

Articles about Nancy's time lobbying for the Equal Rights Amendment

ERA Foes Meet in Polite Debate at Woman's Club

By ANN PELHAM
Staff Writer

Pamphlets supporting the Equal Rights Amendment and petitions against it were displayed on the same card table at the Raleigh Woman's Club Tuesday night. Instead of political buttons for or against the ERA, the predominantly female audience wore construction-paper name tags.

And the debaters were so polite it was difficult to tell when they were disagreeing.

"May I respond to that also?" Nancy Drum, co-ordinator for ERA-United, would ask courteously after her opponent Sen. Thomas Strickland (D-Wayne) had answered a question from the audience. About 150 people were present — twice the number who usually attend the monthly meetings of the Raleigh Junior Woman's Club.

Strickland is a leader in the Senate ERA opposition forces.

About the only emotion displayed during the hour-long meeting was when Ann Lynn Grant stood up in response to Strickland's statement that

"women look after children better than men do" because they are different.

"I am equal," she said firmly, "and I have been equal from birth. My brother has no more talents than I have — we have the same intellect."

After the meeting adjourned, another woman approached Ms. Drum and asked tersely, "Do you think there will be as many men POW's raped as women POW's?"

"We don't need this amendment, my dear," the woman added angrily.

Most talk at the meeting centered on the effect of the Equal Rights Amendment on domestic relations, protective labor laws and the draft.

"Women would lose the benefit of protective labor law under the Equal Rights Amendment," Strickland said, and later read from a state statute that limited the hours a week a woman could work to 48, while limiting men to 56 hours a week. "Women are not as physically strong as men," he said.

Ms Drum said that law and another providing women with a seat during rest periods were the only protective labor laws for women in North Carolina. "They could be re-written in sex neutral language," she said.

However, the statute limiting women to a 48-hour work week was changed by the General Assembly in 1973 and now simply limits both sexes in certain occupations to a 56-hour week.

Federal regulations were also changed in 1974, according to a spokesman at the state Labor Department, so that a couch is no longer required in women's restroom facilities.

"To my knowledge, there are no longer any (different labor laws for men and women)," state Labor official Andrew Wyatt told The News and Observer. "There are some different laws according to sex for minors."

One of Strickland's major points in his ten-minute introductory speech was the vagueness of the amendment. "The language of the amendment is very innocent-sounding but you



The News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.
Thursday, March 6, 1975

'Equality does not mean sameness' — Ms. Nancy Drum

'Women look after children better than men do' — Sen. Thomas Strickland



have to look behind the law to see what it would do," he said. He added later, "I just don't know what it will do — we just don't know" in so many cases.

Ms Drum countered that in interpreting the amendment, the court will return to the records to find the legislative intent. "Equality does not mean sameness," she read from the Congressional debate in the Congressional Record.

"But you look for legislative intent when the amendment is not clear," Strickland said. "This amendment is clear."

"Have you read the legislative intent?" Ms. Drum asked playfully, talking out of the side of her mouth like a gangster.

"Well . . . I don't need to read the legislative intent," the silver-haired Strickland replied smoothly after a moment's hesitation.

The courts would look closely at the legislative history of the amendment on both the state and national levels when they interpret it, said William Van Alstyne, a professor of constitutional law at Duke University, on Wednesday.

After citing laws that treat women differently, Strickland said several times that "Experience is the life of the law."

But Cindy MacKethan said quietly from the audience, "But past experience may not be an adequate rule for the situation of women today."

Strickland said later that the 50 statutes in North Carolina affected by the amendment "could be handled by state legislation without any help from the federal courts."

Friday, December 13, 1974, Sanford, N.C. 27330



NANCY DRUM of Coalition United makes a point while Rachel Guthrie (left), president of the Sanford League of Women Voters, listens. (Staff photo by Jimmy Haire)

ERA backer, legislator stage verbal duel here

By JANE PLOTKIN
Herald Staff Writer

The state coordinator of Equal Rights Amendment advocates and a Sanford legislator faced off Thursday afternoon to the amusement of some onlookers, the dismay of others.

Nancy Drum, of Winston-Salem, coordinator of Coalition United, the state organization of pro-ERA women's groups, was in Sanford yesterday to speak to the local League of Women Voters and representatives of other women's groups here.

But the luncheon speech was overshadowed by a fierce contest by Rep. Jimmy Love of Sanford, whose objections to some of Ms. Drum's arguments brought laughter from some of the about 30 observers, while others were obviously angered.

