a fraud the whole process is. Election irregularities included bringing in boxes of pre-voted ballots, allowing easy access to plenty of ballots, failing to register voters, remarking ballots after they were voted, and withholding the results.

So, when the \$5 million is all spent by Bella and her fellow Commissioners, and all the 50 state conferences and the national conference are completed, what will be left? The pre-planned results of a programmed vote cast on propaganda ballots, tabulated by members of NOW, lesbians, and other women's libbers, and then presented to our legislators as "proof" that American women "want" ratification of ERA, Federal-financed abortion-on-demand, Federal baby-sitting services for all children, and other women's lib goals.

Ask your Congressmen and Senators WHY they voted to give \$5 million to the women's libbers and pro-ERAs to promote their anti-family goals. Tell all your State Legislators that the results of this phony vote do NOT represent the wishes of American women.

Agenda Letter # 17 The IWY "Ballot" on which participants at the State Meetings will "vote"

1. Arts and Humanities (139, 140, 142)

The President should take steps to require that women 1) have equal opportunities for appointment to managerial and upper level posts in Federally-funded cultural institutions, such as libraries, museums, universities and public radio and TV; 2) are more equitably represented in the staffing of grant-awarding agencies; 3) benefit more fairly from government grants, whether as individual grant applicants or as members of cultural institutions receiving Federal or State funding.

Judging agencies and review boards should use blind judging for musicians, singers, articles, and papers being considered for publication or delivery, exhibits, and grant applications, wherever possible.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

2. Child Care (148, 151, 154; also see page 84 and following)

The Federal government should assume a major role in providing universal voluntary child development programs with ability-to-pay fee schedules and with direct parental involvement in operation. Employers and labor unions should be encouraged by tax policies of Federal and State governments to establish nonprofit child care programs.

Education for parenthood programs should be improved and expanded by local and State school boards with technical assistance and experimental programs provided by the Federal government.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

3. Credit (172; also see page 55 and following)

The Federal Equal Credit Opportunity Act should be vigorously, efficiently, and expeditiously enforced by all the Federal agencies with enforcement responsibility.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

4. Education (162, 165, 169, 170, 297, 317; also see page 48 and following)

The President should direct the vigorous and expeditious enforcement of all laws prohibiting discrimination in education, including sports, and oppose any amendments that would weaken the protections.

Federal surveys of elementary and secondary schools should gather data needed to indicate compliance with Federal anti-discrimination laws, and these data should be collected by sex and race or ethnicity. The Civil Rights Commission should conduct a study to evaluate the enforcement of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in physical education and athletics.

Leadership programs for working women in post secondary schools should be upgraded and expanded, and private foundations are urged to give special attention to research on women in unions.

Bilingual vocational training and education programs should be extended and significantly expanded.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

5. Employment (161, 176, 182, 184, 192, 197, 202, 211, 295, 296, 303, 304, 306, 307; also see page 45, 61, 65, 71, and following)

The President should direct the vigorous and expeditious enforcement of all laws, executive orders, and regulations prohibiting discrimination in employment, including discrimination in apprenticeship and in construction. The Executive Branch of the Federal government should abide by the same standards as private employers.

Protections and privileges afforded minority business owners should be extended to women business owners.

All enforcement agencies should follow the guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which should be expanded to cover discrimination in job evaluation systems.

The Real Goals Behind the IWY Questions based on a study of the pages cited in Agenda Letter # 17

1. Arts And Humanities

Women should be given preferential treatment over men in Federal jobs and Federal grants even if the women applicants are NOT better qualified and NOT supporting spouse and children, and the male applicants are more qualified and are supporting spouse and children.

2. Child Care:

The Federal Government should assume responsibility for the care of pre-school children. The taxpayers should pay for Federal child-development and baby-sitting services universally available for all children, regardless of financial need, so that mothers of all economic classes will be relieved of the burden of having to care for their children.

3. Credit:

Federal credit laws should be vigorously enforced and women should be given credit even if they don't have a job, or a regular income, or intend to remain in the labor force long enough to pay back the loan.

