

# **Faith, Family, and Feminism: Why the Silent Majority Broke their Silence to Oppose the Equal Rights Amendment**

**Lauren Chan**

By 1972, the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) appeared unstoppable. Despite its embattled history, soaring majorities in both the House of Representatives and the Senate made its long-awaited addition to the Constitution seem inevitable. But nothing is inevitable in history, and the ERA was swiftly put to the test by conservative activist Phyllis Schlafly and thousands of accompanying Christian assailants. With the ERA only eight states short of ratification in 1973, hordes of Christians began waging holy war against it.<sup>1</sup> Their almost decade-long efforts defied the traditional trajectories of politically popular Constitutional amendments and by 1980, the Republican party made a lasting statement by reversing its forty-year legacy of ERA support.<sup>2</sup> Even after a controversial three-year ratification extension, in 1982 the ERA sputtered to a painful halt: expiration.

Historians now debate the reasons for the en masse Christian opposition to a famously simple proposed amendment, which stated that “equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”<sup>3</sup> Replace the word “sex” with “race,” ERA advocates contended, and it would be downright shameful to stand in its way.<sup>4</sup> Regardless of its merits, however, the aforementioned Christian anti-ERA forces flourished. “It’s against everything that Christianity is,” said one woman who was interviewed about the ERA.<sup>5</sup> Flummoxed and frustrated, ERA advocates wondered what ideological roots lay beneath this apparently impermeable divide between faith and feminism.

---

This paper was written for Charles Wetherell’s Advanced Placement U.S. History class in the spring of 2016.

Many historians involved in this debate now turn to the political climate of the 1970s and early 1980s to examine its unique socio-political context. The ERA battle ran parallel to the rise of a highly religious conservatism within the Republican party known as the “New Right.” As such, some historians argue that the ERA was merely collateral damage in a far-reaching Republican political agenda that attempted to coalesce an electorate devoutly conservative in both social and economic terms. While the fusion of Christianity and conservatism was both politically expedient and influential in the anti-ERA crusade, that was not likely the primary motive for opposition to the ERA. Christian opposition to the ERA was in fact driven by female-led grassroots campaigns that typically supported the ideals of feminism itself but drew from religiously zealous defense of family values. Despite claims that females were mere pawns in a male-oriented anti-ERA battle, Christian women primarily enacted opposition to the ERA because they truly believed their families were threatened by perceived social consequences of the ERA. Ironically, most Christians actually did not oppose the ideal of gender parity and even believed they were protecting a God-ordained standard of superior rights for females by opposing the ERA. This tension between collective understanding of Christian ERA opposition as a patriarchal power play, as opposed to a genuine faith-based concern, prevails today.

### **Personal or Political?**

Historians debate the true reasons for Christian opposition to the ERA. Some historians argue that anti-ERA efforts were a genuine, female-led expression of the religious fundamentalist movement. One of these scholars is Donald G. Mathews, a professor of American history who teaches at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In his article, “‘Spiritual Warfare’: Cultural Fundamentalism and the Equal Rights Amendment,” Mathews asserts that behind ERA opposition lay sincere, female-initiated allegiance to the gender roles outlined in fundamentalist understandings of the Bible. Mathews presents the primary roadblock to ERA ratification as the actions of Christian women who were legitimately concerned with the survival of their identities and values. According to his depiction of the movement,

Christian opposition to the ERA was understandable because of its basis in Christian doctrines regarding the “sacred order of creation,” especially as it pertained to gender roles.<sup>6</sup> In his article, Mathews draws predominantly from anecdotal evidence of countless anti-ERA women and their frantic attempts to stop the ERA in its tracks. Lack of empirical data notwithstanding, Mathews presents a conceptually compelling argument by incorporating theology and contrasting feminists’ fluid conceptions of gender with Christian women’s typically static interpretations of gender.

