McLeod: This is Maria McLeod, oral historian. Today is June 30, 2008. I’m with Beverly Hubbert. We are at the Federal Way Regional Library on First Way. I’d like to begin by asking you your full name, date of birth and where you’re from.

Hubbert: My name is Beverly Hubbert. I was born 3/18/34, which makes me antediluvian. [laughter] And what was the rest of the question?

McLeod: Where are you from?

Hubbert: Well, actually I was raised in Montana and moved to Washington when I was thirteen years old. I’ve spent most of my life in the Seattle area. We just sold our home in Seattle about four years ago when we moved into our beach shack.

McLeod: Where do you live now?

Hubbert: It’s called the Home, Washington. The post office is called “Lakebay Post Office” in Home. You’ll find that very common down there.

McLeod: I like us to mention, early on in the interview, why I’m interviewing you. Then we’ll delve more into your background later. Can you say, in brief, what was your relationship to either the state or national campaigns for or against the Equal Rights Amendment of the early ‘70s?
Hubbert: Well, I definitely was not in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. I was invited to be part of Phyllis Schlafly’s organization when she came out to speak at one of our luncheons. That was even before she decided that she was against the ERA. But I have many philosophical and moral problems with the application of the Equal Rights Amendment. My biggest concern was the second section that gave the federal government huge, huge power grab to legislate. Which I don’t believe in. I believe those prerogatives belong to the state.

Was that responsive to the question?

McLeod: Totally. Right on target. And what is your background? Feel free to include any information that you feel is pertinent about your upbringing or your life experience or your education prior to college. It’s an open question.

Hubbert: I am the sixth of six children. I was raised in a small community in Montana called Chinook, which was where my father managed the U&I Sugar Company, there in Chinook. When he passed away, we came to live with my sister in Toppenish, Washington. I had three brothers who had served in the Second World War. I was really the only one left at home. So, my mother and I lived in Toppenish until I went to college. I attended Brigham Young University. I am a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called Mormon. It is, of course, the background and the philosophical underpinnings of most of what I believe.

I didn’t graduate from Brigham Young University. Instead, I graduated from the University of Washington. I transferred my last year. I changed my major and did it in one year. Then I went to work for United Airlines as a stewardess. Not a flight attendant. A stewardess. There were two kinds of airplanes, coaches and first class. Coach had seventy-two passengers. You didn’t serve meals. The other one had fifty-two first class passengers, to whom we did serve meals. People dressed up to go on a flight. We were required to take their tickets and learn their names as we took the ticket, before takeoff,
so that we could call people by their names when we served them their meal, on a pillow. Wonderful to look back on. It was really a great experience.

I flew out of New York City. I flew out of, what’s the garbage dump? LaGuardia. I lived downtown, sort of downtown, New York City. I was the only stewardess that didn’t live out by the field. I lived on 111th and Broadway, which is quite close to Columbia University. My roommate and I averaged two and a half nights a week at the opera for the two years that I lived there. We saw every major Broadway play, including the original cast of “My Fair Lady.” So I have had, I think, a rather broad experience in things that I have done. That’s just before I got married.

McLeod: And tell me what were you studying at Brigham Young University? And what were you studying when you went to the University of Washington?

Hubbert: I was studying music, specifically piano performance, when I transferred to the University of Washington in 1955. They wouldn’t accept the work that I had done BYU. So then I majored in psychology and finished it in one year.

McLeod: Growing up, did you have any significant role models or influential people in your life? If so, who were those individuals?

Hubbert: Well, probably the most influential person was my father, who was very smart and very self educated and could never forgive himself for having voted for FDR the first time. But he did get over it a little bit. A backbone Republican. Very conservative. And that fits right in with our religion.

McLeod: Was he strict with his children?

Hubbert: Yes. Made them work hard. They all got the treatment except me. I’m eight years younger than my brother. So I was not educated in the same way. But my dad had most of his lessons, life lessons, down to one-liners. You know, “Show me a man who makes no mistakes, and I’ll show you a man who does nothing.” That kind of thing.
McLeod: In the 1950s, you went out to New York and you became a stewardess? I take it you went out to New York on your own?

Hubbert: No, I was hired out of the University of Washington. Interviewed in Seattle and was hired by United. So they flew me out. I had to find my own living quarters, what have you. But yes, it was quite an experience. [laughs]

McLeod: Well I was wondering if your parents objected at all; it sounds like such a liberated thing for a young woman to do in the ‘50s.

Hubbert: It was. My father was dead at the time. I think my mother was just so glad to get rid of me. I don’t think I could qualify as an easy child to raise. I am very opinionated and forceful. I really wanted to go to law school. But I had put myself through college working as a lifeguard. I didn’t have the finances to do law school. My mother thought that would be a terrible thing for me because I was so fervent anyway when it came to politics and what have you.

But it was a wild experience to have gone alone to New York. I had to take the first subway ride in my life from Idyllwild, we flew into Idyllwild, which is Kennedy (John F. Kennedy International Airport) now. Get on the right subways, make three changes, and finally end up at this woman’s apartment, as I said, on 111th and Broadway. You just did it. What else could you do? I had to ask, I stopped and asked where the Empire State Building was, because that was one of the subway changes. The guy said, “Right there. You’re under it.” [laughs]

McLeod: Did anyone from your community or your relatives ever question what you did?

Hubbert: Of course.

McLeod: And what was your response?
Hubbert: Well, my response, honestly, and I don’t mean to sound disrespectful, but I didn’t care. This was what I had decided that I wanted to do. I wanted to see the world. I wanted to see real opera. I wanted to experience some of these things. So I did. I was twenty-one, and I could do it.

McLeod: That’s great. In terms of women’s issues, how would you describe your earliest awareness of gender roles, and/or equity or inequity between the sexes? And can you tell me any particular stories or events from your youth that illustrate how the events of the day shaped your awareness of women’s roles.

Hubbert: Well, first of all, in being a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons, I found very quickly, that there was a big difference in the way boys and girls were treated. We have grown tremendously since that time. But because the men held the priesthood, there was this feeling, intended or not, that the women were kind of second-class citizens because we didn’t hold the priesthood. I was very anti-chauvinistic all my life. I can’t tell you when it started. But don’t treat me differently than you treat the boys, because my God loves me as much as he does anybody else. It doesn’t depend on my sex or what I’m going to do in this life.

But I did have difficulty. I was also interested in knowing why we believed some of the things that we did. I evidently asked so many questions, my mother was told to keep me home.