4. Education:

The Federal Government (HEW) should enforce sex-integration in every aspect of our educational system, including elementary, secondary, and college, public and private, academic and athletic, and school social functions, regardless of whether the students and parents involved want such sex-integration. No one should have any right to attend a single-sex school or participate in any single-sex functions in connection with any school or college. We should repeal or reject all amendments to the law which would allow exemptions from the strict mandate against sex discrimination, such as the amendments that permit girls' sororities and boys' fraternities and mother-daughter and father-son school events, and the proposed amendment which would allow girls' or boys' glee clubs.

5. Employment:

The full power of the Federal Government should be used against private employers to enforce preferential employment of women. Every employer should be compelled to reach "affirmative action" quotas for women in every job category, even when this means hiring less qualified women with no dependents instead of more qualified men with many dependents.

6. Equal Rights Amendment:

We should ratify an amendment to the U.S. Constitution called ERA which will (a) make draft-age girls subject to compulsory military combat duty in wartime, (b) wipe out the legal obligation of husbands to provide the primary financial support of their wives and children, (c) give homosexuals the right to get marriage licenses and teach in the schools, and (d) transfer final decision-making power over marriage, divorce and child custody from the individual states to the Federal Government.

Unions should review the impact on women of all their practices and correct injustices to women.

The President should take into account in appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and in seeking amendments to it the obstacles confronting women who seek to organize in traditionally nonunionized employment sectors.

Extra attention should be given the employment needs of minority women, especially blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans.

Enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Social Security Act as they apply to household workers should be improved.

All statistics collected by the Federal government should be gathered and analyzed so that information concerning the impact of Federal programs on women and the participation of women in the administration of Federal programs can be assessed.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

6. *Equal Rights Amendment* (219; also see pages 26 and 373 and following)
The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

7. *Female Offenders* (156, 292; also see page 70).

Federal and State governments should cooperate in providing more humane, sensible, and economic treatment of young women who are subject to court jurisdiction because they have run away from home, have family or school problems, or commit sexual offenses ("status offenders"). Disparities in the treatment of male and female juvenile offenders should be eliminated. States should review their sentencing laws and their practices relating to women in penal facilities with a view to eliminating discrimination and reforming treatment.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

8. *Health* (288)

The President should direct a review of whether women and their mental and physical health needs are being treated equitably in the health related functions of the Federal government, including the representation of women in policy, administration, research design, research populations, and the availability of services to women.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

9. *Legal Status of Homemakers* (244; also see page 13 and following)

Federal and State laws relating to marital property, inheritance, and domestic relations should be based on the principle that marriage is a partnership, in which the contribution of each spouse is of equal importance and value. Homemakers should be covered under social security.

Alimony, child support, and property arrangements at divorce should be such that minor children's needs are first to be met and spouses share the economic dislocation of divorce. As a minimum the economic provisions of the Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act should be enacted in every State. More effective methods for collection of support should be adopted. The Census Bureau should collect data on the economic arrangements at divorce and their enforcement.

Homemakers displaced by widowhood or divorce should be helped to become self-sufficient members of society through programs providing job counseling, training, and placement; advice on financial management; and legal advice.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

10. *International Interdependence* (236, 238, 240, 241; also see page 97 and following)

The President and the foreign affairs agencies of the Federal government should see to it that many more women participate in the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy, including greater consultation with women in citizen voluntary organizations which are concerned with international affairs. More women should be appointed to U.S. delegations at international conferences and to governing bodies of international organizations.

The U.N. Commission on the Status of Women should be continued and should meet annually.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

11. *Mass Media* (143, 145, 250, 253, 259, 260; also see page 18 and following)

The mass media should employ women in all job categories and especially in policymaking positions. Affirmative efforts should be made by the media to expand the portrayal of women to include a variety of roles and to represent accurately the number of women in society.

Appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and the Department of HEW, among others, should vigorously enforce those laws which prohibit employment discrimination against women working in the media. In addition, Federal agencies should continue studying the impact of the mass media on sex discrimination and sex-role stereotyping in the American society. Special consideration should be given to media which are publicly funded or established through acts of Congress.