Love had been invited to the session by the league.

The Drum-Love debate covered everything from Title VII to privy exams, but most interest centered on the potential for women draftees. Ms. Drum said that, unlike the legislative debate of 1973, this year's ERA

supporters are not considering the drafting of women a "dead issue."

"If women want to receive rights and benefits, they also must receive some of the responsibilities," she said. "The draft has always been selective, and if women could serve, the draft will continue to be selective."

Ms. Drum, in explaining the draft selectivity, added that 25 percent of eligible men are subjected to the draft and that one percent of those eligible are placed in combat.

She also claimed that the Constitutional "right to privacy" would preclude any problem of "mixing barracks" by the sexes.

Her draft arguments were among the foci of Love's objections. Love said that he didn't believe the courts would consider the privacy provision in interpreting the ERA and predicted that a number of court suits

would ensue from separation of the sexes in the armed forces and also in dormitories.

"They tried the privacy angle in desegregation cases and didn't get to first base," Love said.

Ms. Drum argued in return that the situation of two men in the same barracks or dormitory is different from the situation of a woman and a man in the same living quarters.

Ms. Drum also cited a Yale Law Review article inserted into the Congressional Record as the intent of Congress in passing the ERA. "The intent of Congress said privacy would be used by the Supreme Court in interpretation of the ERA," she said. Love retorted, "I say the court isn't going to pay any attention to a bunch of Yale lawyers."

The draft argument came to an abrupt conclusion with a comment from Rachel Guthrie, league president, "I can't think of (See ERA on 14A)

Continued on page 3

ERA

(Continued from 1A)

anything more unsexy as a combat situation. . .but we do hear a lot about women not getting paid as much as men."

"If it (the ERA) flat says women can't be discriminated against — if it makes everybody equal, well, you don't want protection and you want both (protection and equality)," Love said.

The statement brought a remark by a woman who asked that her name not be used: "You said 'if it makes everybody equal.' Doesn't that mean that in the back of your mind, you think we aren't equal. Well, so were slaves unequal and laws were passed to protect them," said the woman.

Love replied that he was only being "subjective" in his comments.

Addressing Ms. Drum, he added, "You just don't know what's going to happen in the future. That's what bothers me about the whole thing."

After the discussion between Ms. Drum and Love, a number of women approached Ms. Drum with congratulatory remarks about her ability to argue with Love. One woman confided, "My husband is a lawyer and he talks to me just like he (Love) was talking to you."

As passed by Congress in 1972, the ERA states: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." It has been ratified by 33 states, five less than the number needed by March, 1979, for it to become law.

"In a nation that has guaranteed freedom and justice for all, nothing is more important than bringing 51 percent of the population into this freedom," she said.

She said the ERA is necessary to insure constitutional protection against sex discrimination despite various legislation already enacted to protect women from discrimination, including Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

"The Supreme Court has been inconsistent in how it has interpreted women's rights legislation," she said.

Between 50 and 60 North Carolina statutes would be affected by the ERA, she said. This protective legislation, she said, "is demeaning to us — men, too in terms of the whole human race. It's putting us down in the protective sense, saying, 'There, there little girl. . .'"

Upon ratification of the ERA, states will have a two-year period to revise statutes that treat men and women differently, Ms. Drum said. "During the two years, each state will review the statutes that discriminate on the basis of sex, either by a special commission or through a pre-existing one. Then, states will either extend the statutes to apply to both sexes or find them invalid," she said.

"The basic principal is that federal, local and state laws must treat each person as an individual."

ERA supporters will lobby during the two-year period to see that some statutes are extended to men, said Ms. Drum, including the "privy exam" by which the clerk of court ensures that a woman is not being coerced into giving her husband ownership of her property. "This protection should be extended to men, also," she said.

Ms. Drum said ERA supporters are implementing strategy changes to guard against a 1975 defeat in the state legislature. "We feel the issues are being clarified and understood," she said. "We want to be honest."

ERA supporters are hoping to avoid the emotionalism which led to the issues defeat in 1973.

"We are going about this professionally," she said. "We have hired a professional lobbyist. The emphasis is on both a low-keyed and professional approach with regard to education," Ms. Drum said. "We want every person who votes for it to understand it. . .so there will be no revision efforts."

Pro-ERA Forces Seeking Equality, Not Sameness

Nancy Drum, state coordinator for ERA-United, says that opponents to the Equal Rights Amendment make a mistake in equating "sameness" with "equality."