On the opposite side of the spectrum, other historians argue that anti-ERA efforts were primarily motivated by the formation of a family-centered New Christian Right political agenda that could garner widespread support. Historian Seth Dowland, who holds a Ph.D. in American Religions from Duke University, compares previously ambivalent evangelical Christian opinions on abortion, feminism, and gay rights to the hard-line positions developed throughout the 1970s. According to Dowland, most evangelicals “supported the Equal Rights Amendment and equivocated on abortion” in the early 1970s, and the matter of gay rights was seen as a “marginal issue until the end of the decade.” Dowland then suggests that the anti-ERA movement was simply a mouthpiece for a larger “defense of the family” premise emerging from this relatively recent conservative inclination. Dowland also states that evangelical leaders and New Right politicians were the leading forces in this political charge rather than the women that the ERA would have mainly affected. While Dowland’s logical proceedings appear to clearly indict these apparently scheming political tacticians, he condemns “Christian Right leaders” and a “small cadre of evangelical ministers” without ever naming more than one example.<sup>7</sup> By reason alone, Dowland presents a damning case against evangelical Christians and their supposedly religious misgivings surrounding the ERA. However, without substantive evidence in his article “Family Values’ and the Formation of a Christian Right Agenda,” Dowland cannot so sweepingly claim that such large-scale divisive positions drew exclusively from a conniving few. Furthermore, Dowland’s liberal bias appears by his omission of the counter-argument for sincere, female-driven ERA opposition. Despite its faults, there are certainly truths

to be found in Dowland's argument, especially when considering the decisive Christian shift in the political atmosphere of the time.

### **It's All Politics: The Role of the New Religious Right**

Like Dowland, some argue that Christian male leaders led a politically-motivated, fundamentally patriarchal charge against the ERA with women in tow as puppets in order to ensure that conservatism was not branded as anti-women. To this end, many point to the fact that men served as the original catalysts for opposition as evidence. Longtime North Carolina senator and vocal ERA assailant Sam Ervin stirred up anti-ERA sentiment within Congress until he could recruit Phyllis Schlafly, the eventual figurehead, to step into the fight.<sup>8</sup> After Ervin teamed up with Schlafly, she wrote Ervin, telling him that they needed female visibility "at the top."<sup>9</sup> This concern reveals that the lack of celebrity female opposition to the ERA was a threat to male politicians like Ervin because Ervin, and the entire anti-ERA cause, could have been pegged by the public as anti-women. This desperation for conspicuous female solidarity suggests that women, at least at the beginning of Ervin's attacks on the ERA, were simply needed as token supporters. Additionally, the rise of the Republican Christian Right, led mainly by men, appeared to engineer a New Right agenda at the expense of the ERA's success. During the ratification window of the ERA, conservative politicians founded a network of research institutes and successfully mobilized a wider Christian base, revitalizing their party as they drained the ERA of its support.<sup>10</sup> For example, politician Howard Phillips, a former official in the Nixon administration, helped establish religious political groups like The Moral Majority and the American Life League.<sup>11</sup> This push by the Republican party to widen their constituency demonstrates politically-motivated reasoning for ERA opposition, reasoning that had little or nothing to do with gender equality itself. Their actions suggest the manifestation of an establishment politic desire to win over more Christian voters rather than a care for the ERA's content and consequences. Christian leaders and churches themselves also engaged their congregations in political activism. Popular Christian televangelist Jerry Falwell established a political action committee and effectively expanded the Religious Right's agenda to include support for religious school tax

credits, defense of South Africa, and increases in military spending, along with staunchly pro-life, anti-ERA stances.<sup>12</sup> At a large event for religious leaders, Falwell stated that the responsibilities of preachers were threefold: “Number one, get them saved; number two, get them baptized; number three, get them registered to vote.”<sup>13</sup> By blurring the line between religion and politics, Falwell associated the ERA with a menu of conservative Christian beliefs, suggesting an anti-ERA mindset more concerned with a holistic Right agenda rather than feminism itself. Despite the presence of politically-charged rhetoric in many anti-ERA arguments, however, these bureaucratic intents were secondary to sincere, female-led, religious motives.