McLeod: From school?

Hubbert: No! [laughs] From the young women’s activities in the evenings. We had what they called “mutual.” This one teacher said, “You know, I would really be happier if you kept her home.” But of course they couldn’t do that because I was the only one who played the piano. They had to have somebody who would play the piano for the opening and closing and all that sort of thing.
One thing comes to mind. I remember one girl giving a talk in church and telling how very proud she was to polish her brother’s shoes because he was going to go on a mission. That was one thing that she looked at as a privilege, that she could polish her brother’s shoes. I thought that that was probably one of the most stupid things I’d heard. Of course it has stuck with me. But that was the attitude, and it was promulgated. They did do everything they could to get the young men to go on missions, and they tried to make them special.

Women didn’t go on missions. Not in our church, the mission is two years. Except at that time, it was three years for Japan because it took them so long to learn the language. But most women didn’t go back then.

McLeod: You’re talking about young men serving as missionaries?

Hubbert: Missionaries, yes. Now a huge number of young women go. But they’re required to be twenty-one. The boys go at nineteen. Women now make a tremendous difference.

McLeod: It’s interesting to hear you talk about the historical changes in the Mormon church. What do you think brought about those changes, or made things more equitable for young women and young men?

Hubbert: Well, honestly, I think it was the influence of the outside world. I don’t think that we could have continued to be in that role that was so different than what was expected in the world. We are a growing church. We believe in continuous revelation. We believe that change comes with the times. That was just one of the things that we took into account in applying these things.

The second thing of it is that after the Second World War, in the ‘50s and the ‘60s, there were very many single women. You had to accommodate them. Not everybody is happily married. They have a place in the church, in the congregation, and in the application of building the kingdom of God. So you had to include and broaden your perspective in order to take in your constituency. It was just a natural growth.
Besides, there are enough people like me who just wouldn’t put up with it. If you’re going to talk about young men being special, you don’t want this eighteen-year-old girl standing up on the front row, just standing there until the lay bishop and/or other male speakers also include the young women, because I would do that. Wasn’t I awful? But I guess I didn’t have a father to ride influence on me.

McLeod: How old were you when your father died?

Hubbert: I was thirteen. He was only fifty-two years old. So it was really hard on my mother.

McLeod: Did you have any uncles who stepped in, or other father figures?

Hubbert: No. We lived very far away from most of the family. I suppose you could say the role models somewhat became one of my brothers, who was the closest to me in age. My sister was the oldest. Then four boys. Then eight years later, me. So my sister and her husband took on some of that role.

But I grew up during the Second World War. That made a huge difference in how people viewed each other and the family. Being from a small town, in a small town, during the war, my whole life revolved around the war. I talk to my husband, who grew up in Seattle, and the WWII experience wasn’t all that pervasive. But my experience was; I had three brothers in the war. That’s all we ever talked about. It was constant. We played the games. We fought over who was going to be Tito, who was going to be this or that or what have you, so that it was all consuming. It did make a difference in how you viewed your life, not just the war, but your life. So many women left that little town and went to Seattle and worked in the airplane factories and what have you. They took on roles that were not traditional. That had a big influence when they came back. Because, of course, they had experiences that made them somewhat unsatisfied with being just a housewife.

I’m talking about the population of the city of Chinook, Montana in general. The Mormons were not the largest congregation. As a matter of fact, we were probably the
smallest. In those days we were totally socially unacceptable, as many believed we were not Christian.

McLeod: Remind me why you moved to Seattle.

Hubbert: Well, my father died. We lived in a sugar company house. My sister, who was the oldest, lived in Toppenish. So we came to Toppenish to live in 1948 year. Then I ended up in Seattle when I changed universities and my major and went to work for United Airlines.

McLeod: So how did it impact you, moving to the city where you were a minority in some ways because you were a Mormon, and, as you say, you were not socially accepted?

Hubbert: Not accepted at all, no. As a child in Chinook, there was a different denomination on every street corner. I can’t tell you how many there were. But remember, Mormons were considered a cult, even accused of worshiping Joseph Smith, whom we accept as a prophet. Polygamy was the biggest problem. You look back, and the church did away with polygamy in the 1880s. It was still a terrible problem. Everybody believed that the Mormons practiced polygamy. Now I look back and I think, they accused us of that, and yet I was unaware that they were wife swapping, among other things.

I was not welcome in one of my friends’ home because of my religion. Yet, they owned a bar. Her mother tended bar and the father ran a high stakes gambling game in the back room. So it was certainly a double standard.

But the reason why my family was not so ostracized is that my father was the largest employer in Chinook. So that then accrued a little bit of sociability to my mother who was then the gadfly around town, going to the card games and what have you. It’s a different kind of life when you’re in a place with eighteen hundred people, and most of the people work for your father. It makes a difference. [laughter]
McLeod: And you were probably the really cute, young child of the family, as the sixth child, eight years younger than your oldest brother. You probably had some fun as a kid.

Hubbert: I did. I really did. I can remember my brothers were sometimes responsible for taking care of me, and they couldn’t keep track of me. My mother would send them out to find me. I had hiding places where I’d watch these guys. They’d be yelling for me, calling for me. They’d never find me. I’d always cause them trouble when I’d come tooting in late. [laughter]

McLeod: At what point in your life did you become involved in politics? And what attracted you to politics? And how did you become involved?

Hubbert: I was so distressed that the (1952) nomination for the Republican Party was stolen from Robert Taft by General Eisenhower that it was a traumatic event. That had a lot of influence on me because, of course, I had listened to my father. I was very active in trying to become literate in history so that I knew a lot about it. I love history. I knew who the candidates were, what have you, but was too young to actually become involved in it.

However, when I got to college, I was much more interested in what was going on as far as the application of the law. Who’s going to do something about this chauvinism that we keep getting shoved down our throats? It was a big deal to me. I must confess to you. There was something in my soul that would not accept this second-class status. Not just in our church, but in society in general. I would have had a hard time getting into law school at that time. And medical school, forget it. They just didn’t take women.

But somehow or other, right after I got married, somebody made some crack about the John Birch Society. I knew nothing about them, but they indicated that they were really horrible people, a secret society. They had this book called the “Black Book” that told all about this society. And how do I get it? Where does it come from?