"They are not the same thing," she said Monday. "Equality is having opportunities and privileges equal to those of your peers."

THE WORDING of the amendment — called "too vague and open to liberal interpretation" by its opponents — is simple for a purpose, said Julie Miller of Raleigh, legislative chairman for the state National Organization for Women.

"Either you do have equality or you don't."

One thing important to understand, Ms. Drum said, is the process of ratification. Congress passed the amendment in 1972, but it won't be ratified until 38 states have approved it by 1979. If the 38th state passes it, there will still be a two-year grace period to allow states to review their statutes and bring them into line with the amendment.

The ERA is needed, Ms. Drum said, to avoid time-consuming, piecemeal litigation. To date, the United States Supreme Court has not found discrimination on account of sex unreasonable — except in two narrow decisions.

Nancy Klein of Charlotte, an officer in ERA-United, pointed out that while the 14th Amendment — the right of citizenship — theoretically could be interpreted to include women, the Supreme Court has chosen not to do so.

"WHICH, AMONG other things," said Ms. Klein, "required us to work 72 years to get the vote. In past cases, the Supreme Court has denied women the right to practice law, the right to equal employment, the right to jury duty and the right to vote."

Should the ERA be ratified, she added, it would clearly establish sex along with race and age as conditions where discrimination is unconstitutional.

Alimony laws would not be affected, ERA lobbyist Howard Twiggs said, because North Carolina in 1967 revised its statutes referring to marriage and divorce to read "supporting spouse" and "dependent spouse."

With no references to sex,



State ERA-United Coordinator Nancy Drum
... with 4-year-old daughter, Meredith

these statutes would not need revision.

No one would have to share the same public toilet facilities. "The right to privacy is based on a 1965 Supreme Court decision," Ms. Drum said.

"IN PASSING the ERA in 1972, Congress introduced into its records, as a majority report, sections of the Yale Law Review Journal on the ERA which dealt with the constitutional aspects of the right to privacy.

"It is clear that Congress passed the ERA with the intention it be interpreted within the framework of this constitutional right. And that it should include differentiations for the unique physical characteristics of men and women.

"Rape laws would not be changed, because they are dealing with these unique differences. The rape of a man is different from the rape of a woman."

Social Security laws would

have to be changed, Ms. Drum believes.

"IT HAS BEEN only within the past few years that a divorced woman has been able to receive Social Security from her husband if she had none herself," she said. "And even so, they must have been married for 20 years. The divorced woman who was married only 19 years or less is out of luck.

"When a man and woman retire and both are receiving Social Security, normally a wife receives only half of hers and the man receives all of his. She is eligible for all of hers only if her income was more than 50 per cent more than her husband's. This would definitely change."

With the ERA, child support would be ordered by the court according to either spouse's ability to pay. It would be judged proportionate to income, Ms. Drum said. "If the wife was not working, she would not be responsible for child support and the law would not force her to work."

Charlotte Observer — January 17, 1975

Women's Rights Amendment May Hinge on Change in Carolina

March 1975

By Lyle Denniston

Washington Star Staff Writer

RALEIGH, N.C. — There is a political gospel according to Herbert Hyde, and it has a lot of believers.

"If the Piedmont flexed its power, it could take over this state, it could dominate the legislature."

Now if that's a fact, and there are many in this state who think so, North Carolina may be on the verge of real change.

Stirrings of progressivism are evident through the "Piedmont," that great mid-state crescent running from Raleigh around through Durham and Greensboro and Winston-Salem and down to Charlotte.

These stirrings are beginning to be felt in the symbolically modern (Edward Durrell Stone, designer) Legislature Building here.

A major test of whether this is something more than stirrings is coming soon. The North Carolina legislature is about to take up again the "equal rights for women" amendment to the U.S. Constitution. And that seems to be a pet cause in the Piedmont.

Herbert Hyde is counting on that. The "sage of the house," as some of his colleagues call the redhead from Buncombe County, thinks he has the votes for that amendment, and a goodly number will come from the

Keeping things quiet at the Odd Fellows Hall

Piedmont. Some will come for his area, the Blue Ridge Mountains to the west. Few, if any, will come from the "East," which up to now has always dominated state politics.

Closeted (literally) in the wee, barely functional office that each representative has near the House chamber, Hyde is willing to talk about anything except his strategy for winning. He is the main sponsor of the amendment in the House.