### A Female Infantry Defending Family, God, and Country

Christian women enacted ERA opposition because they believed it was their duty to defend their families and country against perceived expansive consequences in the social and moral spheres. First, it is important to clarify that women were actually the drivers of the Christian anti-ERA movement. The idea of male-dominated ERA opposition is a weak one mainly because more men than women supported the ERA. A cartoon for the *Austin American Statesman* features an elderly couple discussing the ERA (see Appendix 1). When the husband, reading a newspaper article, tells his wife he can’t “see th’ harm” in the ERA, his wife explodes back, yelling for him to read the part about “requiring homosexual bathrooms,” “outlawing families,” and “mandatory abortions.” When he tries to counter, saying “No, that’s all” (likely referring to the succinct nature of the proposed amendment), she interrupts, screaming that the ERA is another “devious” feminist “trick.”<sup>14</sup> Empirical evidence also supports the proposition that more men approved of the ERA than women: a *New York Times*/CBS Poll revealed that in 1980, 55% of men supported the ERA, while only 47% of women did.<sup>15</sup> Both the cartoon and the poll results indicate a more widespread male acceptance or even ambivalence to the ERA, reinforcing the idea that women were at the helm of active anti-ERA efforts. Furthermore, the wife’s intensity in the cartoon speaks to the great passion with which Christian women felt they were defending their faith. Christian women’s motives for opposing the ERA with such enthusiasm can be partially attributed to a belief that women

were the appointed stewards of religion for their households. In this case, that perceived responsibility to ensure the moral future of their families and their country helped drive their anti-ERA efforts. Shirley Spellerberg, STOP ERA Florida Chairman, wrote that women were “drop[ping] everything to fight” in this “religious war,” citing the fact that women “keep the family’s faith” as a primary reason for their zeal. “Our women,” wrote Spellerberg, “figure that the politicians and bureaucrats have had their turn and they’ve botched it,” letting the United States decay into a “moral pygmy.”<sup>16</sup> The mass participation of Christian women that Spellerberg described further indicates the energized initiative that Christian women took on. Finally, women were both the primary participants and leaders of the entire anti-ERA movement. Phyllis Schlafly, no doubt the principal leader of the entire crusade, can be seen in numerous photographs leading STOP ERA rallies—rallies filled with women—whether they were picketing the White House or passing out STOP ERA apple pies (see Appendix 2).<sup>17</sup> Women served as the chairmen of STOP ERA chapters in various states, organized themselves, and reached out to male lawmakers, pressing them to oppose the ERA. For example, Mrs. Thomas Zeko of California did just this when she personally wrote to her representative Don Edwards in 1971 to voice her ERA opposition, arguing that the ERA would cause significant societal harm.<sup>18</sup> By contrast, men are scarce if not nonexistent in photos of anti-ERA rallies. This significant presence of female participants in the anti-ERA campaign further reveals that women were passionate enough and invested enough in anti-ERA sentiment that they would devote their time and talents to the cause. Ironically, women were immersing themselves in the male-dominated political system in order to oppose an amendment that would objectively limit a woman’s ability to have maximum influence in said political system. This paradox notwithstanding, by and large, women saw themselves as warriors who would defend their families tirelessly. Teddi Holt, homemaker and STOP ERA Georgia member, sums it up nicely. Holt wrote in her narrative antifeminist perspective that mothers “must stand up for the protection of our homes and our children.” If they failed to “unite against threats to the home,” she wrote, the “keepers of the home ... will not have a home to keep!”<sup>19</sup> So what threats, exactly, were women so fervently defending their homes from?