(The IWY Media Guidelines on page 250 are also available in leaflet form for distribution to the media.)

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

12. *Older Women* (283, 286)

Public and private women's organizations should work together to give publicity to the positive roles of women over 50 and to provide the services that will enable elderly women to function comfortably in their own homes instead of moving to institutions. Medicare coverage should be liberalized and the use of generic drugs of certified equivalent quality should be allowed and encouraged, to reduce the cost of medicines.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

13. *Rape* (261)

State and local governments should revise rape laws to provide for graduated degrees of the crime, to apply to assault by or upon both sexes; to include all types of sexual assault against adults; and to otherwise redefine the crime so that victims are under no greater legal handicaps than victims of other crimes. Local task forces to review and reform law and practices of police, prosecutors, and medical personnel should be established where they do not now exist.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

14. *Strategies for Change*

Strategies for change listed in the original appendix is not a workshop where recommendations would be made but a workshop where means of implementing recommendations would be considered.

7. *Female Offenders:*

All sex discrimination should be eliminated from our prison system. Prisons should be fully sex integrated, both as to prisoners and to guards. There should be no bar to the use of male and female guards on all jobs, including supervision and search.

8. *Health:*

Women should be given preferential treatment in all physical and mental health services and studies provided by the Federal Government, including services relating to population control.

9. *Legal Status of Homemakers:*

Husbands of homemakers who are NOT employed outside the home should be required to pay an extra Social Security tax on the assumed value of the homemaker's services. The additional annual Federal Social Security tax per family would be between \$384 and \$1,128, depending on which version of the plan is adopted.

10. *International Interdependence*

An equal number of men and women should be hired in all areas of foreign policy, State Department, and the United Nations, regardless of the number of qualified applicants available.

11. *Mass Media:*

The media should be compelled to give preferential treatment in hiring and promoting women to all policy-making positions, even when women are less qualified and men are more qualified. Advertisements which show women in the "stereotyped" role of homemaker (such as having a clean laundry or serving a delicious meal) should be forbidden. Jokes about women must be censored.

13. *Rape:*

The laws against rape should be revised to prohibit only sexual assault by either sex. (Assault, of course, is a much lesser crime with much lighter penalties.)

15. *Reproductive Freedom:*

Every woman should have the legal right to kill her unborn baby at any time. We should encourage the continued killing of one million unborn babies every year by providing Federal financing and by courses and counseling in the schools so that girls will accept the killing of unborn babies as freely as tonsillectomies and appendectomies.

16. *Women in Elective and Appointive Office:*

Women should hold half of all elective and appointive offices, even if voters do not choose to elect them. The right of voters to choose their candidates should be restricted to the extent necessary to fill this female quota.

IWY "Ballot" (continued from column 1)

15. *Reproductive Freedom* (267, 270, 278, 300; see also page 78 and following)

The IWY Committee believes that the moral decisions relating to reproduction are rightfully the responsibility of individual women and that every woman, regardless of her economic circumstances, education, race or ethnic origin, age, rural or metropolitan residence, is entitled as a basic human right to have readily available the means of controlling reproduction. The IWY Commission:

- Supports the series of Supreme Court decisions guaranteeing reproductive freedom to women;
- Urges all branches of Federal, State, and local governments to give the highest priority to complying with these Supreme Court decisions and to making available all methods of family planning to women unable to take advantage of private facilities;
- Condemns any interference, open or subtle, with a woman's right to control her reproduction; and
- Urges organizations concerned with improving the status of women to monitor how government complies with these principles.

Particular attention should be paid at all levels of government to providing family planning services for teenagers, education in responsible sexuality, and reform of laws discriminating against illegitimate children and their parents.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

16. *Women in Elective and Appointive Office* (183, 311; also see page 40)

The President, Governors, political parties, women's organizations, and foundations should join in an effort to increase the number of women in elective and appointive office, including especially judgeships.

Agree _____ Disagree _____ Don't Know _____

These recommendations are a summary of major recommendations appearing in "... To Form a More Perfect Union ...", the report of the National Commission on the Observance of IWY, and the page numbers following the headings refer to pages in that report on which the detailed recommendations appear. The format permits use for securing opinions from participants in writing either before or at the State Meeting.