"This issue," say as he tugs at a curtain pull that won't work, "is no

different from any other. You get the votes and use whatever influence you got."

THE ISSUE, of course, is different, very different, and Hyde leaves little doubt that he, too, knows that. The "ERA" is hotly controversial, nearly everybody knows about it now and cares, one way or the other, and every state's reaction to it is crucial. If it is to become part of the Constitution, the amendment must win in four more states—and, as a practical mat-

ter, it probably has to do that this year.

North Carolina's role could be decisive. The amendment has as good a chance of passing here as it has anywhere. In fact, this is one of only four states definitely counted upon by its supporters to go along.

Should ERA falter here—particularly now, after six weeks during which it has stumbled more times than it has gained elsewhere—the campaign for it just might be over.

Besides, North Carolina is something of a laboratory now for testing such issues: The rising power of cities in a rural state, transmitted

into the legislature by redistricting, is thought likely to give the state's politics a more "liberal" cast. ERA is a good test of that, since here—as elsewhere—it is seen as a liberal cause.

These are reasons why, somewhat to its annoyance, North Carolina is beginning to look at the issue with a national audience watching.

Howard F. Twigg shudders at that. Getting up from the desk in his law office high in the BB & T tower downtown, Twigg greets an out-of-state visitor:

See EQUALITY, A-6

EQUALITY

Continued From A-1

"I've just finished listening to tapes of the North Dakota debates (on ERA), with all that ranting about outsiders."

Later in the conversation, he returns to the thought: "National attention would not help us. My own feeling is that it will make it more difficult for us to pass."

Twigg is paid to worry about such things. ERA United, the umbrella group put together here to unite the campaign for the amendment, hired him as its lobbyist.

The difference this is making is immediately apparent. Twigg wants the matter done quietly this time. No "pro-ERA" marches, no demonstrations at committee hearings, no threats of political reprisal. Subtlety and reason, nothing more.

Says an ERA United newsletter: "We are asking you to write the legislators in your home district." But then it adds, underlined: "Letters should be extremely polite, very low-key and pleasant."

ANOTHER paragraph advises: "In an effort to correct some of the difficulties apparent from the 1973 session, this year's lobbying effort will be low-key, stressing home lobbying. We are asking you to contact only your own legislators while they are at home on weekends."

The last time around, the amateurs did it just the opposite way. They loaded up in buses, descended on Raleigh, hissed and cat-called in committee sessions. The result: Senate defeat, 27 to 23, and a lingering reputation for hysteria.

At the legislature the other day, Rep. A. Hartwell Campbell was remembering 1973. Opening the first meeting of the year of the House Constitutional Amendments Committee, which he chairs, Campbell was quiet but emphatic:

"This issue created an atmosphere and behavior almost beyond control at one or more hearings. I do not intend this shall recur. I won't allow it to come to push or shove. I don't intend to have a carnival or a circus."

There was no risk of it that day. The committee meeting was open to the public, but only a few news reporters were on hand. There was no sign of Howard Twigg, or of Nancy Drum, ERA United's "coordinator."

Campbell, who personally opposes ERA, was a bit testy. The day before, local newspapers had said 9 of the 17 members of his committee were sponsoring ERA bills, and 10 would vote for it in committee.

The press has already said how this committee will vote. The chair may as well hand over the gavel to the press."

He recovered his composure, noted that "people from without are now beginning to look to North Carolina," and added that the state "appreciates their curiosity." He said he would not object "if someone intends to extend to the First Lady an invitation to appear before this committee."

Mrs. Betty Ford, the President's wife, has been campaigning in Washington—and by telephone—for ERA. It is doubtful, though, that ERA supporters here would consider her to be very helpful. There is only 1

Reput can in the 50-member Senate, and only 10 in the 120-member House.

TWIGGS, and Rep. Hyde, are the two person ERA supporters consider most important to their cause right now.

The hefty lawyer, looking like a large country boy in his blue tie printed with a heroic figure of a discus thrower, is a familiar figure around the legislature. He was in the House for eight years—until his defeat last fall.

Twigg makes his contacts by telephone in the daytime, or in person at the Legislature Building at night, when the two houses often sit.

"I felt originally," he recalls, "that, from a committee and leadership standpoint, our chances were better in the Senate (this year). It is also much easier to keep the pulse of 50 than of 120."

"That being so," he adds, "I would prefer to get my harder job out of the way first."