Rather than equal rights for women, females' defense of the family sentiment was predicated upon the fear that the ERA was the first step in a slippery slope leading to an anti-family, non-Christian nation. First and foremost, Christians feared that the ambiguous wording of the ERA would provide for abuse of the amendment and allow liberal politicians to veer into unwanted social territories. Phyllis Schlafly, who was also a lawyer, communicated to her many followers that the ERA was so loosely worded that it would require additional court interpretation, which could not be trusted.<sup>20</sup> This fear reveals a deeper mistrust of the court system exacerbated by the liberal "Warren Court" of the 1960s and the recent *Roe v. Wade* decision of 1973. Based on the judicial context alone, Christians were unlikely to place their confidence in the Supreme Court with the ERA. However, many Christian mothers also believed that the ERA would remove them from their domain: their homes and children. Phyllis Schlafly, for example, wrote in the November 1972 issue of her monthly conservative report that the ERA would make a wife "equally responsible to provide a home for her family and to provide 50 percent of the financial support of her family."<sup>21</sup> Being forced out of the home and into a job would have been a major lifestyle shift, and women—especially in a nation saturated with suburban ideals of stay-at-home moms—were justifiably afraid of the prospect. As Teddi Holt wrote, feminists were "calling for liberation from the things women like me love most—our husbands, our children, our homes."<sup>22</sup> This Christian fear of unwanted, forced freedom from the home reveals that their motivations for opposing the ERA were defensive in nature. Christians were also concerned with the encroachment of abortion rights. A photo of an anti-ERA protest contained a woman carrying a sign reading "Stop Abortion: Let REASON Not PRESSURE Determine Your Vote (see Appendix 3)."<sup>23</sup> The *Austin American Statesman's* cartoon also included this same fear: a wife shouting angrily about potential "mandatory abortions."<sup>24</sup> Especially in the wake of the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision, which coincided with the beginning of major anti-ERA actions, abortion was a fear-inducing subject for Christian women who viewed it as murder. The protest photo and cartoon both demonstrate that while women were usually politically inactive, the reality of abortion was so repulsive to them that it ignited their enthusiasm for anti-ERA efforts. The issue of gay

rights was another speculative effect that Christians disdained because it challenged the traditional family and traditional understandings of the Bible. Televangelist Jerry Falwell voiced this fear at a large Christian event when he stated that the “ambiguous wording” of the ERA would mean that “homosexual marriages could not be disallowed anywhere.” To roaring applause, Falwell declared that this effect would be a “repudiation of our conviction that the traditional family mold is right” and that “what God has condemned [cannot be] sanction[ed].”<sup>25</sup> Falwell’s suspicion of the connection between the ERA and gay rights displays the same traditional-family-centric, conservative reasoning for ERA opposition that many Christians adopted. For example, in Mrs. Thomas Zeko’s letter to her House representative she prefaced her argument by stating her perceived intent of the “lesbians ... of women’s lib.”<sup>26</sup> By naming lesbian women as central components of the feminist movement, Zeko further displays this widespread Christian fear of nontraditional, non-heterosexual encroachments on American culture. Even at rallies, a disdain for gay rights was apparent through signs reading “God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve,” a clear dig at gay rights (see Appendix 4).<sup>27</sup> All these anti-ERA references to gay rights display the fearful conjecture that gender equality meant marriage equality. Finally, a Cold War fear of communism even seeped into the anti-ERA debates. The aforementioned Zeko letter categorized the women’s lib movement as being comprised of “communists,” revealing the inflation of perceived socialist presence within feminism.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, STOP ERA member Teddi Holt wrote that the feminist movement was not only “begun by communist and socialist leadership,” but was also “saying that our children needed to be ‘socialised.’”<sup>29</sup> This need to defend one’s own offspring from socialist encroachments took “defense of the family” rhetoric to a very literal level for many Christian women, suggesting that the hypothetical arguments put forth by anti-ERA activists did not just defend God and family but also country and capitalism. It’s clear that anti-ERA Christians paraded many consequences unrelated to gender equality itself—so what did they think about the rights of women?