So I called the Bon Marche book department and ordered it. That’s how secret it was. Robert Welch had written a book called The Politician, also known as the John Birch Society’s “Black Book,” which was his exposé of Dwight Eisenhower. It had a lot
of background, a lot of history in it. It just led from one thing to another. I was always very partial to Robert Taft because my father had been. I thought that the stealing of the nomination, which they did, was dirty politics. But they still did it, which was really too bad.

Eisenhower wanted to run as a Democrat, for heaven’s sakes! [laughs] And they said no, we want you to run as a Republican.

McLeod: When you first got married, you said before, I think you lived in Seattle. Is that right?

Hubbert: Well, I came back to Seattle to live when I got married because my husband lived in Seattle.

McLeod: And what was his business?

Hubbert: He worked for Honeywell.

McLeod: And were you working at the time as well?

Hubbert: Well, I had just given up being a stewardess and was going to go back to school for a fifth year so I could be a teacher.

McLeod: Did you do it?

Hubbert: I got the fifth year, but you couldn’t corral me into being a teacher. [laughs] So I just did other things. I’d done one or two other things to bring in an income to finance my four daughters’ college educations. I was a manufacturer’s rep, on the road for a long time. Then I was also the vice president of marketing and sales for Methane Technology, which was to provide compressed natural gas as a vehicle fuel. It was a very interesting idea about twenty years too early.
The guy had designed a small compressor that you could take the gas out of your house. It was a clever idea. If you heated by gas, you had it made. You could compress the gas in the trunk overnight. Of course, it had to be in the trunk because the tanks were huge and very heavy. But that way, it negated the necessity for an infrastructure throughout the United States where you could tank up on compressed natural gas. It failed because his compressor didn’t work all the time.

McLeod: You mentioned your four daughters, and you said they went to college, and that’s why you worked.

Hubbert: Well, first of all, I should explain to you that my children were very talented musicians, and were pianists. A pianist practices eight hours a day to get into college and to stay in. So there was no time for them to have part-time jobs. They earned most of their money through scholarships. So I really had to bring in an income to keep them in college. Two of them went to Brigham Young, and two of them went to the University of Southern California. Those two, incidentally, ended up with PhDs. One in music and the other ended up getting her PhD from Duke in cancer biology and pharmacology.

My first, my oldest daughter, is a painter, fine arts painter. She is just about able to support herself selling her paintings. Very talented. And my second daughter, who is a very gifted pianist, tried academia in music and couldn’t hack it, so she’s now a court reporter.

McLeod: I think parents are at least partly responsible, I’ll just put that on the table, for the fact that their children have confidence in themselves. How did you work to do that?

Hubbert: Well, a couple of things. I did teach my children to play the piano — I play myself — because I wanted them to be able to contribute to the worship service. We are a lay church. There are no professionals. Somebody had to teach their kids how to play the piano and the organ, and I wanted them to learn how to do that. But second of all, I believe that it is very intellectually stimulating to learn a symbolic language and be able
to perform with ten fingers, it takes brainpower. It did work, but I kind of followed them around. Most of the time I felt as though I was just hanging on by my fingernails.

One of the things they did that really gave them confidence was gymnastics. They turned out for George Lewis’ team, and he had actually trained someone who had qualified for the Olympics. But you learn that you’re judged by one person on your routine and you get a high score. The next day, a different person on the same routine done exactly the same way, will score it differently. So you learn that scoring is not a true indication of your value. It made a big difference in their attitude because the confidence had to be within themselves, not what someone else told them what they were worth.

And I will be very frank. I worked on that a lot.

McLeod: What about this issue about equity between the sexes? You said you were very much anti-chauvinist. Did you instill that in your daughters? Or did they grow up in a different era, and you didn’t have to emphasize that as much? How did you do that?

Hubbert: I worked on it. I never wanted my children to feel like second-class citizens in their church or anyplace else. So they knew what the score was, I guess, from the very beginning. But I would do things, like on the inside of the front door were all of their medals and the things that they’d won from gymnastics and from piano. They were very good. They won medals all of the time. So that was to remind them of their accomplishments going out the door. That’s what they saw last, so that they would know that they could do some things really well.

Little things made a big difference. My third child was on one of these college bowl teams. She was a very fine classical pianist. She also was the sports expert. She knew much more about sports than the boys. She watched football with her father, so she knew all of the guys, all their numbers, all the stats on the football and the basketball, etcetera. So the girls had a chance to participate in different ways. Not just the traditional things that a woman would do. I certainly hope that I gave them a leg up in deciding what they wanted to do for them to have as much experience. We taught them to water ski, snow ski, sail, play the piano. They played the violin, they sang. Lots of experiences, so
that they had an idea that there were a lot of things that they can do. And, fortunately, they were smart enough that they could do whatever they wanted to do.

McLeod: That’s great. So tell me about your involvement in politics. You mentioned a little bit. I think you said you were reading about the history of Eisenhower, and you had researched the John Birch Society, and you got the “secret” Black Book, quote unquote. How did that then translate into you actually becoming active, I’m assuming you did, in political organizations?

Hubbert: I did. I thought about this, because I thought maybe you would ask me that. I honestly cannot tell you which came first. But I do think the party organization came first. We lived in Lake Forest Park, and we were made the first legislative district. It had to be organized. I became the vice chairman, and was responsible for organizing, meaning finding precinct committeemen in each precinct, and getting all of the functions going for party organization, including organizing caucuses, conventions, etcetera, etcetera. That came first, I’m quite sure.

And along with that, this girl over in Bellevue called me and asked, “Have you got a Republican Women’s Club in your district?” No, I don’t. Most of them were very liberal, very social, and we were kind of the poor end of the women’s family. Most of the people at the time were very active in Dan Evans’ campaign. And they were very socially active. Some of them were very wealthy and had much more experience in politics than we had. We were the newcomers. We were told by Goldwater in 1960, “Grow up. You want to get your own candidate nominated? You go out and organize the party.” So we did. We found that there were already people there. It was really quite an experience to try to find like-minded people who will be precinct committeemen for nothing and expected to go out and collect money and register voters and that sort of thing.

Well, this girl called me and said, “Have you got a club?” And I said, “no.” She said, “How would you like to form one?” I said, “no.” She said, “Well, let me tell you why.” She said, “Phyllis Schlafly is going to run for the national chairmanship of the National Women’s Organization.” Not NOW, but the national Republican women’s organization, the National Federation of Republican Women. She was the vice president
(1964-67), and the tradition was that she would move up to president. But they didn’t want her, obviously. So she sent out word that, let’s see if we can beat them at their own game. And who’s Phyllis Schlafly? Well, she wrote the book *A Choice, Not an Echo* and that’s how I knew of Phyllis. Which was from the Goldwater (presidential) campaign.