House Vote on the IWY Bill, Dec. 10, 1975

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 162, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 761]

YEAS—252

Abdnor	Frenzel	O'Neill
Abzug	Giambo	Ottinger
Adams	Gibbons	Patten, N.J.
Addabbo	Gonzalez	Patterson,
Allen	Green	Calif.
Ambro	Gude	Pattison, N.Y.
Anderson,	Guyer	Pepper
Calif.	Hall	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	Hamilton	Pettis
Andrews, N.C.	Hannafor	Peyster
Annunzio	Harkin	Pickle
Ashley	Harrington	Pike
Aspin	Harris	Pressler
AuCoin	Hawkins	Preyer
Badillo	Hayes, Ind.	Price
Baldus	Hays, Ohio	Pritchard
Barrett	Heckler, Mass.	Quie
Baucus	Hicks	Rangel
Bedell	Hillis	Rees
Bell	Holland	Regula
Bergland	Holtzman	Reuss
Biaggi	Howard	Richmond
Blester	Howe	Rinaldo
Bingham	Hughes	Risenhoover
Blanchard	Jacobs	Rodino
Blouin	Jeffords	Roe
Boggs	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
Boiland	Johnson, Colo.	Rooney
Bolling	Johnson, Pa.	Rose
Bonker	Jordan	Rosenthal
Brademas	Karth	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Brodhead	Keys	Runnels
Brooks	Koch	Ruppe
Broomfield	LaFalce	Russo
Brown, Calif.	Leggett	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Lehman	Santini
Burke, Mass.	Levitass	Sarasin
Burton, John	Litton	Sarbanes
Burton, Phillip	Lloyd, Calif.	Scheuer
Carney	Long, La.	Schroeder
Carr	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Cartier	McClary	Sharp
Chisholm	McCloskey	Shriver
Clausen,	McCormack	Simon
Don H.	McDade	Skubitz
Clay	McFall	Slack
Cleveland	McHugh	Smith, Iowa
Cohen	McKinney	Smith, Nebr.
Collins, Ill.	Macdonald	Solarz
Conable	Madden	Staggers
Conte	Maguire	Stanton,
Conyers	Martin	J. William
Corman	Matsunaga	Stanton,
Cornell	Mazzoli	James V.
Cotter	Meeds	Stark
Coughlin	Melcher	Steelman
D'Amours	Metcalfe	Steiger, Wis.
Daniels, N.J.	Meyner	Stokes
de la Garza	Mezvisinsky	Stratton
Dellums	Mikva	Studds
Dent	Miller, Calif.	Symington
Diggs	Mills	Thompson
Dingell	Mineta	Thone
Dodd	Minish	Traxler
Downey, N.Y.	Mink	Tsongas
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Udall
du Pont	Moakley	Ullman
Early	Moffett	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Mollohan	Vander Veen
Edgar	Moorhead, Pa.	Vahik
Edwards, Calif.	Morgan	Waxman
Eilberg	Mosher	Weaver
Emery	Moss	Whalen
Erlenborn	Mottl	White
Evans, Colo.	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Fary	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Fascell	Murtha	Wirth
Fenwick	Myers, Pa.	Wolf
Fish	Nedzi	Wright
Fisher	Nix	Wydler
Flood	Nolan	Yates
Foley	Nowak	Yatron
Ford, Mich.	Oberstar	Young, Alaska
Ford, Tenn.	Obey	Young, Ga.
Forsythe	O'Hara	