### The Reduced Rights Amendment

Ironically, Christian women who opposed the ERA were often actually in favor of equal rights between genders. Historian David Kyvig argued in his article “Historical Misunderstandings and the Defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment” that anti-ERA leaders connected with a population of women “not entirely opposed” to women’s rights.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, the notion that all anti-ERA Christians protested women in the workplace is easily dispelled. Teddi Holt wrote in her anti-ERA narrative that she had no doubt a woman could be a competent president of the United States because she thought women were “exciting,” “intelligent,” and “very, very necessary.”<sup>31</sup> In a similar vein, when Mrs. Thomas Zeko wrote to her representative in opposition to the ERA, she first conceded that “women, of course, should receive equal pay for equal work.”<sup>32</sup> Televangelist Jerry Falwell wrote in his 1980 book *Listen, America!* that working women should be regarded with dignity and rewarded equally for equal work.<sup>33</sup> Clearly, these Christians did not oppose equality for other women who wanted or needed to be in the workforce. In fact, they explicitly supported it, revealing that their true objections lay beyond the scope of gender equality. Furthermore, Christians believed that the ERA would do nothing in the realm of improving equality for women. In his book, Falwell went on to write that his real grievance was that gender equality in employment was not the central focus of the “present feminist movement” or of the ERA.<sup>34</sup> Schlafly agreed: while she meticulously documented potential ERA-made changes to family life, moral standards, and even the military, she noted in a 1981 newsletter that she believed the ERA would make absolutely no changes to employment.<sup>35</sup> Schlafly and Falwell’s arguments that employment equality, the alleged goal of the ERA, would not be changed, further reveal that Christians actually did consider equal rights for women to be a cause worthy of real change—just not in the form of the ERA. It wasn’t just top-level leadership that professed their support for equal rights itself. Protesters proclaimed their appreciation for women’s rights by holding signs that read “Women’s Rights—YES! ERA—NO!” And “Women’s Rights—Yes.

The Amendment—No.” reveal that while women were ready for equal rights, Christian women especially were not ready for the host of other ramifications they thought the ERA entailed (see Appendices 3 and 4).<sup>36</sup> Finally, Christian ERA opposition tended to support education for women and believed those opportunities would be impaired by the ERA. In Schlafly’s 1977 book *The Power of the Positive Woman*, she argued that the ERA would force women’s colleges to “go fully co-ed or give up all ‘federal assistance,’” and since “graduates of women’s colleges are more likely to be career achievers,” the ERA would limit the career capacity of many women receiving an education.<sup>37</sup> Schlafly’s statement reveals the effective yet paradoxical argument of accusing the ERA of harming the status of women already in a position to succeed. However, this proved to be one of ERA opposition’s tried-and-true tactics: tell women they already have rights—even superior rights—that the ERA would take away.

Many Christian women believed that they had superior rights and protections that the ERA would diminish. These perceived advantages fall into two major categories: financial security and physical safety. Financially, Christian women believed previous legislature already ensured protections against paycheck inequality. Phyllis Schlafly claimed that the ERA was unnecessary because of several laws already passed by Congress: the Equal Pay Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, Title IX of the Education Amendments, and credit protection legislation passed in 1974.<sup>38</sup> This points back to the dislike of the ERA’s broad language; Christians preferred that discrimination be combatted through specific laws less prone to court manipulation. Christian women also relied on the Christian framework of financial support for the mother. Schlafly said that the “great legacy of Moses” stipulated that “children are a woman’s best social security—her best guarantee of social benefits such as old age pension, unemployment compensation, workman’s compensation, and sick leave ... all the physical, financial, and emotional security.”<sup>39</sup> This argument reveals a Christian desire to retain the infrastructure of a religious family in which females remain dependent on the family for financial protection. Finally, ERA opponents believed that the ERA would actively hurt women financially. Schlafly, who believed the ERA

would proliferate the nation with no-fault divorce, claimed that the ERA would “wipe out the state laws that require a husband to support his wife,” forcing the “cast-off wife ... to hunt for a job to support herself”—Schlafly even posited that life insurance commissions would no longer be able to approve lower life insurance premiums for women based on longer life expectancy.<sup>40</sup> Though such accusations seem petty, the fact that they were included reveals that every allegation was fodder for the flame of Christian outrage against the ERA. By expressing the potential threats that the ERA leveled against women, Schlafly effectively mobilized middle class Christian women who saw “danger, not promise, in independence” and were fearful of a workplace-and-paycheck world that many had never before experienced.<sup>41</sup>

