

▶ **ERA is not needed for women to succeed.** ERA would not give any woman a pay raise or prevent any act of sexual harassment. ERA does not put women in the Constitution; they are already there. Under the 14th Amendment, all “persons” — which includes women and men — are granted equal protection. Is there any opportunity that American women are missing? What injustice would ERA remedy? None. ERA cannot benefit women in employment because our employment laws are already sex neutral. Instead, ERA would be a boon for activist lawyers, judges, and bureaucrats.

▶ **ERA does not allow for any exceptions for privacy** and would force the sex-integration of prisons, athletic competitions, schools, and showers. Nobody benefits if male and female prisons are combined; in fact, female prisoners would be at a significant privacy and security disadvantage. Currently, most women’s shelters and transitional housing that help abused women do not allow men inside for the protection and security of women — but those shelters would be illegal under ERA.

▶ **Title IX, a federal law requiring schools and colleges not to discriminate “on the basis of sex,” shows some of the mischief ERA will do.** Feminist bureaucrats have used Title IX to punish men by forcing universities to abolish men’s teams in gymnastics, swimming, golf, football, and wrestling. ERA would also abolish the reasonable exceptions in Title IX which currently allow single-sex schools, fraternities, and sororities.

The American people said NO to the Equal Rights Amendment in 1982. Don’t take a chance on ERA mischief — or on what activist judges can do to interpret ERA.

Vote NO on ERA.

Let ERA rest in peace.



Eunie Smith, President

Cathie Adams, First Vice President

Anne Schlafly Cori, Chairman

200 West 3rd St., Ste. 502
Alton, IL 62002
618-433-8990

eagle@eagleforum.org
EagleForum.org

Please enroll me as a member of Eagle Forum:

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____

State: _____ Zip: _____

Area Code: _____ Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

(Put me on list to receive email alerts.)

***Eagle Forum has opposed
ERA since 1972***



▶ **The Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution does not allow for any exceptions,** even common sense exceptions that recognize that only women get pregnant and have babies or the difference between an X and Y chromosome. ERA demands complete sex equality, and in Section Two, instructs the federal government, not the states, to enforce that “equality.”

Reasons why the United States should not become a completely sex-neutral society:

Equal Rights Amendment text:

Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

▶ **ERA would force taxpayer-paid abortions, since pregnancy only happens to one sex.** ERA would eliminate the Hyde Amendment that prevents federal funding of abortion, and secure abortion as a Constitutional right. Any restrictions on abortion, such as parental notification or laws against partial-birth abortions, would be unconstitutional sex discrimination.

▶ **Benefits that women receive would be eliminated,** such as Social Security benefits for homemakers, WIC nutrition program which aids women, financial incentives for women-owned businesses, financial aid for education that is only granted to women, and any workplace accommodations for pregnant women or breastfeeding mothers.

▶ **Constitutional amendments have a much greater force than other laws.** ERA language would be applied in every area where a state has chosen to make a distinction on the basis of sex, including family courts, education, athletics, prisons, set-asides, and services for the disadvantaged. States, not Congress or the federal bureaucracy, should make these decisions.

▶ **Our military readiness would be compromised by forcing equal representation of women in all military roles including combat and selective service.** Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has said the ERA would require that young women could be subject to the military draft and must be placed in direct ground (infantry) combat in equal ratios to men. Although we have a volunteer army, once in the military, no soldier is a volunteer but must serve where ordered — including combat. We do not want social experimentation or judicial activism to interfere with military readiness. Women can perform in many military positions, but should not be forced into ground combat where they face higher risks of disproportionate, debilitating injury and abuse than men do.

▶ **ERA should not be sold as an emotional “feel-good” law which would only be “symbolic.”** Rather than adding “women” to the U.S. Constitution, ERA would add “sex,” which would be open to multiple court interpretations — and “sex” is both a noun and verb with many different definitions.

▶ **All liberty-loving Americans should oppose ERA, because of ERA’s second section: “Congress shall have the power to enforce the provisions of this article.”** Unlike other amendments to the Constitution, which limit the power and scope of the federal government, ERA instructs the federal government to take more power: “Congress shall.” ERA would overturn countless state laws and demand that the federal government enforce complete sex neutrality in all aspects, including family law, criminal law, education, and insurance rates. States would lose much of their power and authority, and our federal system of government would become virtually meaningless under ERA.

▶ **ERA cannot legitimately be added to the Constitution. The Supreme Court ruled in 1982 (*NOW v. Idaho*) that ERA had failed ratification** because the amending process requires that an amendment be approved by 38 states in the allotted time in order to reflect the wishes of a supermajority of Americans. ERA failed to garner this “contemporaneous consensus” as it had only 35 states. Twenty-four of those states explicitly tied their approval in the 1970s to the original time limit of 7 years. Ignoring the law, proponents in 2018 sold legislators in two states to vote for ratification and then claimed that they only need one more state. The other 47 states which have not voted on ERA in nearly fifty years should not be forced to accept any Constitutional amendment without holding a contemporaneous vote.