So we formed another club. The first thing you knew, we were calling other clubs to see if they had a designated individual who would be attending this convention. And before they caught on to what we were doing, we had commitments from twenty clubs to let us send a representative from their club to this organization.

That was my first experience with Phyllis. I have to tell you it was not a rewarding one. In many respects, she’s brilliant. It was fun to meet Madame Chennault. It was very fun to meet some of the highers up in the world who were supporting Phyllis in this role. For her to be successful, I’ve always claimed that God has taken a direct hand in it. But this is her philosophy: individual initiative and responsibility. It’s, “I give you this job, now go do it.” Now there’s no communication. There’s no direction. You don’t know who’s in the next county or anything else. But she prevailed.

Anyway, so we did get to this convention, which was held in Washington, DC. Of course the liberals beat the socks off us because they knew how to run a convention, and Phyllis didn’t.

McLeod: Is this the 1968 Republican Convention you’re talking about?

Hubbert: Not the Republican Party. The National Federation of Republican Women, which is an entirely different horse.

McLeod: Okay.

Hubbert: Phyllis should have been elevated to, or at least be made, president. But they didn’t want her. I don’t know how she ever became vice president. But they controlled the credentials committee, and you very quickly learn in politics you control the credentials, you control the whole thing.
I attended one of Phyllis’ strategy sessions. I’d only been involved in party politics a couple of years. I thought, these people haven’t a clue. They have not a clue what they’re doing. And they didn’t. And this girl that I was with knew a little bit about Roberts Rules of Order and parliamentary procedure. She was able to help a little bit, but they just ran over Phyllis.

So I think by that time that Phyllis was looking for a cause, quite frankly. So that after having met Phyllis and spending the time with her, which I did, I was really very impressed with Phyllis. I thought she was all together. I liked her philosophy. She believed very nearly the same thing I did, except on religion. She was Catholic, and I was Mormon. She had a small problem with my religion, I think, to begin with.

We decided, well, we’ve got a club, let’s do something with it. So we had a luncheon. I coerced most of my cohorts, the downtown Republican office, you know, the guys had money to buy tables for this luncheon. Imagine paying a hundred dollars a table in those days. Well, it turned out that when they found out that Phyllis was the speaker, Les Ullman, the mayor, shows up uninvited and a few things like that. It was so crowded that I had to get up and tell the people that, “In times past we could hold our meetings in a phone booth and not be crowded. So, we apologize for the crowding, but enjoy it. Just squeeze in, and let’s get a few more people.”

She spoke on weapons, the arms race, things like that. You know, during college, at the end of the Second World War, she actually worked in the ammunition industry. She tested ammunition, and she did statistical studies on why they failed, that sort of thing. So, you knew she was pretty smart. But she’s also a very charming speaker.

When it was over, that’s when she asked me if I would be willing to work with her. We were standing at the head table. I remember this as though it were just yesterday. There was this person who we called a “liberal” who had come, we thought, to find fault with Phyllis. She came up and asked Phyllis what she thought about the Equal Rights Amendment that had just come out at the Congress – the 1972 passage of the amendment by Congress, when the ratification process began. And she said, “Well, I don’t see anything wrong with it. But you know, I haven’t studied it.”

Standing next to this liberal was a woman whose name is Kay Regan. She’s a thousand years old in the Republican Party. I think she predates FDR. Anyway, she just
about came out of her shoes. So after the liberal left, Kay was all over Phyllis. “You’ve
got to do this, this is bad, blah, blah, blah. You’ve got to do this.” We take credit for
having motivated Phyllis to get going on this Equal Rights Amendment. I give full credit
to Kay. She just was all over Phyllis. “It does this; it does that.” Till finally Phyllis
backed up and said, “I’ll study it right away.”

McLeod: So when was this?

Hubbert: Right when it came out of Congress. I can’t remember how many states had
ratified the thing. We were late coming to the party. The fact was, we were late coming to
the party and finding out exactly how involved and how the ramifications of the
application of the wording of this very simple sounding, innocuous amendment, could be
dangerous to us.

McLeod: So it was already in the ratification process?

Hubbert: Yes! I think it was 1972. I’m not sure, but I think in Washington State it had
already been voted out of the House, the Senate, and the state Legislature. This one, this
one was very interesting because–

McLeod: Okay. So we should say that you’re holding up the Washington States ERA
voter’s pamphlet, or a Xerox of the voter’s pamphlet – the statement for and the
statement against HJR61, House joint resolution.

Hubbert: This was the House joint resolution that was referred to the people. Now most
of the time, the states ratified it in the Legislature, and it was not referred to a vote of the
people. But somehow, they got this out. They actually had a vote of the people. It won by
less than one tenth of one percent difference. They won by such a small margin.

McLeod: Like 3,600 and some odd votes.
Hubbert: Just an incredibly small, considering nobody knew what it was about, and there was no organization against it except what’s on the back of this thing. It’s remarkable. Now had that been a candidate, it would have required an automatic recount. But because it was a ballot issue, you had to pay to have it recounted. We couldn’t raise the money. So, we were never sure. This is the state Equal Rights Amendment. There were people on our side who were against the national but accepted the state one and saw nothing wrong with it. It just took your breath away. Most of them said they were against the federal ratification of the ERA because of the possibility of drafting women and forcing them to serve in combat. All of the bad things in the Equal Rights Amendment were enacted in the state law. So when it came right down to it, the ratification of the federal amendment was totally unnecessary because they had so many states that had passed, instead of this very bad amendment to the Constitution, had amended their own state constitutions which were, in my opinion, left worse off than before. I think it’s very unfortunate because it incorporated everything that’s bad about the Equal Rights Amendment.

McLeod: Okay. So I have to ask you to clarify here, and I know you’ll be able to do it beautifully, but you’re a woman who has sat in front of me and talked so strongly about equity and anti-chauvinism, including equity in the Mormon church, or having some more prominent place in the Mormon church and issues like that. So what is bad about the Equal Rights Amendment?