NAYS—162

Alexander	Beard, R.I.	Brinkley
Archer	Beard, Tenn.	Brown, Mich.
Armstrong	Bennett	Brown, Ohio
Ashbrook	Bevill	Broyhill
Bafalis	Bowen	Buchanan
Bauman	Breaux	Burgener
Burleson, Tex.	Hefner	Nichols
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	O'Brien
Butler	Hightower	Passman
Byron	Holt	Poage
Cederberg	Hubbard	Quillen
Chappell	Hungate	Randall
Clancy	Hutchinson	Rhodes
Clawson, Del	Hyde	Roberts
Cochran	Ichord	Robinson
Collins, Tex.	Jarman	Rogers
Conlan	Jenrette	Roush
Crane	Jones, Ala.	Rousselot
Daniel, Dan	Jones, N.C.	St Germain
Daniel, R. W.	Jones, Okla.	Satterfield
Danielson	Jones, Tenn.	Schneebeil
Delaney	Kasten	Schulze
Derrick	Kazen	Sebelius
Derwinski	Kelly	Shipley
Devine	Kemp	Shuster
Dickinson	Ketchum	Sikes
Downing, Va.	Kindness	Sisk
Duncan, Ore.	Krebs	Snyder
Duncan, Tenn.	Krueger	Spence
Edwards, Ala.	Lagomarsino	Steiger, Ariz.
English	Landrum	Stephens
Eshleman	Latta	Stuckey
Evans, Ind.	Lent	Sullivan
Findley	Lloyd, Tenn.	Symms
Fithian	Lott	Talcott
Florio	Lujan	Taylor, Mo.
Flowers	McCollister	Taylor, N.C.
Flynt	McDonald	Thornton
Fountain	McEwen	Treen
Frey	McKay	Vander Jagt
Fuqua	Madigan	Vigorito
Gilman	Mahan	Waggonner
Ginn	Mann	Walsh
Goldwater	Mathis	Wampler
Goodling	Michel	Whitehurst
Gradison	Milford	Whitten
Grassley	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins
Hagedorn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Haley	Montgomery	Wilson, C. H.
Hammer-	Moore	Wylie
schmidt	Moorhead,	Young, Fla.
Hansen	Calif.	Young, Tex.
Harsha	Myers, Ind.	Zablocki
Hastings	Natcher	Zerferetti
Hechler, W. Va.	Neal	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Evins, Tenn.

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews,	Gaydos	Patman, Tex.
N. Dak.	Hanley	Railsback
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Riegle
Casey	Heinz	Spellman
Davis	Helstoski	Steed
Esch	Hinshaw	Teague
Fraser	Horton	

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

Mrs. Spellman with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Riegle with Mr. Railsback.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Heinz.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Teague.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Davis.

So the bill was passed.

Senate Vote On The IWY Bill, May 11, 1976

These Senators voted against all appropriations for the IWY. They deserve our extra special thanks:

Allen	Fannin	Randolph
Bartlett	Garn	Scott,
Bellmon	Goldwater	William L.
Buckley	Helms	Stevenson
Curtis	Laxalt	Thurmond

These Senators voted against the Birch Bayh Amendment to increase the IWY appropriation from \$3 million to \$5 million. They deserve our thanks:

Allen	Curtis	Goldwater
Bartlett	Dole	Griffin
Bellmon	Domenici	Hansen
Brock	Eagleton	Hart, Gary
Buckley	Eastland	Hatchfield
Byrd,	Fannin	Helms
Harry F., Jr.	Ford	Hruska
Cannon	Garn	Huddleston

Johnston	Muskie	Stennis
Laxalt	Nunn	Stevenson
Long	Pastore	Stone
McClellan	Pearson	Talmadge
McClure	Randolph	Thurmond
Montoya	Roth	Tower
Morgan	Scott,	Young
Moss	William L.	

These Senators voted FOR the Birch Bayh Amendment to increase the IWY appropriation from \$3 million to \$5 million. Since the Bayh Amendment passed by only one vote, every Senator who voted yea is responsible for its passage:

(Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.)

YEAS - 46

Abourezk	Hartke	Packwood
Bayh	Haskell	Pell
Beall	Hathaway	Percy
Bentsen	Hollings	Proxmire
Biden	Jackson	Ribicoff
Brooke	Javits	Schweiker
Burdick	Kennedy	Scott, Hugh
Case	Leahy	Sparkman
Chiles	Magnuson	Stafford
Clark	Manfield	Stevens
Cranston	McGee	Symington
Culver	McGovern	Tait
Durkin	McIntyre	Weicker
Fong	Metcalfe	Williams
Glenn	Mondale	
Gravel	Nelson	

These Senators ducked out and did not vote on the Bayh Amendment, thus enabling it to pass by one vote:

NOT VOTING - 9

Baker	Humphrey
Bumpers	Inouye
Byrd, Robt. C.	Mathias
Church	Tunney
Hart, Philip A.	