So the House will be the opening arena. There, Rep. Hyde, who has served in the Senate as well, and Rep. H. M. (Mickey) Michaux Jr., a black lawmaker from Durham, have introduced ERA ratification resolutions, HB 15 and HB 16. Hyde and Michaux will testify Tuesday about their bills. Committee hearings are set for March 4 and 11 in the House.

Unlike the situation in many states, in North Carolina the senate is considered the more liberal body. It is presided over by the state's top-ranking Democrat, Lt. Gov. James B. Hunt Jr. (the governor, James Holshouser, is Republican), and it has a strongly liberal Judiciary Committee. Hunt and a clear majority of the Judiciary Committee are said to be most sympathetic to ERA.

Twigg candidly says he is "just more comfortable in the House," which he says he knows better.

"My very good friend, Jimmy Green, is speaker. All I want is a fair break in the House. From him, we've got just that."

"Gentlemen, please welcome Ms. Figby to our committee. . . Now, Ms. Figby, would you please fetch us some coffee. . ."



As North Carolina prepared to take up the Equal Rights Amendment, the Raleigh News and Observer published this cartoon by artist Dwayne Powell.

It is a personal campaign, this effort of Twigg's. He says he thinks more about ERA, even in his leisure hours, than "about any legal case I've got, and I have a full and active calendar."

He claims to have "many friends on both sides of the issue," and he rejects entirely the suggestion of some ERA followers that it would be a good tactic to remind the legislators that women have power at the polls. After last fall's elections, ERA campaigners were claiming they had done, in six senators who had voted "no" on ERA, and eight representatives known to have been against the amendment.

"I don't want to see any of my friends defeated in the next election," Twigg says firmly. "Intimidation is the farthest thing from my mind. I want no part in anything like that."

THAT MESSAGE has been heard, but not entirely heeded, a few blocks away at the offices of ERA United. The one-room, efficient-yet-cluttered office, one floor up in the decaying Odd Fellows Temple building, is run by Nancy Drum.

Recalling the election outcome on races where ERA was a main issue, she says: "We do have some credibility now. I don't think there's a member of the legislature who is unaware of what we did. The biggest single thing we have to trade is the woman's bloc."

She cited again, as she often has, the defeat of Sen. Michael Mullins of Mecklenburg County, which surrounds Charlotte. An announced ERA supporter, his switch at the last minute in 1973 helped defeat ERA in the senate, and that was used heavily against him in the 1974 campaign.

That race, of course, was in the Piedmont. Ms. Drum concedes that her movement's efforts are likely to be stronger in the center and western parts of the state, and "weakest in the eastern part."

She herself comes to the movement from the Piedmont; her home is in

Winston-Salem, in perhaps the most liberal county in the state—Forsyth.

A "civil libertarian," state leader of the National Organization of Women, member of the ACLU, Ms. Drum describes her work on ERA as "a natural extension of those interests."

In almost two years of pro-ERA effort, she has learned some things about lobbying and about political organization, she says. Plainly in control of the office she runs, and familiar in specific detail with the card files she keeps on all legislators, she stresses the need to "deal with this in a professional sense."

Ms. Drum now regards as naive the flooding of legislative halls with demanding pro-ERA constituents, and vows this time "to stand at the doors and explain to our people that conduct must be appropriate."

Moreover, she says, "we have made it known that Twigg is our official representative, and anybody else is strictly on his own."

Ms. Drum herself can be seen at the Legislature Building, moving swiftly down the hall to pass out pro-ERA research studies. But otherwise, she is in the public galleries during sessions, and seems determined to stay out of the way.

Her principal function, it appears, is to marshal the research needed to try to answer ERA's critics.

Last time, the opposition surfaced just at about the time of the convening of the legislature. All of a sudden, we were confronted with these issues—about states' rights, about sending mothers to war, about throwing women out of their homes. It was a very emotional debate. We had no time to deal with it."

THIS TIME, she insists, ERA United is ready. For example, she was passing out to legislators at a recent night meeting a 39-page study, "Before and After the Equal Rights Amendment." It attempts to foresee exactly how ERA would affect such things as alimony and child support, credit, jobs, the military draft, women's privacy, and so on, under North Carolina law and under federal law. For example, it argues that ERA will not force men and women to use the same restrooms, and it insists that ERA "would not undermine the role of the homemaker."