Hubbert: First of all, in the application of those words, there are so many things that are detrimental to women. Now bear in mind that prior to this time, women did enjoy special privileges in this country according to the law. For example, when you went to work and had a job lifting things, they could not require you to lift the same weight as a man. After the Equal Rights Amendment, they could not discriminate. You had to be able to lift the same weight as men. In other words, there was no taking into account that it was a woman who was required to do the job. It had to be exactly the same for men and women. Our position was, women are not made like men. Men are stronger. And people used to come out of their chairs when I said that.
We believed that women should have the right to be able to say, “I can’t work overtime because I have to go home and take care of my family.” That was done away with with the state Equal Rights Amendment because they didn’t give that privilege to men. So there were many things that women had special dispensation by law to accommodate for their number one position in society, which is the mother of this race and the one who raised the children.

Now prior to the Equal Rights Amendment, I’m appalled at the number of young women in this society who do not know that prior to this time, every man that caused a child to be brought into this world was required to financially take care of that child, whether he was married to the woman or not. They had that kind of protection. They did away with that. There were so many things where equality was a step down for us. It made it much more difficult for women in the workplace. It made women equally responsible for the financial care of their children. They not only had to bear the children, raise them, keep the house, put the food on the table, but now they had to be financially half responsible for this. There was no equality in that.

It’s hard to understand that equality is not always equal. There are so many, so many things involved in the Equal Rights Amendment that made it very much more difficult for women. The thing that so many of us objected to is that it’s passage would make the government equally responsible to draft equal numbers of women as men into the armed services. You could not exempt them from combat. They would have to serve just as a man. Now this is kind of ludicrous. We tried to tell them that women are made differently. They can’t do some of the things. That doesn’t make them less. It does give them the privilege of not having to function like a man when they’re not built like a man.

There were many other parts of this thing that were really horrific. I had many experiences. I was kind of the only guy out there fighting this problem in Washington. The ERA became so popular that by the time we got women on our side who would go out to speak against it, the people were so rude to them that it was hard for these women to take this kind of abuse publicly. “How can you be against equality?” Then they hung this thing on us, “Oh, you don’t want a same sex bathroom, what’s the matter, you’re afraid you’ll be attacked by a man?” Well, I’d rather be attacked by a man than a woman.
It never came to same-sex bathrooms. But that’s the joke they would hang on us. They would do all these things.

McLeod: So you weren’t concerned about same-sex bathrooms?

Hubbert: Of course not. That’s irrelevant. But there were other issues that we suggested might come down the pike. One of them was that unmarried men might be able to adopt children. We thought that we should try to preserve the family. We never saw the day when we would actually have to by law describe marriage as a union between a man and a woman. That was the most outrageous thing to consider we would have to do it by law. There were so few homosexuals that were, I guess, what you would call “out” at that time, that it was hard for people to understand that. But we saw the day that you should consider these are the things that may very well happen.

There were meetings when I felt like I had gotten out of there barely with my life, even in my own church groups. I would talk to these young people, young Mormon groups, and they would say, “You know, you’re looking for communists under the bed. This is never going to happen.”

And I would say, “Okay. I hope I’m still alive. But I want your name and your phone number, because I’m going to call you when these things happen. I’m going to tell you that I told you so. Because you’re not considering what the application of the verbiage is. You’re looking at this as how could you be against equality? Well sometimes equality isn’t equality.”

Then to suggest that there would be homosexual marriages was beyond acceptable conversations. That was so wild. I would mention this at my own peril, because it was so outrageous that I would say something like that. Remember, this is thirty-five years ago. There weren’t very many people on the podium with me that were against the Equal Rights Amendment. Most of the time, there were three or four women that were for the Equal Rights Amendment, and there’s me. I started out with a couple of people, and I do wish they were still here. They were great, great people.

McLeod: Will you mention their names?
Hubbert: Yes. One of them was Dee Dahl. Her husband was a physician. And Marge Robbins, who was really a gallant woman. Both have since passed away.

Now remember, at the same time we’re fighting the Equal Rights Amendment, Dee and I are fighting the state income tax out of her basement. Now most people won’t believe that, but we fought the income tax twice by ourselves.

McLeod: What was the issue with the income tax at that time?

Hubbert: Well, we’re taxed enough! You know? Give me a break. But we used such things as a three-legged stool. You know, they’re talking about property tax, federal tax, and now a state income tax. You know what the use is for a three-legged stool? To milk a cow. Okay? You’re going to be milked for your money.

The second time we ran it, we took an apple, and took it all down just to the core. Like this is one more bite of the apple, and how much of it is left? We got a few men that would contribute enough money. They didn’t give us a chance of beating the income tax, because Dan Evans was in favor of it, the whole Legislature was in favor of it. Who would think that two women using a mimeograph machine out of a woman’s basement—but, gee, we went all over the state with these mimeographed sheets. We got people to pass them out.

There was a woman by the name of Gladys Edwards, if I’m remembering correctly, in the Central district who took tons of those fliers. She was a woman of color, a black woman. She was absolutely marvelous. But she felt her people were going to be the hardest hit because they were the lowest on the economic ladder. And to tax them more? Our position is, the Legislature will never have enough money. Their expenditures always exceed their income. They’ve got to be like us, I can’t go out and sell my debt like they can. They’ve got to live within their income.

We were successful two times. Then the third time we thought we were going to have to fight it, and all of a sudden there was a committee. [laughs] Some businessmen got together and decided they were going to fight. So we didn’t have to do it. We were very busy at the time trying to do other things besides, like trying to open up our own
school. In those days it was illegal to home school your children. They made it so impossibly difficult to find a building that could accommodate the requirements for a school. You had to have so much space for children, all of these things. We really wanted to open our own school, but we just couldn’t finance it. So we were doing a lot of other things besides trying to raise our children.

McLeod: So tell me, you mentioned speaking in front of people on the ERA, and often being one, or only one of two, against four. Well, I’m going to ask you a couple of questions. The first one is where were you speaking? To whom were you speaking, and what were the issues that were coming at you?

Hubbert: Everybody wanted to know about the Equal Rights Amendment. We had raised enough fuss that people were beginning to ask the question about what is it, why are we against it. I was invited as a member of the Republican Party organization for the district clubs. I would talk to anybody. Any number. I didn’t care. Two of us would be a great congregation, you know.

And speaking of congregations, there were churches that, after their worship service, would have these coffee hours. I would be invited to come and speak. I remember one time I went to speak, and Marilyn Ward was the speaker for the Equal Rights Amendment. It was the most fun we ever had. I learned more from her on how to present it. Lay back a little bit, this sort of thing. I did a lot of talking to businessman’s clubs downtown. I always suspected that the money behind the Equal Rights Amendment came from the men, because they were the ones who benefited most from the Equal Rights Amendment.