Keep reminding your Senators and Congressmen that you know how they voted on giving \$5 million to the women's libbers. If they voted no, thank them again. If they voted yes, you can hold them to account for their folly and extravagance. Express your continued indignation against this Federal financing of the radical women's libbers.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.

Eagle Forum

"the alternative to women's lib"

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

618-462-5415

President, PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

May 1977

THE APPLE PIE STORY:

In response to hundreds of inquiries, here are the true facts of the Apple Pie incident.

On Sat., Apr. 16, I attended a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City to receive an award from the Women's National Republican Club. During the reception just before the Speakers Table paraded in, a man smashed an apple pie into my face. I did not see the pie until I got my eyes open after it happened. Apparently a photographer had advance notice. The picture published in many newspapers clearly showed the pie just before it hit me, while I was looking the other way and did not see it coming.

The man who hit me with the Apple Pie was Aaron Kay, a hired pie thrower who heads a business called Pie Kill Unlimited, and is part of an anarchist group called the Emma Goldman Brigade. I do not know who paid him.

The National Organization for Women (NOW) was picketing me in front of the Waldorf at the same time. The week prior to the luncheon, NOW kept calling the Club trying to get them to cancel the award to me, and trying to get various politicians to refuse to attend. Despite NOW's protests, the luncheon was a huge success.

Yes, I did say afterwards that I was glad it wasn't a cherry pie because that would have ruined my dress. We have to keep our sense of humor even when confronted by slobs.

It was obvious, of course, why he assaulted me. Just before he threw the pie he said, "That's for ERA." He chose apple pie because of the connotation of Apple Pie and Motherhood, and because in Illinois we baked apple pies for our state legislators.

The pie gave me an injury in my right eye. I expect to be fully recovered after about three weeks, but it was very inconvenient studying for my law school exams with the use of only one eye.

The Apple Pie incident clearly shows what type of tactics we can expect from ERA proponents. Maybe this is what Betty Friedan meant when she threatened after Fla. defeated ERA: "We're going to stop being ladylike."

IWY STATE CONFERENCES:

The Commission on International Women's Year (IWY) has started holding conferences in each of the 50 states. The U.S. Congress appropriated \$5 million for these conferences. The IWY Commission is using this money to generate public support for ERA, government-financed abortion, and Federal child-care. See the May P.S. Report for more details.

It is absolutely outrageous that our taxpayers' money should be spent by NOW and other women's libbers to promote their special-interest lib and anti-family goals.

Six Illinois state legislators have filed suit in Federal Court to enjoin the use of these conferences to promote ERA and other lib goals. We do not know if the Federal courts will stop this expenditure of taxpayers' money, because, after all, the money was voted by Congress. Whatever the Court decides, however, we all have a right to be indignant at this improper use of our money! Here is what you can do:

1. Send a team of people to monitor the IWY conference in your state, attending the sessions and the workshops, so you can report the true facts on:
 - a) The misuse of taxpayers' money to promote women's lib goals.
 - b) The biased program, agenda, speakers, workshops, and printed materials -- and the way those who are opposed to women's lib goals are denied equal rights.
 - c) The crooked way the votes are taken: the many violations of fair election rules and parliamentary procedure.
2. Hold press conferences and make these facts known to the public and your legislators.
3. Send letters of indignation to your U.S. Senators and Congressmen telling them that you resent very much that they voted \$5 million to the women's libbers to promote their lib proposals. Why didn't Congress give an equal amount to those opposed to ERA?
4. Write your State Legislators and remind them that all the pressure they are getting FOR ERA is due solely to this Federally-financed propaganda campaign.