She and Twigg are hoping that legislators, when it comes time to deal with ERA, will be able to focus their attention on those specific issues, not on out-and-out emotional pitches.

But Twigg is prepared to concede the difficulty they face. "Fear is an easier thing to raise than it is to quiet," the lobbyist says. "They (ERA opponents) come to town and they raise all kinds of fear about it."

"They say that woman's role in the home will never be the same again. How do you go about refuting that? You've got 50 different allegations of that nature being made. It takes a long time to explain away—and they can make it in one phrase."

For Twigg and others working for ERA, the best hope will be if the legislature can act swiftly.

"I would hope it moves quickly," he comments. "We can live with this—better than the average legislator can. Out of consideration for them, I hope we could move it out of the way."

He and Ms. Drum are worried that delay might make their state the last, or nearly the last, to ratify. She suggests that if North Carolina turns out to be the make-or-break 38th state, it would be very detrimental. The pressure would be very intense.

Twigg recalls, in a kind of sardonic joke, that North Carolina waited until 1971 to ratify the 19th Amendment on women's right to vote—that is, 51 years after it became a part of the Constitution. "I just hope our state will be more of a leader this time."

Campbell, the committee chairman who is setting the pace, makes it clear that he is in no hurry. "I want to emphasize," he told his committee, "the need for the most extensive search for the facts. We should satisfy ourselves that all the pertinent facts have been developed."

He says his committee "will not be stampeded into precipitous action. . . . We will act as if we were one of the first, not one of the last (to ratify)."

That comment, heard by Rep. Hyde, reminded him of a story. It was the one about the king who seized all the money and valuables of the realm, and was trying to sneak off with them. When caught, the king said: "I would be prepared to have a thorough investigation, running all summer if need be."

Hyde, an apparently savvy member of the House, does concede that North Carolina may not be a state to count on for swift ratification. "We're pretty independent here," he suggests. "We were the next to last state to become a part of the original Union."

HE IMPLIES that he is a bit amused by some of the pro-ERA forces' tactics. Noting that ERA campaigners had gotten pledges of support from many lawmakers, he comments: "I don't know how many people made commitments—or how many people live up to the commitments they make."

But he was annoyed, he made clear, by a questionnaire he got from the Business and Professional Women. "At the end, they wanted me to sign a pledge! I wrote back and said I was for ERA, but I didn't approve of oaths except those required by the Constitution, and I was not going to sign their damned pledge!"

Hyde is being counted upon, very heavily, by Twigg. "I feel very secure," the lobbyist says. "Herbert understands the legislative process very well. He is a superb constitutional lawyer, a grand debater, a very senior member."

He is also, it appears, one who sees the need to keep the rhetoric about ERA somewhat homespun. The Piedmont may be the place to get the liberal votes, but Hyde knows the risk of having an issue in this legislature identified solely with the cities. His somewhat bucolic, Sam Ervin manner seems designed to help spread his gospel to rural listeners, too.

That, of course, is where ERA is vulnerable, in North Carolina as elsewhere.

Rep. Campbell, relaxing on a modern yellow sofa outside his cubbyhole office, suggests that the pro-ERA

campaign is identified with "our very few large cities" and the "more liberal elements" in the state.

Stressing that there "are lots of rural people," he says that the state is "basically moderate or conservative on this issue." Campbell, who comes from Wilson, just east of the Piedmont and considered part of "the East" in state political terms, says he feels the people of the state probably would like a chance to vote themselves on the issue in a referendum.

A bill to call such a referendum is pending before Campbell's committee, but he says he won't even call it up until after some vote is taken for or against ERA ratification.

The organized opposition to ERA has only lately come into existence in North Carolina, and it is focusing its early efforts on the referendum approach.

Mrs. Bobbie Matthews, a housewife in Rocky Mount who used to teach music at the college level and formerly held a state education post, is state leader of the month-old "North Carolinians Against the Equal Rights Amendment."

Her rhetorical plea is a simple one: "I want to keep things as they are for the American woman. She can have her cake and eat it, too!"

HER TACTICS include a heavy schedule of speechmaking and TV appearances for herself, working with some 30 regional chairmen scattered across the state, encouraging a direct lobbying effort by volunteers, and getting "as much free advice as we can."

It is clear that Mrs. Matthews wants to have the anti-ERA campaign identified with the plain people of the state who do not hold positions of power or influence.

Contrasting her following with the other side, which she says is "mostly professional women, who have facilities and funding," her organization "is really quite opposite: ours is all volunteers, ours has come from the grass roots."

