

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, AND VIVIAN, I DO APPRECIATE YOUR EFFORTS BECAUSE THAT
ELECTION TO THE BOARD OF VASSAR WAS THE VERY LAST ELECTION I WON. BEFORE WE
PRAISE OUR COHESIVENESS, OUR DEVELOPMENT AND OUR SUCCESS, LET US EXAMINE AND REVIEW
WHERE WE ARE ON THAT UNIQUELY PERSONAL DECISION, THAT MOST FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF
WOMEN - THE DECISION AS TO WHETHER TO BEAR CHILDREN OR NOT. YOU SEE I NO LONGER HAVE
ANY CONSTITUENCY TO WORRY ABOUT. I CAN REMEMBER ONE JULY EVENING IN THE CORRIDORS
OF THE CONGRESS WHEN BELLA ABSUG WAS SO UPSET ABOUT A RIDGER THAT WAS BEING ATTEMPTED
TO ~~BE PUT~~ ON AN HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL. IT WAS THE PROIBITION ON FAMILY PLANNING
TECHNIQUES. I DON'T REMEMBER THE DETAILS. AND I COULDN'T REALLY QUITE UNDERSTAND
HER GREAT CONCERN. * I THOUGHT WE HAD HAD ROE VS. WADE. THAT THE SUPREME COURT HAD
SPOKEN AND THAT THAT WOULD BE THE END. BUT SHE HAD THE FORESIGHT AND ACUMEN TO
UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS AROUND THE CORNER. IF I MAY INJECT A PERSONAL NOTE - HOW WE
HAVE MISSED HER - ALL OF US - HOW WE HAVE MISSED HER BEING IN THE CONGRESS THIS YEAR.
AND HOW WE HAVE MISSED HER FOR THAT MIGHT OF BEEN IN THE SENATE. AND ALL I CAN SAY
IS IT'S NOT OVER, BELLA, AND I TRUST THE TIME WILL COME WHEN THERE IS A VACANCY
ON THE SUPREME COURT AND/WE CAN STAND FIRM AND COHERENT AND ADAMENT. I HAVE COME
TO YOU TODAY WITH AS GREAT A SENSE OF GRIEVANCE AND INJUSTICE AS I ~~HAVE~~ OF
INDIGNATION, WITH ANGUISH AS WELL AS ANGER OVER THE RECENT COURSE OF EVENTS IN
ALL THREE BRANCHES OF OUR GOVERNMENT AS REGARDS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ABORTION.
ALL THREE BRANCHES NEED TO BE EXAMINED. THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING
WILL CONVENE ON TUESDAY. AND WE KNOW, WHATEVER WE FIGHT/WHAT WE GET OUT OF THERE WON'T
BE VERY GOOD. WE KNOW ALL THE ANTI-ABORTION EMPHASIS THAT WE HAVE HAD IN THE LAST
TWO YEARS IN THE CONGRESS, WHERE A VARIETY OF MEASURES TO LIMIT ROE VS. WADE
HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN. AND WE ALSO KNOW THE SPILLOFF THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
ON ~~AT~~ THE STATE LEVEL. WE ALSO KNOW THAT WE HAVE A SPECTER FACING US IN 1978 OF THE
POSSIBILITY OF A U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION. THESE ARE MATTERS THAT WE NEED TO BE GREATLY
CONCERNED WITH. WELL, ELECTIVE OFFICIALS ARE NOT NECESSARILY COURAGEOUS PEOPLE.
AND WE UNDERSTAND THAT. AND WE UNDERSTAND THAT IF YOU DON'T GET ELECTED AND YOU
WON'T BE ABLE TO DO VERY MUCH, GOOD. SO, WE'LL OVERLOOK THE CONGRESS FOR THE MOMENT.