THE SCANDAL OF MEDIA COVERAGE ON ERA:

The biased media coverage of ERA is so blatant that it imperils the whole concept of a free press in America. Everyone who is concerned about freedom of the press should be shocked at the abuse of power displayed by large segments of the national media. There are, of course, a few parts of the media that have shown objectivity in reporting, but here are some recent examples of extreme bias:

1. The ABC-TV "documentary" aired in Jan. gave only 20% of the hour to the cons and 80% to the pros, and pieced the show together in a highly prejudicial way that permitted the pros to answer the con arguments, but did not allow the cons to answer the pro arguments. The IWY Commission is now using this "documentary" in its campaign to ratify ERA.

2. When the Nevada Senate passed ERA, network TV gave it prime-time coverage, even though passage by one House has NO constitutional effect whatsoever. When the Nevada House defeated ERA 3 days later, it was a non-event in the news. (For weeks, I received calls & letters saying, "too bad we lost in Nev." The fact is, of course, we won. But it wasn't reported that way.)

3. In Florida, the pros and the cons each scheduled a rally on the Capitol steps. The pros had 12 people, the cons had 2,500 people. TV news gave equal time to both events and showed NO pictures of our crowd. The newspaper printed NO pictures of our crowd, only a picture of a few discarded signs.

4. When the Florida Senate defeated ERA, network TV interviewed the proponents, who lost, and did not air a single interview with the opponents, who won.

It is time to start collecting documentation on the scandal of the biased media coverage of ERA and tell the American people how they have been misled and misinformed. This is a project on which YOU can help.

SEND ME YOUR DOCUMENTATION, on media bias. If newspaper or magazine, enclose clipping showing date & name of publication. If TV or radio, give name of station, date, time, name of persons involved, and all the specific information you can. Your examples can cover any media bias about ERA, no matter when it took place, even back to 1972. Mail to Eagle Forum in an envelope marked "MEDIA REPORT." Do NOT include other questions or orders in the same envelope, because envelopes marked "Media Report" will not be opened until we are ready to write a national report. Your cooperation in this project will be much appreciated.

NOW HAS A PUBLIC TANTRUM ON ERA:

NOW did not take defeat gracefully when Florida defeated ERA. NOW leaders cried, shouted, clenched their fists, threatened economic retaliation, and hurled ugly accusations at the courageous Senators who voted NO.

NOW and other ERA proponents have announced a boycott on: (1) Florida orange juice, (2) Virginia apples, (3) Louisiana shrimp, (4) Georgia peaches, (5) North Carolina hose, and (6) Nevada vacation spots. They are trying to prevent any conventions from being held in the 15 unratified states. (This is so silly because those states contain many of the best convention cities, including Miami, Atlanta, New Orleans, St. Louis, Chicago, Phoenix, and Las Vegas. They really ought to include New York because of the great N.Y. referendum against ERA.) All Eagles should exert every effort to patronize the products and the states that NOW is boycotting.

NOW ELECTS A NEW PRESIDENT:

The National Organization for Women is trying to change its image. (That isn't easy -- it still stands by its pro-lesbian resolutions!) NOW has elected as president Eleanor Smeal, a woman with a husband and children! What kind of a wife is she? In an interview immediately after her election, she said she stopped wearing her wedding ring five years ago because "it was a symbol that you belong to somebody." Also, she said that, although her daughter is just the right age and wants to go to Disney World, "now we can't go to Florida" because NOW has declared a travel boycott on Florida" for defeating ERA.

For the record, as Eagle Forum President, I am glad to state that I DO wear a wedding ring, and it IS a symbol that I "belong to somebody."

Also, I have taken my children to Disney World -- twice. And I might just take them again because of the NOW boycott!

CONGRATULATIONS AND APPRECIATION TO THE WONDERFUL WOMEN & THE COURAGEOUS LEGISLATORS WHO DEFEATED ERA IN 1977:

ARIZONA
ARKANSAS
FLORIDA
GEORGIA
MISSISSIPPI
MISSOURI
OKLAHOMA
NEVADA
NORTH CAROLINA
VIRGINIA
AND IDAHO RESCINDED ERA, TOO!

AND THANKS TO THE LORD WHO GUIDED OUR WAY TO VICTORY.

Phyllis Schlafly