The pro-ERA forces are relying, she said, on "officers of various national organizations" to help them, while "ours is just through individuals. Simply a matter of volunteers."

Mrs. Matthews, while conceding that the anti-ERA effort may be handicapped because it "has been a little slow" in starting, insisted that the cause is not yet lost. "I certainly don't think so. From the response we've had."

If the experience in other states is repeated here, the anti-ERA forces will have more success if they wait until the very eve of voting to put on their heaviest lobbying.

Mrs. Matthews indicates that her group has no plans to repeat the "march-on-Raleigh" approach that was used by the anti-ERA as well as the pro-ERA sides in 1973. "We have never discussed marches," she says flatly.

For herself, she is somewhat apologetic about getting involved heavily only now.

When the amendment first emerged from Congress in 1972, she said, "I just accepted it."

"We were sort of apathetic about the whole thing. That is a disease of the American people, and it has been for quite a while."

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1975

One More Spring

By Tom Wicker

RALEIGH, N. C., April 17—Spring has come to North Carolina in the annual riot of color. Along the highways and in the well-tended front yards of towns and cities, dogwood, azaleas and redbud are blooming brilliantly against the green backdrop of pine trees. No state is more beautiful in the season of renewal although here as elsewhere rejuvenation seems more the property of Mother Earth than of her human creatures.

North Carolina's spring blossoming is nowhere more beautiful, for instance, than in the carefully tended square surrounding its relatively new Legislative building. Inside that edifice, as if unaware of change, growth, new times, as symbolized outside by the pansy and tulip beds adding their flaming colors to the pink and white of dogwood and the deeper tones of azaleas, the legislators are exhibiting the same old fears and confusions and perplexities that seem to beset humankind without seasonal adjustment.

This is not just because the legislators defeated ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment this week, thereby probably preventing the addition of that amendment to the national Constitution in 1975, but because of the way they did it—in a welter of misinformation, false apprehensions and emotional pressures. That is the way it seems to go on this remarkably volatile matter, which arouses passions as almost nothing else can, and which here as elsewhere has found its opponents presenting their opposition in the guise of protecting rather than oppressing women.

Tuesday, the resolution favoring the E.R.A. passed, 60 to 58, in a preliminary vote in the House of Representatives; Wednesday, it failed a final passage in the same body, 62 to 57: which more or less repeated the story of 1973 when the E.R.A. first passed, then was defeated in the North Carolina Senate by two last-minute vote switches.

This time there were three overnight changes from yea to nay (and one nay voter who was absent on the first test). One changed vote was that of a woman, Representative Myrtle E. (Lulu Belle) Wiseman, who tearfully explained later that her switch was caused by a flood of phone calls from friends and neighbors back home in Avery County.

"I know they don't know what E.R.A. is all about," Mrs. Wiseman was quoted as having said to the press services, "but I just couldn't in my own heart vote against my people."

Most of the other opposed legislators also were claiming to have "voted their districts," which may be what they thought they were doing; but the truth may be more nearly that they went along with the people who made

the most noise and brought the most pressure, since a recent Gallup Poll showed that even in the South a slight majority of respondents favored E.R.A.

Besides, all of the usual far-fetched fears had been aroused here—not that women were getting too uppity but that the amendment guaranteeing them equal rights "might" somehow lead to dire results—maybe homosexual marriages, even, or women being slaughtered on the battlefield, or bisexual toilets. Former Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., this state's favorite oracle, testified in opposition with impressive consequences. He gave opponents both intellectual cover and the "civil rights" theme that the section of the E.R.A. authorizing Congress to legislate to enforce it somehow was one more usurpation of power by Washington.

Democratic Majority Leader C. Kitchin Josey of Halifax, by all reports, used the draft issue to gory

IN THE NATION

"The truth may be more nearly that they went along with the people who made the most noise."

effect. A wounded veteran himself, he discoursed on combat as "living hell" and said he had a "gripping fear" that E.R.A. would draw women into it. This was topped by Republican Representative Fred Hutchins of Forsyth, who said he didn't "mind my boy being cannon fodder but I don't want my 18-year-old daughter being cannon fodder." This caused one of the thirteen women members, Representative Patricia S. Hunt of Orange, to wonder whether "the mother of those children would ever make that statement."