LET US THEN GO TO THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. I CAN REMEMBER STANDING ON A
PODIUM IN BOSTON AT THIS VERY KIND OF CONVENTION AND SAYING WE NO LONGER HAVE STARS
IN OUR EYES OVER PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES OR NATIONAL PARTIES. WE FORGET, I AM
AFRAID MANY OF US FORGOT THAT. WE DID DEVELOP STARS IN OUR EYES OVER OUR
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE. AND FROM WHAT I SAW OF MANY WOMEN AT THE NATIONAL
CONVENTION IN '76 WE DEVELOPED STARS IN OUR EYES OVER THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.
NOW, LET'S GO TO THAT JULY 13TH ⁷⁷ PRESS CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S. LET
US NEVER FORGET THOSE RINGING PIESTIC WORDS ON ABORTION FOR THE POOR, AND I QUOTE:
"AS YOU KNOW THERE ARE MANY THINGS IN LIFE THAT ARE NOT FAIR, THAT WEALTHY PEOPLE
CAN AFFORD AND POOR PEOPLE CANNOT. BUT I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
SHOULD TAKE ACTION TO MAKE THESE OPPORTUNITIES EXACTLY EQUAL, PARTICULARLY WHEN
THERE IS A MORAL FACTOR INVOLVED." I PUZZLED AND THOUGHT ABOUT THAT PHRASE, AND THAT
EXPRESSION, AND ALL I COULD THINK OF WAS ^{"DOES} /THIS MEAN MORALITY FOR THE POOR? DOES IT MEAN THAT
IT IS A MATTER OF EITHER MONEY OR MORALITY? OR DOES IT MEAN THAT MONEY IS MORALITY.
AND THEN, TO THE SECRETARY OF HEW, LET US SAY NO MORE THAN THAT HE CERTAINLY PRACTICES
HIS PRINCIPLES IN THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION WITH AN INCREDIBLE ZEALOUSNESS. DOES
THAT ZEALOUSNESS REFLECT THE COMMITMENT OF HIS PRESIDENT? I CAN'T TELL AND I'M NOT
GOING TO TRY TO READ BETWEEN THE LINES. OR DOES IT REFLECT THE ZEALOUSNESS OF THE
BISHOP'S CONFERENCE. AND LET ME AGAIN SPEAK ON A PERSONAL LEVEL. I KNOW THE STRUGGLE
AND THE LOBBYING AND THE EFFORT IT HAS TAKEN TO GET WOMEN APPOINTED IN THIS PRESENT
ADMINISTRATION. I REALIZE THAT THERE WERE LETTERS WRITTEN TO THE PRESIDENT. YOU EACH
WILL HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR MINDS ON THIS. BUT ARE THOSE LETTERS ENOUGH? SOMEHOW OR
OTHER THE ANALOGY COMES TO MY MIND THAT ALL THOSE "BRAVE" PEOPLE IN THE JOHNSON ADMINIS-
TRATION AND I PUT QUOTES AROUND BRAVE, THAT OPPOSED THE VIETNAM WAR, DIDN'T SPEAK
OUT UNTIL THEY WERE OUT OF OFFICE.

AND THEN WE COME TO OUR THIRD BRANCH. AND I GUESS I HAVE THE GREATEST SENSE OF CHAGRIN THERE BECUASE WE DO EXPECT MORE OF THAT GROUP THAT I NOW CALL ^{ll}THE SUPREMES. IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT WITH INCREASING FREQUENCY THE COURT TURNS THOSE CASES THAT IT DOES HEAR INTO CONSTITUTIONAL DISASTERS. THIS IS APLY DEMONSTRATED BY THE CASES OF ABORTION HANDED DOWN ON JUNE 20TH OF THIS YEAR. BUT ACTUALLY WHY DID WE EXPECT MORE? THOSE DECISIONS ARE IN THE TRADITION OF THE BURGER COURT DECISIONS WHICH HAVE FALLEN MOST CRUELLY ON THOSE LEAST ABLE TO PROTECT THEMSELVES. DURING THE COURT'S PAST TWO TERMS IT HAS DENIED SOCIAL ^CSECURITY BENEFITS TO ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN WHO WOULD HAVE RECEIVED THE BENEFITS AUTOMATICALLY HAD THEY BEEN LEGITIMATE. IT HAS REFUSED TO ALLOW POOR PEOPLE IN KENTUCKY TO SUE OVER THE CURTAILMENT OF SERVICES TO INDIGENTS BY LOCAL HOSPITALS. IT HAS KICKED OUT OF COURT ANOTHER GROUP OF POOR PEOPLE WHO COULD NOT FIND PLACES TO LIVE IN THE SUBURBS OF ROCHESTER BECUASE OF ^{RE}STRICTIVE ZONING ORDINANCES. IT HAS ALLOWED THE STATE OF VIRGINIA TO PROSECUTE HOMOSEXUALS FOR SODOMY WITHOUT EVEN BOTHERING TO WRITE AN OPINION SAYING WHY THAT WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY PERMISSIBLE OR WHAT THE STATE'S INTEREST IN SUCH PROSECUTION WAS. ^{IT HAS Refused} IT'S THE COURT THAT SPEAKS ABOUT THE COMPELLING INTEREST OF STATES IN CHILDBIRTH AND YET WILL PERMIT THE USE OF PHYSICAL FORCE EVEN WHEN IT IS EXCESSIVE IN THE SCHOOL CASE THAT ~~THEY~~ HANDED DOWN IN APRIL OF THIS YEAR. ~~A~~ ^A LIKELY PRELUDE TO THE JUNE 20TH DECISIONS. ~~THE THREE DECISIONS~~ ^{as} BEAL VS. DOE, ^{A STATE} PARTICIPATING WAS NOT REQUIRED BY TITLE XIX OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO FUND THE COSTS OF NON-THERAPEUTIC ABORTIONS, ALTHOUGH A STATE IF IT DESIRED WAS FREE UNDER TITLE XIX TO PROVIDE SUCH FUNDING. ^{as Beal v. Doe, the court ruled that} MAHER VS. ROE, ^{in that decision} HANDED DOWN ON THE SAME DATE. A CONNECTICUT REGULATION EXCLUDING FUNDING FOR NON-THERAPEUTIC ABORTIONS DID NOT VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION, ALTHOUGH THERE WAS FUNDING FOR PREGNANCY AND CHILDBIRTH. ^{is provided} THERE IS A FOOTNOTE ON THAT CASE. THOSE TWO PLAINTIFS WERE A SIXTEEN YEAR OLD HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR AND AN UNWED MOTHER OF THREE, ^{They are} THAT'S THE HUMAN FACTOR INVOLVED. ^{is} POELKER VS. DOE HANDED DOWN ON THE SAME DATE, AN INDIGENT WOMAN SOUGHT TO OBTAIN A NON-THERAPEUTIC ABORTION IN A CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION

(Reference?)

for

as

ON THE BASIS OF^{*} CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION IN A PUBLIC HOSPITAL AND WAS TURNED DOWN.
ON JUNE 29TH THE U.S. SUPREME COURT NULLIFIED JUDGE ^{DOOLING} ~~DOOLING~~'S RULING HOLDING
UNCONSTITUTIONAL A CONGRESSIONAL BAN ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION TO END
PREGNANCY THAT DID NOT ENDANGER A MOTHER'S LIFE. YES, THAT COURAGEOUS JUDGE
~~HAD RULED AND PERSEPTIVE ONE~~, HAD RULED IT DENIED THE NEEDY THE MEANS TO EXERCISE
A RIGHT GUARANTEED THOSE WITH MONEY. I'VE READ AND REREAD THOSE DECISIONS AND THERE
IS BEAUTIFUL AND MEANINGFUL LANGUAGE IN SOME OF THE OPINIONS. THE ONLY PROBLEM IS
THAT THE LANGUAGE IS FOUND IN THE DISSENTS. AS JUSTICE BLACKMAN SAID IN HIS
DISSENT IN BEAL VS. DOE "THE COURT TODAY BY ITS DECISIONS IN THESE CASES ALLOW
THE STATES AND SUCH MUNICIPALITIES AS CHOOSE TO DO SO TO ACCOMPLISH INDIRECTLY
WHAT THE COURT IN ROE VS. WADE BY SUBSTANTIAL MAJORITY AND WITH SOME EMPHASIS I
HAD THOUGHT, SAID THEY COULD NOT DO DIRECTLY. THE COURT CONCEIVES THE EXISTENCE OF
A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT BUT DENIES THE REALIZATION AND ENJOYMENT OF THAT RIGHT
ON THE GROUND THAT EXISTENCE AND REALIZATION ARE SEPARATE AND DISTINCT. FOR
THE INDIVIDUAL WOMAN CONCERNED, INDIGENT AND FINANCIALLY HELPLESS AS THE COURT
OPINIONS IN THE THREE CASES CONCEDE HER TO BE, THE RESULT IS PUNITIVE AND TRAGIC.
IMPLICIT IN THE COURT'S HOLDINGS IS THE NOTION THAT SHE MAY GO ELSEWHERE FOR
HER ABORTION. AND ^{Justice} BLACKMAN CONCLUDES, I FIND THIS ALARMING, ALMOST REMINISCENT OF
"LET THEM EAT CAKE." SOME NINE OR TEN YEARS AGO A BLACK ACTIVIST IN TEXAS TOLD
ME THAT JUSTICE OUGHT TO TAKE OFF HER BLINDFOLD AND SEE WHAT WAS GOING ON.
BUT AFTER READING THOSE MAJORITY OPINIONS I REALLY DON'T THINK IT WOULD ENLIGHTEN
THE MAJORITY OF THE SUPREME COURT TO TAKE THEIR BLINDFOLDS OFF.

YES, THE RIGHT TO ABORTION HAS BECOME A CLASS ISSUE, A RACE ISSUE, A
PRIVACY ISSUE, EVEN A CONSUMER ISSUE, BUT ABOVE ALL IT IS OUR UNIQUE ISSUE.