McLeod: How so?

Hubbert: Well, who didn’t have to pay for the children brought into this world? A woman gets pregnant, has a baby, she’s got to take care of it herself. The law was changed with the Equal Rights Amendment. Men were off the hook. Such things as no-fault divorce. We had a lot of displaced homemakers who had given their entire lives to
support their husbands in college to get them jobs, etcetera. Men could leave their wives with no resources. Alimony, I don’t think, was every practiced in this state. They were beyond getting money for raising children. So, everywhere you went it was the men that benefited, in my opinion.

McLeod: So when you spoke to these business organizations downtown that were mostly men, did they seem amenable to what you were saying? Or did they seem to be a tough audience?

Hubbert: It depended. Most of the time they were amazed, first of all, that there was a woman that would get up and take them on, and who would speak against it. They thought all women were in favor of it. When I would accuse them of being the beneficiaries, most of them would agree. It may have been with a chuckle, but most of them agreed that the people who were going to benefit most financially were the men.

McLeod: It sounds like when you came on board, from you’ve described historically, that you were mostly working against the national campaign. Were you aware of Happiness of Motherhood Eternal, or HOME was the acronym. Or League of Housewives, or any of these other groups in Washington working against the ERA?

You’re covering your eyes right now, as I ask this question. [laughs] I have to ask why?

Hubbert: Well, one of the things that happened to me, as a friend of Phyllis, was when she would be invited to speak in Washington at these meetings where other organizations were getting together to talk about being against the Equal Rights Amendment, she would refer them to me, and I would be her substitute. So, I would end up with some of these people. The one woman I spoke of that I ended up trying to avoid was the one whose sole position was, “The Bible says, ‘Women submit to your husband.’” There were a lot of them like that, who believed that the Bible mandated that these women be subservient to their husbands. I avoided those groups. I didn’t want to be part of them. I don’t mean that unkindly. I’m out to win, and I’m out to make my points. I don’t want to have to get
involved with trying to justify the Bible or to be somewhat nonagreeable with the Bible.
That didn’t put me in a very good position. So I really stayed away from that as much as I
could.

McLeod: So that was a political strategy there. Did you also personally believe what they
were saying or not? Would you disagree with them about the Bible mandating the role of
women and the role of men?

Hubbert: Well if you’re getting into a philosophical religious question, let me say that I
believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly. I think that
there are some places where it was translated by men, for men. I think that has to be taken
into account.

Now, my religion is very, very much male-oriented. The men hold the priesthood.
They hold the power of the organization. Women are their equals in everything except we
do not hold the priesthood. But in this day and age, don’t try to make an opinion or a
decision that the woman disagrees with, because the women in the church do most of the
work. The men may make a lot of the decisions, but never unilaterally. It has always
been, even in plural marriage or at the very beginning of the church, the position is that
the man holds the priesthood, but the woman is an equal partner, and she must be in
agreement with these decisions. Then if she is not in agreement, if it is that serious of a
decision, then the man has the right to make the decision and expect that the woman will
support him in it. And that’s my position.

No, I don’t believe that women have to submit to their husbands. I don’t believe
that the Bible teaches that they’re second-class citizens. If that’s an evangelical position,
then I have a problem with it. But I don’t know a lot about where they are now. All I
know is that then I couldn’t take that fight on. I had enough just trying to convince people
that the Equal Rights Amendment wasn’t good for them.

McLeod: Remind me again, I think you’ve said it to an extent, what was your strategy,
and what worked best?
Hubbert: [laughs] I’m not sure anything worked. But when we were invited to speak, it got really tough because the people were so rude. The women were so rude sometimes I really didn’t want to go. But my position is just as valid as theirs. I personally felt that my calling as a woman was to do my very best to educate the women as to how they’re getting screwed on this thing.

For example, when I went down to testify against the Equal Rights Amendment at the state Legislature, I sat next to a woman who was so much in favor of it, because she knew it was going to force her deadbeat husband to pony up child support. I said, “I think you’re not taking a very good read on this.” Everybody had the same thing. So I didn’t even bother to testify. I just left. It was a lost cause, and I didn’t want to take that on at that time.

McLeod: Was this before the state ERA passed, when there were discussions in the House? Did you go down to Olympia then?

Hubbert: Yes. They had committee meetings where you could sign up and speak against or for it. The reason why I stuck with it is because I truly, honestly believe that it is not in the best interest of women. I have here my little Schlafly report, and this is on what’s wrong with equal rights for women. I think I’ve got a second copy of that. It tells you some of the things that happen. I didn’t want that to happen to my children. Now I don’t think I need any man to stand up for me. I think I’m capable of taking care of myself. At the same time, there are a lot of women who can’t. There are a lot of poor women who are really getting taken for a ride on this thing. I think that the business requirements that I mentioned — the weight requirements, the fact that they could force you to work overtime — are just a few of the things that were happening.

I would always close by saying, “Women have enjoyed special privileges by law in this country because of the value that this country placed on the family, and the woman who had the children and raised them. I see no earthly reason to go to equality. Because it is a detriment to the woman in society.”

I do believe we have suffered from it. I believe our young women have suffered from it.
McLeod: In what ways?

Hubbert: Well, because these things are so taken for granted now. Men don’t have to support the children. Because sex is sex, and you have a child, it’s yours, you take care of it. The men are no longer responsible. It’s like the immaculate conception. All of a sudden she can do it by herself. Therefore, she’s responsible for it.

I did predicted some of these things that are happening, like that there would be adoption by homosexuals. You’re talking about some of the ramifications of the application of the law. When I would suggest that homosexual men would be able to adopt children, those were fighting words. Then to suggest that there would actually be homosexual marriage, truly that was not to be talked about. It was just kind of dangerous to yourself to suggest these things. But look how it’s expanded, and how all of these things that we’ve predicted have come to pass. Here are the things that Phyllis predicted, on her website, and she was right. These things have come to pass.

McLeod: Phyllis Schlafly’s Eagles Forum, the website?

Hubbert: Yes. So they have come to pass. Nobody notices anymore. Young women don’t know what it used to be. They don’t know what their rights used to be. Thirty-five years, that’s almost two generations of children that have grown up and have been indoctrinated into this lifestyle, etcetera. So I don’t feel happy in being able to tell you I told you so. I think it’s a tragedy for the women in this country, and I think it’s a tragedy for this country. I think that the family has always been the backbone of this country, whether you like it or not. That’s what’s made this country strong. If you destroy that, you’re going to end up unhappy. I think that what will come down the pike for our children will be horrific. And I’m very sorry to see it come.