Nevertheless, the Equal Rights Amendment is dead in North Carolina until at least 1977, when no doubt another round of emotional appeals and pious protests will ill conceal the basic fact that the women's rights amendment is having a hard time in virtually all-male legislatures. Obviously, a lot of women are opposed to E.R.A., too, and no doubt some men are sincere in their desire to protect women from exploitation.

But that is all the more reason to remember that, except for the enforcement section, all the amendment says is that "equality of rights under law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

NEWS & OBSERVER
1777 G.I. H. C.
D-131,230 S-131,00

MAR-14-75

Women Use Baked Bread To Fight ERA

A group of women opposed to ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment to the U. S. Constitution handed out homemade bread Thursday to members of the General Assembly.

Mrs. Janice Leonard, the Raleigh housewife coordinating the project, said the bread baked by women from around the state was not an attempt to influence the legislators, but "a gesture" of their opposition to the proposed 27th Amendment up for consideration in the House Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

"This is just a way women from across the state have of expressing their opposition to the ERA," said Mrs. Leonard.

Notes saying "to the bread winners from the bread bakers" were placed on the loaves which were wrapped and decorated with bows.



Staff photo by Karen Tam

ERA foes sort homemade bread for legislators

ERA Backers to Switch Tactics

WASHINGTON (UPI) — The feminist drive for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, once considered a safe bet in 1975, has foundered under the growing weight of conservative political foes, religious fundamentalists and fears of the unknown.

Flushed with confidence when the year began, ERA supporters have seen victory in only one state — North Dakota — and defeat in 13 others, leaving the amendment stalled four short of the 38 states required to make it part of the Constitution.

In the states where ERA was rejected this year, proponents say their troubles were compounded by their own tactical failures and a string of broken promises by legislators who previously had indicated support.

The amendment, which would abolish any law that discriminates on the basis of sex, was passed by Congress in March 1972, and quickly approved by 22 state legislatures before the year was out. Eight more states voted to ratify in 1973, and another three last year.

Florida rejected it last week for the fourth consecutive year, despite personal lobbying by Betty Ford and Gov. Reubin Askew. The goal of ratification in 1975 is clearly beyond reach, for only Missouri and Illinois are still debating it this year.

Most ERA backers are confident they can win before their March 1979, deadline, when the amendment must be ratified or face automatic death. But their losses this year have prompted reappraisal of the forces building against them.

The opposition has come primarily from "Stop ERA," a loosely knit group of housewives organized by Phyllis Schlafly, a conservative Republican from Alton, Ill. They contend ERA would remove certain protections women enjoy under existing law, and that most women don't want to lose them.

Stop ERA has gained strength in many states through alliances with ultraconservative church and political groups, including the John Birch Society. But state Rep. Hannah Atkins of Oklahoma, where ERA lost this year, says right-wing support is only the "surface reason" for opponents' increasing success.

ERA supporters formed coalitions of women's groups to lobby in each target state. They pooled their funds, hired Washington consultants and relied primarily on professional lobbyists to speak for them in state capitols.

Meanwhile, using old-fashioned blitz tactics, ERA opponents flooded legislatures with scare pamphlets and busied housewives by the hundreds to appear for floor votes. The literature warned that ERA would legalize homosexual marriages, force women into combat and require both sexes to use the same public toilets.

The result in South Carolina was typical. State ERA coordinator Janet Wedlock said the amendment was defeated because eight legislators reneged on their public promise to support it.

"When it came down to the wire, they were not able to withstand the type of pressure they were subjected to," she said.

Rep. Herbert Hyde of North Carolina, where the ERA was defeated by five votes, said many of his colleagues were swayed by constituent fears of what ratification might bring.

"If the people do not understand it and are afraid of it and therefore against it and keep telling their representatives that, this is what makes a difference," Hyde said. "That is what made the difference here — pure politics back home."

Thus, said ERA coordinator Nancy Drum of Winston-Salem, opponents succeeded "in exaggerating highly charged emotional and doubtful issues . . . a wastebasket collection of all the social issues they were afraid of and all the social ills that exist in our society."

Mrs. Schlafly sees the struggle — and the arguments of ERA supporters — somewhat differently.

"They're so dumb," she said. "The big thing that has hurt them is that when they are required to present their case, they spend half their time attacking me. It is quite obvious they have no case."

At this point, Mrs. Schlafly says, ERA advocates can win only with heavy new spending.

"The question is," she asked, "can you buy a constitutional amendment?"

UPI, April 13, 1975