The second category of protections that Christians felt they were preserving for women was physical safety. While it is difficult to ascertain whether or not the ERA actually would have sped up the inclusion of women in the draft, Christians feared that women would be drafted and assigned to combat duty if the ERA was passed. They believed it was men’s God-given role to fight and defend women. When pressed further about why she thought Christianity and the ERA were incompatible, one woman at a Jerry Falwell Moral Majority event said the following: “God made man to be superior and to protect the woman. He didn’t make women to go out and fight; he made the man to go out and fight and protect the woman.”<sup>42</sup> This ideological position suggests that Christians felt they were defending roles established by God himself. In a photo of an anti-ERA rally, young women wore badges reading “All that is between me and the draft is ERA (see Appendix 5).”<sup>43</sup> This pushback demonstrates the panic that the threat of a draft struck into girls and women alike. This panic, exacerbated by the constant Cold War threat of an actual war, was a primary motivation for many women to oppose the ERA. If not for their own sakes, why not for their daughters’ sakes? While claims of an all-gender draft may have been unsubstantiated, they were fuel for angry fire of ERA opponents. Anti-ERA leaders also pointed out a possible decrease in the safety of women even if they weren’t drafted. Schlafly wrote in her widely-distributed November 1981 newsletter that the ERA would lower the consent age for sexual acts to twelve years old, legalize prostitution,

and repeal the Mann Act, which protected women by criminalizing human trafficking and prostitution within the United States.<sup>44</sup> She also claimed that prisons, sports teams, and even bathrooms would be gender-integrated, all of which could carry opportunities for rape and abuse.<sup>45</sup> In fact, the recent racial integration of public bathrooms made Southern states especially receptive to fears of major change in public facilities, and Senator Sam Ervin used these racist sentiments to his advantage during the inception of anti-ERA coalitions.<sup>46</sup> Finally and perhaps most alarmingly for her followers, Schlafly wrote that rape laws would be defanged due to the ERA.<sup>47</sup> Schlafly's statements were understandably frightening for women. The broadcasting of these scary potential physical dangers suggest that Christian women were influenced not just by social and financial ramifications but also by a natural human desire to defend their own bodies.

### **The Lasting Legacy of the Silent Majority**

For Christians, the de jure goal of legal gender equality was overshadowed by the perceived de facto intent behind the ERA. Christian-held fear of the ERA was social (fear of nontraditional families, abortion, and gay rights), ethical (the desire to protect women), and even patriotic (defense of capitalism, the military, and democracy). In fact, Christian opposition to the ERA lay in nearly every single category except opposition to the ideal of equal rights for women—a misinterpretation that feminism struggles with to this day. The ERA was a perceived invasion on what they believed was ordained by God as morally and religiously sacred. To thousands of Christian men and women, the ERA itself was extremist in every way. It was, in Schlafly's own words, "extremist in its anti-family objectives," "extremist in its assault on our moral standards," and even "extremist in its attack on the effectiveness of our armed services."<sup>48</sup> Religion has always been zealously discussed and vehemently defended. Therefore, it follows that any potential effect beyond equal rights for women would be attacked passionately by Christians as if their very identities were at stake. That was their reality:

their world view and way of life threatened by a single amendment. For present and future feminists, an important question still remains: is there a way to frame the ERA and feminism so that Christians can be convinced it would be beneficial to families and morality? Or are the Christian faith and feminism forever ostracized from one another? In this day and age, when it would appear that a third wave of feminism is re-entering the global scene, this question could be vital to the success of feminist accomplishments within the United States. It was certainly a life-or-death situation for the ERA.