But as Mother Teresa said, there has never been a civilization that has survived the killing of their own children, or the forcing of the women to fight in combat. And she’s right. She’s not a Mormon, either. She said it very clearly. “Give me your children. Don’t destroy them. I’ll take them.”
But there are no societies, classical civilizations, that have survived those two things. You cannot kill your children and get away with it. There is a God, and he will not be mocked. You can’t destroy the concept of the family being the center of society and survive. I’m sorry. I wish it were different. But it isn’t. And I’m seventy-four. And I probably won’t be around to see all of it come to pass.

McLeod: You had a public side of being involved and speaking for these organizations and at these events. But I wonder, in becoming politically involved in the campaign against the ERA, how did you feel that coming together to work on your campaign impacted women you were involved with. And how did that work impact relationships among women?

Hubbert: Well, I can only give you my personal experience. At the beginning they were mostly Mormon women. None of them wanted to talk to me. I was practically persona non grata. I was just the oddball out. Phyllis went to the hierarchy of the Mormon church in 1972 and asked for help. They said no, we do not get involved in political questions, and the people have to make their own choices. It’s very important that the Mormon women, men, study this issue and come to their own conclusion. That lasted until it looked like it was going to pass. Then the church did come out and suggest that this was not in the best interest of women.

It didn’t really change much as far as my experience went, until the church said it’s okay to be against it. Then all of a sudden, everybody else was against it. Nobody remembered that I tried all those years to tell them to be careful, listen, study these things. They set up their own organizations. They made their own experts in these relief society organizations that probably couldn’t fight their way out of a paper bag with the open end. But you know, when the church says do something, you do it.

That Ellensburg conference ended up being a classic example of the church telling women to go do something, and they had no idea what they were doing.

McLeod: So you’re talking about the International Women’s Year, 1977, Ellensburg conference.
Hubbert: Yes. Yes. It was an absolute disaster. Not only did the men not know what they were doing, the women didn’t know what they were doing.

McLeod: Can you just state, briefly, the function of that conference, what was supposed to occur at that conference?

Hubbert: On whose behalf?

McLeod: Well, either side.

Hubbert: Okay. The Ellensburg conference was held in order to elect delegates to move on to the Houston convention, which was going to talk about the Equal Rights Amendment and what have you. Somehow or other somebody in the church in Washington state got the bug in their bonnet that we ought to send all of these Mormon women over to vote against the Equal Rights Amendment. They didn’t know that it had already passed in this state. They didn’t know that the vote they would be taking – and of course, they took a vote – wasn’t binding. They didn’t know that there was nothing that could be accomplished by going.

My position was you’re taking all of these women’s time, all of this money, for no good reason at all because Houston was a dead end. It did nothing. The federal government gave them five million dollars to hold this celebration, and they still got the extension for ratification. Why spend your time going down there when it’s a dead issue? In our state, it had already been passed. There’s nothing you could do about it.

They didn’t have any idea how to run a convention, including Susan Roylance, who supposedly was in charge of the Latter-day Saints women. They didn’t know how to make a house count. So it was a disaster as far as I was concerned.

Now, the reason why the liberal women wanted it was to create this groundswell, nationally, to make these states that hadn’t ratified it think that everybody was in favor of it. It really backfired on them.
McLeod: Okay, so let’s go back to that. By the end of 1973, twenty-two states had ratified, and then more ratified, bringing the number to thirty-five of what needed to be thirty-eight by 1977. Congress passes this extension in 1978, extending ratification until 1982. But during that time, five states rescind their ratification vote.

Hubbert: Yes.

McLeod: Those states rescinding are Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, Tennessee, and South Dakota. So, can you place me back there in this time period and talk to me, because it’s largely credited to Phyllis Schlafly’s campaign, StopERA/Eagle’s Forum that these states rescinded. Can you give me your characterization of what went on? I ask because it does seem like there was this forward momentum for the Equal Rights Movement, and then all of a sudden something happens.

Hubbert: Yes. But that forward movement was what, six months? When those guys in the House and the Senate voted on it, to pass that out, nobody knew a thing about it. One of the congressman’s wives got her husband on the phone and said, “I’ve just heard these liberal, bra burners interviewed, and you better vote against it.” He said, “Too late.” It had already been voted on. If he had a little bit more time, worked a little bit harder on the Senate members, maybe those against could have stopped it there. The Senate refused to ratify all of the amendments, refused to accept the amendments that would have protected women.

So during this was a very short time. About six months? I think New Jersey ratified it before it was actually passed by Congress. Everybody was in favor of it. It was just, zip. They didn’t even read it. In some states, the debate was ten minutes long. So the state Legislators were stampeded because it sounded so good. They could satisfy these women constituents who wanted various things, and they could be heroes to women.

But it stopped the minute Phyllis got herself in gear. At that first conference she had where she invited me, there were representatives from every state. She said, “This is what we’re going to do. We’re going to educate the people. We can’t probably stop this,” except they had targeted certain states, one of which was her own, Illinois. Then she had
a couple of other women who were really very classy, smart, accomplished women, who could possibly handle it in their own state. But in those states they kept bringing it up every year; they had to vote on it every year. But by the time Phyllis got started with Stop the ERA, she was sending out women like me who would talk to any group, whether our state had had ratified or not, simply because it was an educational tool.

They did target certain states that they went into. You didn’t have to worry about Utah. Utah was never going to pass it, no matter what. Idaho passed it, and then came to their senses and finally, and I point to that because the judge who ruled that rescission was legal is my hero.

McLeod: Judge Callister?

Hubbert: Yeah. He ruled that rescission was legal. Now the libs, the women who were in favor of this thing, were saying that, no, you cannot rescind your vote. Once you vote, it’s done. And we said no, you have seven years to accept or reject that amendment. And within that time, just because you vote in favor doesn’t mean you can’t reconsider the vote and rescind it. And these states voted to rescind. But McAllister was the federal judge who then ruled, who said, yes, rescission is legal.

McLeod: You know, though, I don’t want to contradict you at all but I think I read that it did go to the Supreme Court, but it didn’t make it until 1982, and the deadline for the extension was already–

Hubbert: Passed. Yes.

