Aborting the E.R.A.

With friends like the A.C.L.U., the E.R.A. doesn’t need enemies.

by Douglas Johnson

Does Democratic control of the U.S. Senate, coupled with the current heightened public interest in the Constitution, create an environment favorable to launching a revival of the Equal Rights Amendment?

Many feminist leaders think so. At a recent Washington press conference, spokeswomen for 16 liberal women’s groups said that the E.R.A. was their top legislative priority for the 100th Congress. They predicted overwhelming approval.

Despite their confidence, however, this effort to revive the E.R.A. is certain to fail. The chance that Congress will pass the E.R.A. this year or next is slim. If it were passed, the chance that the amendment would be ratified by the required number of states is zilch. The main reason? Abortion.

Many people used to think that there was no connection between the E.R.A. and abortion. But the American Civil Liberties Union has changed all that.

Sixteen states have added equal rights amendments to their state constitutions. In four of those states, A.C.L.U. lawyers have argued in court that the state’s refusal to pay for abortions under Medicaid constitutes a violation of that state’s equal rights amendment. Briefly stated, their argument goes something like this: Abortion is a medical procedure sought only by women; therefore, a law that treats abortion differently from other medical procedures is a form of sex discrimination.

To date, the courts have given a final answer to this argument only in Pennsylvania and Connecticut. In Pennsylvania, a judge accepted the A.C.L.U.’s position, and the state was compelled to pay for elective abortions for a year. The State Supreme Court, whose members are elected, reversed that decision. More recently, in Connecticut, the A.C.L.U.’s victory was more complete. Connecticut’s Medicaid program paid for abortions only to save the mother’s life or in cases of rape and incest. Last April, Judge Robert I. Berdon of the Superior Court declared this policy unconstitutional under the state’s equal rights amendment and ordered the Medicaid program to pay for all physician-performed abortions.

“Since only women become pregnant, discrimination against pregnancy by not funding abortion is sex-oriented discrimination,” Berdon ruled, accepting the A.C.L.U.’s argument virtually verbatim.

Berdon’s ruling was a stunning breakthrough for the attorneys at the A.C.L.U.’s Reproductive Freedom Project in New York, who masterminded the equal rights amendment abortion linkage. They were given a precedent to use in attacking anti-abortion laws in other states that have equal rights amendments. Already, the Project has published a booklet that encourages E.R.A.-based legal challenges to state laws that require physicians to notify parents be-
If a Federal E.R.A. were interpreted as the A.C.L.U. desires, in other words, it would invalidate almost every existing Federal and state law dealing with abortion. The Hyde Amendment, which prohibits Federal funding of most abortions, would obviously be declared unconstitutional, as would similar laws in 36 states. According to Federal Judge John T. Noonan Jr., an eminent Constitutional scholar, the E.R.A. would also jeopardize laws in 44 states that allow doctors, nurses and hospitals to refuse to participate in abortions without being penalized. (Abortion-rights lawyers have long criticized such laws as constituting state approval of “discrimination.”) Furthermore, the E.R.A. would provide a solid constitutional foundation for legal abortion—a foundation that, according to former Solicitor General Rex Lee, Judge Noonan and others, would endure even if the Supreme Court reversed Roe v. Wade.

You may regard these potential outcomes with approval or horror, but my aim is not to discuss the merits of the A.C.L.U.'s position. Rather, I would like to make a political point. Now that everyone understands that the E.R.A. may have such a significant impact on abortion law, it cannot possibly inspire the degree of political consensus it needs to become part of the Constitution. Although the E.R.A. had problems during its first go-round, its defeat was never a foregone conclusion. But, by creating an undeniable link to abortion, the A.C.L.U. has erected a political obstacle that backers of the amendment will find insurmountable.

A Constitutional amendment requires an extraordinary degree of political consensus. A two-thirds vote in favor in each house of Congress must be followed by ratification by three-quarters (38) of the states. Ratification in any state requires a favorable vote in both houses of the state's legislature, with the exception of Nebraska, which has a unicameral legislature. Put another way, if as few as 13 of the 99 state legislative houses oppose ratification, the amendment will not become law.