Ultimately, the success of Phyllis Schlafly and the Religious Right against the ERA reveals the power of the supposedly “silent” majority of moderate, religious opinions that are said to be rarely expressed. Christian opposition to the ERA serves as a prime example of the power of this “silent majority” to be extremely loud and push back against liberalism with astonishing force. Today, at Trump rallies, crowds hold up a sign with the following slogan: “The Silent Majority Stands With Trump.” A closer glance reveals that the rise of Trump actually has many parallels to ERA opposition. For feminists and liberals intent on securing legally-mandated equal rights for women, Phyllis Schlafly was a demonic figure. Betty Friedan even publicly told Schlafly, “I’d like to burn you at the stake.”<sup>49</sup> This sentiment is not unlike that of liberals who fearfully gawk at the meteoric rise of Trump or other ultra-conservative 2016 presidential candidates like Ted Cruz. Schlafly and her anti-ERA ranks, similar to Trump and his supporters, cared far more about outcome than process and weren’t afraid to inflate fears, exaggerate consequences of contemporary politics, or make their rallies flashy and impassioned. One journalist, for example, called Phyllis Schlafly’s STOP ERA rallies as “the best show in town.”<sup>50</sup> The combination of a fear-driven campaign and a polarizing leader like Trump in his presidential campaign or Phyllis Schlafly in her anti-ERA crusade are just two examples of progressive change promoting intense backlash, a pattern that has echoed throughout United States history. ●

## Appendices

## Appendix 1



Sargent, Ben. "Mona, Darned if..." In *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

## Appendix 2



Dale Wittner. Phyllis Schlafly Dispenses Ammunition to the Troops. In *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority: The Biography of Phyllis Schlafly*, by Carol Felsenthal. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981.

*Appendix 3*

"Raleigh Rally." In *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

*Appendix 4*

Wide World Photos. Schlafly and Company. In *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority: The Biography of Phyllis Schlafly*, by Carol Felsenthal. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981.

*Appendix 5*

“Me and the Draft.” In *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

**Notes**

1. David E. Kyvig, “Historical Misunderstandings and the Defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment,” *The Public Historian* 18, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 45, JSTOR.
2. Donald G. Mathews and Jane Sherron De Hart, *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), vii.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Donald G. Mathews, “‘Spiritual Warfare’: Cultural Fundamentalism and the Equal Rights Amendment,” *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1993): 129, JSTOR.
5. Unnamed Woman, interview by Bill Moyers, *Moyers Moment*, last modified August 31, 2012, accessed December 3, 2015, <http://billmoyers.com/content/bill-moyers-on-the-rise-of-the-religious-right/>.

6. Mathews, “‘Spiritual Warfare’: Cultural Fundamentalism and the Equal Rights Amendment,” 131.
7. Kyvig, 51.
8. Seth Dowland, “‘Family Values’ and the Formation of a Christian Right Agenda,” *Church History* 78, no. 3 (September 2009): 607, JSTOR.
9. Mathews, *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation*, 51.
10. Donald T. Critchlow and Nancy Maclean, *Debating the American Conservative Movement: 1945 to the Present* (Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009), 40.
11. Ibid.
12. Clyde Wilcox, “Laying up Treasures in Washington and in Heaven: The Christian Right and Evangelical Politics in the Twentieth Century and Beyond,” *OAH Magazine of History* 17, no. 2 (January 2003): 26, JSTOR.
13. Jerry Falwell, interview by Bill Moyers, *Moyers Moment*, last modified August 31, 2012, accessed December 3, 2015, <http://billmoyers.com/content/bill-moyers-on-the-rise-of-the-religious-right/>.
14. Ben Sargent, “Mona, Darned if...,” in *Why We Lost the ERA* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 115.
15. Leslie Bennetts, “Winning Over Women Who Will Vote,” *The New York Times*, October 17, 1980, Proquest Historical Newspapers.
16. Carol Felsenthal, *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority: The Biography of Phyllis Schlafly* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981), 52-53.

17. Felsenthal, 169.

18. Thomas Zeko to Don Edwards, September 9, 1971, in *The National Archives: Education Updates*, ed. Christine Blackerby, <http://education.blogs.archives.gov/2013/12/05/the-equal-rights-amendment/>.