McLeod: So it was a moot point.

You talked about it being difficult when you were out there presenting, and the feeling you got of being beat up, or that you got away just with your very life when you were trying to present your side, the Stop the ERA campaign. Can you tell me the ways
Hubbert: Extreme bias. The first question they seemed to always ask me was if I was a member of the John Birch Society? Because you had to be a screwball to be against the ERA. And how could you possibly be against equality for women? But they’d never let me answer. When I was interviewed by the media, it was always a superficial thing, like, “So you’re against unisex bathrooms?” Which, you know, if you gave them a good, cogent answer, it was always cut out. But we weren’t interviewed that much. We were the elephant in the corner. The people didn’t even really want to talk to us.

Now I don’t want to give you the impression that I was afraid when I was up against these women, or against these audiences. I always had enough confidence that they wouldn’t abuse me physically. [laughs] But it is draining to always have somebody against you. You can’t say anything. They don’t even let you answer the questions. And then they’re making fun of your positions.

But I found one thing to be consistently true. Nobody on the liberal side could ever find one right that the Equal Rights Amendment guaranteed to women that was not already guaranteed in law. They would always say in the end, “Well, we just want to be in the Constitution. We just want it there.” Everything, including equal pay for equal work, all of these things, equal education, whatever it is, it had to be applied through the law that was already passed. The Voting Rights Act of ’64, all of these things, never have the liberals or the pro-ERAs come up with a single extra right given to women by the Equal Rights Amendment.

McLeod: So you’re referring to the many civil rights laws that were passed in the early and mid ‘60s?

Hubbert: Right. Right.

McLeod: And you’re seeing those as the umbrella that women fit under as well.
Hubbert: Yes, yes.

McLeod: And did you ever have to address the fact that the language of laws would sometimes say “he” instead of “he/she?” I think in Washington State there were a hundred statutes that had to be changed to change the wording and make it gender neutral language? So what was your response to that? I’m sure you got that question sometimes.

Hubbert: Not very often. Not very often. They were not that minute about what they were talking about. But they were after the broader issues. And it didn’t make any difference to me. Change it to be unisex. But I am against the Equal Rights Amendment as an addition to the federal constitution and to the state constitution. I will tell you my honest opinion is the state constitution has done much more damage than the federal constitution would have done, except when it comes to the second section of that amendment. That is, that it gave the federal government all power to enact that law. It has never been attached to any other amendment. It was the most outrageous power grab by the federal government that we’ve ever documented.

McLeod: And why do you think that language was there?

Hubbert: Well, so that they could take over making laws that apply to family, women, etcetera, etcetera, away from the states. They go with the power; they want the power. All of the things that are not enumerated in the Constitution reside with the states. Well go read the Constitution and look at what the Constitution gives power to the federal government to do. They can have an Army, they can have a Navy; they can negotiate with other governments. They can build roads, they can have a mail service. Very limited power is given to the federal government. The rest resides with the state, including all laws dealing with the family and relationships within the state.

McLeod: You know, regarding laws about the family, and I meant to ask this earlier, and I did not, did you ever work on Referendum 20? The abortion law in Washington State? And did you bring that up as part of the ERA? Or did you see them as separate issues?
Hubbert: No, no. That was one of the things that we kept talking about. I’m sorry I didn’t bring it up. We felt that that would make abortion on demand legal, part of the law.

McLeod: The ERA?

Hubbert: The ERA brought that along with the homosexual marriage, the adoption of children. The thing that concerned us greatly at the time was abortion. We felt that that would be encased in that law. Their thinking, the libs said, “Well, the man has sex and walks away free. The woman ought to be able to walk away free. So we want to fund the abortion of that child that she doesn’t want.”

I confess to you, I really got burnt out. I had children to raise; I had other things to do. I felt it was time for somebody else to get in and work it. Abortion laws seemed to be a little bit clearer to more people than the Equal Rights Amendment. But believe me, nobody believed me when I suggested that the ERA made abortions easier to get. I don’t say “me” alone. I’m talking about the group that was working with Phyllis, the Eagles Forum, etcetera. It was a very loose organization, believe me, a very loose organization, but we did our best. She’s the one who got the information out. She’s brilliant. She’s excellent at writing. She can distill difficult information so that you can use it easily. That’s what these kind of Phyllis Schlafly reports are about. But I got tired and took a rest.

McLeod: I should mention that you have a big red folder here, a kind of briefcase thick with reports, and you have a 1972 copy of *The Schlafly Report*. So you say you got burnt out. Did you ever quit working on the Stop ERA/Eagles Forum campaign? After the conference in Ellensburg, what happened for you?

Hubbert: Well, I got coerced into going to that conference, which made me most unhappy, by a member of my church, who was in a position of authority — a man who was a friend. I wanted nothing to do with it. I really got out of politics after the Equal Rights Amendment expired. I really honestly got burnt out. As I say, I had children. I had
to help finance their college education, this kind of thing. And I believe in sharing, letting somebody else work the problem. You know?

McLeod: Are you politically active now? Are you doing anything now?

Hubbert: No. No. I was active for a long time. I attended the 1968 Republican National Convention as a member of the Washington State delegation. I stayed active for a long time. But it gets vicious. I am not active now.

McLeod: Who was your candidate in ’68?

Hubbert: Reagan! Unfortunately, he’d only been governor two years. The man who financed him, whose name was Salvatori, said, “No, it’s too soon to run.” But remember, he gave that fantastic speech for Goldwater that just set the rest of us on fire. It was fun. We knew Reagan personally. He would come up to Seattle, and we would visit. It was fun to be a small part of that cadre. It was a long time before he actually got the nomination. But we were on the ground level of building that, and it was fun. It was really fun. We were not very popular in the state. [laughs] Nevertheless, we had a good time.

McLeod: Well it’s been great talking to you. Is there anything else you want to talk about that I didn’t ask?

Hubbert: No, but thank you for inviting me. I love to talk about the accomplishments that we have had. And to me, it is accomplishment. We got a lot of women educated. That doesn’t sound very elegant, does it? We were able to educate a lot of women, and they educated themselves. A lot more women have stayed politically active. This is what was one of the wonderful results. They were not active before, but it got them out, and they have stayed active. A lot of them have done really wonderful things. They’ve spent a lot of time in the Legislature fighting dead issues that, God bless them, I certainly wasn’t willing to spend the time.
McLeod: Thank you so much.

[END INTERVIEW.]