The original E.R.A., approved by Congress in 1972, failed to obtain approval by the required 38 states despite an unprecedented 10-year ratification period. Thirty-five legislatures approved the amendment, with five later rescinding their approval. (The legality of such re-
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E.R.A. coalition. The E.R.A. enjoyed substantial public support from members of the Catholic hierarchy during the 1970s, but the A.C.L.U.'s legal efforts have changed that. Following the A.C.L.U.'s initial success in using Pennsylvania's equal rights amendment as a pro-abortion legal weapon, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops announced that it would "have no alternative but to oppose" the E.R.A., unless it is amended to prevent it from affecting abortion laws.

Growing opposition by the Catholic bishops and other pro-life forces has already effectively halted the addition of equal rights amendments to state constitutions. Since 1982, anti-abortion sentiment has been primarily responsible for defeating state equal rights amendments in legislatures in Minnesota, Rhode Island, Wisconsin and New York. To the surprise of many political observers, even voters in Maine (1984) and Vermont (1986) rejected equal rights amendments. In both states, contentious public debates centered on the abortion issue, and bitter feminist leaders gave anti-abortion forces much of the credit (or blame) for the surprising outcomes.

As University of Vermont professor of political science Garrison Nelson told The New York Times after the Vermont vote: "If the E.R.A. can't win in Vermont, it can't win anywhere, because the right conditions were present."

Abortion has become the albatross around the E.R.A.'s neck. The current Congress is unlikely to approve an amendment that may be construed as supporting abortion or state funding of abortion. The E.R.A.'s only chance of passage by this Congress hinges on whether its proponents agree to a revision that will make the amendment inapplicable to abortion.

A modification of this sort was first proposed in 1983 by Congressman F. James Sensenbrenner, a Wisconsin Republican who, although a conservative, voted to ratify the E.R.A. when it came before the Wisconsin legislature in 1972. The Sensenbrenner clause would revise the E.R.A. to explicitly state that it would not "grant, secure or deny any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof." This revision would not change the current legal status of abortion, nor would it permit the E.R.A. to be employed for anti-abortion purposes. It would simply render the E.R.A. neutral on abortion.

When the E.R.A. last came before the House of Representatives in 1983, feminist leaders recognized that the Sensenbrenner clause would command majority support. To prevent this, they persuaded then-Speaker Tip O'Neill to allow only a single up-or-down vote on the traditional language. They were stunned when the E.R.A. was defeated by six votes, with many anti-abortion Democrats and E.R.A. co-sponsors voting against it.

It is unlikely that an unamended E.R.A. will fare any better in this Congress. Over 60 liberal and moderate House members consistently vote against abortion, and the A.C.L.U. has made it impossible for them to plausibly argue that there is "no connection" between the E.R.A. and abortion.

Moreover, many pro-choice Congressmen think that an E.R.A. is needed for reasons that have nothing to do with abortion. In growing numbers, they are recognizing that the E.R.A. is doomed for the foreseeable future unless it is revised to remove it from abortion politics. Even pre-eminent liberal Congressman Barney Frank of Massachusetts recently wrote on a National Right to Life Committee questionnaire that he would support the Sensenbrenner clause "if necessary to pass E.R.A."

For the anti-abortion movement, blocking the traditional E.R.A. is a purely defensive effort. Anti-abortion leaders find the Sensenbrenner solution appealing because it would allow them to forget about the E.R.A. and redirect their full energies to more affirmative goals.

The E.R.A. is at a critical juncture. If a sufficient number of pragmatic pro-choice Congressmen were to accept the Sensenbrenner solution, the E.R.A. could be restored to political viability. If, on the other hand, Congress resubmits the E.R.A. to the states without the Sensenbrenner revision, the anti-abortion forces will be waiting in the state legislatures, and it will all be over but the shouting.

Douglas Johnson is legislative director for the National Right to Life Committee, the nation's largest anti-abortion organization.