19. Teddi Holt, *Women Who Do and Women Who Don't Join the Women's Movement* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), 54.

20. Critchlow, *Debating the American Conservative Movement: 1945 to the Present*, 40.

21. Jane J. Mansbridge, *Why We Lost the ERA* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 90.

22. Holt, 51.

23. Mathews, *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation*, 101.

24. Sargent.

25. Falwell, interview by Bill Moyers.

26. Zeko.

27. Dale Wittner, *Anti-ERA Protesters, in The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority: The Biography of Phyllis Schlafly*, by Carol Felsenthal (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981), 169.

28. Zeko.

29. Holt, 52.

30. Kyvig, 52.

31. Holt, 49.

32. Zeko.

33. Jerry Falwell, *Listen, America!*  
(Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1980), 150.

34. Ibid.

35. Phyllis Schlafly, "How ERA Would Change Federal Laws," *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* 15, no. 4 (November 1981): 4, Eagle Forum.

36. "Women's Rights Yes, ERA No," in *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 101.

37. Phyllis Schlafly, *The Power of the Positive Woman*  
(New Rochelle: Arlington House Publishers, 1977), 119.

38. Critchlow, *Debating the American Conservative Movement: 1945 to the Present*, 39-40.

39. Ibid., 198.

40. Schlafly, *The Power of the Positive Woman*, 83; Mansbridge, 111.

41. Critchlow, 253.

42. Unnamed Woman, interview by Bill Moyers.

43. "Me and the Draft," in *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 71.

44. Schlafly, "How ERA Would Change Federal Laws."

45. Ibid.

46. Kyvig, 51.

47. Schlafly, "How ERA Would Change Federal Laws."

48. Ibid.

49. Felsenthal, 301.

50. Felsenthal, 168.

## Bibliography

Bennetts, Leslie. "Winning Over Women Who Will Vote." *The New York Times*, October 17, 1980. Proquest Historical Newspapers.

Critchlow, Donald T. and Nancy Maclean. *Debating the American Conservative Movement: 1945 to the Present*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009.

Dowland, Seth. "Family Values' and the Formation of a Christian Right Agenda." *Church History* 78, no. 3 (September 2009): 606-31. JSTOR.

Falwell, Jerry. Interview by Bill Moyers. *Moyers Moment*. Last modified August 31, 2012. Accessed December 3, 2015. <http://billmoyers.com/content/bill-moyers-on-the-rise-of-the-religious-right/>.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Listen, America!* Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1980.

Felsenthal, Carol. *The Sweetheart of the Silent Majority: The Biography of Phyllis Schlafly*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981.

Holt, Teddi. *Women Who Do and Women Who Don't Join the Women's Movement*. Edited by Robyn Rowland. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.

Kyvig, David E. "Historical Misunderstandings and the Defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment." *The Public Historian*, 18, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 45-63. JSTOR.

Mansbridge, Jane J. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Mathews, Donald G. "Spiritual Warfare: Cultural Fundamentalism and the Equal Rights Amendment." *Religion and American Culture* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1993): 129-54. JSTOR.

Mathews, Donald G. and Jane Sherron De Hart. *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Schlafly, Phyllis. "How ERA Would Change Federal Laws." *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* 15, no. 4 (November 1981). Accessed January 11, 2016. <http://www.eagleforum.org/era/psr/psrnov81.pdf>.

Schlafly, Phyllis. *The Power of the Positive Woman*. New Rochelle: Arlington House Publishers, 1977.

Wilcox, Clyde. "Laying up Treasures in Washington and in Heaven: The Christian Right and Evangelical Politics in the Twentieth Century and Beyond." *OAH Magazine of History* 17, no. 2 (January 2003): 23-29, JSTOR.

Zeko, Thomas. Thomas Zeko to Don Edwards, September 9, 1971. In *The National Archives: Education Updates*, edited by Christine Blackerby. <http://education.blogs.archives.gov/2013/12/05/the-equal-rights-amendment/>.