For many years, the Business and Professional Woman has been alerted to the stresses of the holidays and the often high expectations that come with the calendar. We are bombarded with tips to reduce this stress, including scaling back commitments, planning ahead, and just going with the flow. Yet our private concern is how to make sure all of our important contacts know that they are special at this time of year. We don’t want to disappoint.

I recommend just sending a very personal, grateful gift. Simply Say “Thank You”. It will probably not be rejected or returned. It’s bound to be low guilt for the receiver, as I assure you that they will not have to hit the mall to return the favor.

How do I know? Let me tell you a funny story. For most of my working life (in my career settings) I’ve been one of a small handful of women in the room. You know what I mean. Of course, being one of only a few women also, I’ve been the only “Joanna” in that room and probably the whole building. By an odd twist of fate, I am now surrounded by many professionals named “Joanna”. It’s wildly uncanny and sometimes hilarious. None of us are used to this type of confusion over a name that we thought was rare.

I sometimes get an e-mail that has “Thank you, Joanna” as the subject. Never have I questioned why the sender would be thanking me. I eagerly open the message and only after reading the e-mail do I find that another deserving “Joanna” was the recipient. Ha-Ha on me.

At times like this I realize that we say “Thank You” too seldom. Why do I immediately presume that gratitude should be sent my way? Well, because I am due recognition also. We truly underestimate the power of the word “Thanks”. Let’s make a vow to put this word to work where it is seriously needed.

As you ponder the gifts that you are going to give this Holiday Season, please do not spare the most wonderful gift of all. Let your members know how much they mean to you personally, how truly “Thankful” you are that they are in your network, and how grateful you are that they chose to give their gifts to BPW. I wish all of you a wonderful Holiday Season. Please do know that your achievements are breath-taking. You make a difference to me and those that you touch. The differences you have made in 2009 will last generations. THANK YOU.

Joanna Moses-Elliott, President
The WEE event was kicked off on Friday night with a social at the home of Past State President Verna Taylor. It was hosted by Verna and her daughter, Wayne-Duplin President Sandra Taylor Torrans and attended by local members and guests, as well as BPW members from other areas of the state. We enjoyed a great meal and many of the BPW/NC Executive Committee and other out of town guests enjoyed Verna’s hospitality for the night. As for the remainder, all I will say is “What happens at a social, stays at a social!” Plan to be at the next one and stay late when the party really gets going!

Saturday, November 7, 2009, dawned beautiful and sunny. The tempo was set for the Inaugural WEE Event in Kenansville. More than ten clubs were represented from all three regions! The setting was The Country Squire Restaurant and Tavern with lots of ambiance and elegance. Wayne-Duplin BPW hosted the event.

Many of you may be wondering how the Fall Regional Event became the Inaugural WEE Event. Our Vice President, Rhonda Hunter of Lincolnton, came up with the name for the event and designed the logo. She wanted this wonderful assembly of women to have more appeal and meaning than simply the Regional Event. If you were there, you agree that the day was definitely a day of Empowerment and Enlightenment for Women. Rhonda did a great job in giving the event its own identifier.

Any great event must have participants and presenters. We started the day with breakfast and networking. Afterwards we assembled in the Jester’s Court for our program. Our first speaker was our own Trina Hines, Women Joining Forces Chair and author of “9/11: Pentagon Leadership SOS.” She spoke of her experiences in the military and of the day the plane crashed into the pentagon. Every eye was on Trina as she relived the events of that day and how she was fortunate to escape with her life due to a chain of events that got her out of her office in the Pentagon. She spoke of the other people in her office and on her hallway that were not so fortunate and credits God with saving her life. She uses her experiences to empower and enlighten others.

Dr. Barnsley Brown, the owner of Spirited-Solutions, Inc., was our next speaker. She spoke on the powerful traits of successful women. She told of how her life experiences with those that others may have overlooked, because of their differences, had empowered her life. She encouraged us to examine ourselves and find the value in those different than ourselves, thereby empowering and enlightening ourselves toward success.

Our third speaker was Catherine Triplett, 2008 NC Woman of the Year and owner of Alternative Life Force Therapies. She talked with us about empowering our bodies and enlightening our minds through exercise, healthy eating habits, and meditation. She spoke on the powerful benefits of alternative therapies when used in addition to medical practices and conventional medicine.

The day was interspersed with many opportunities for early Christmas shopping from our vendors and opportunities to renew old acquaintances and make new friends. We had several guests who expressed an interest in joining various clubs around the state. The meal, dessert, and entertainment were excellent. The next WEE event will be in the spring. Start planning now to be there!
Empowering Women: Mind, Body & Spirit
Rhonda Hunter, Vice President

Thank you Virginia Dare BPW Club! Your Women’s Symposium “Empowering Women: Mind, Body & Spirit” was awesome and I was extremely honored to be one of the keynote speakers. I brought a message of the ERA (Equal Rights Amendment) efforts that are alive and well. The ERA is now very vividly in the minds of every woman who attended, perhaps because of the “RED BRA” or my sense of humor. There was heartfelt laughter and a good time to ignite the need to get the ERA ratified once and for all.

A very special thanks to Fran Kapinos for her generous hospitality in hosting us in her beautiful beach home, not only me but Michelle Evans and Virginia Adamson, too. I appreciate both ladies who agreed to travel with me to the Outer Banks prior to our journey to the “WEE” Event in Kenansville. Memories are many and shared by my special BPW sisters.

Rhonda delights the ladies with her “Red Bra” and lighter but professes not to be a “bra burning feminist”.

Virginia Adamson, Michelle Evans, Fran Kapinos and Rhonda Hunter

Happy Holidays!
MARK YOUR CALENDARS!
The inaugural NC Women United Member Showcase will be hosted by Triangle BPW on Thursday, March 11, 2010. For the last couple of Tar Heel Woman issues, I reminded our BPW sisters that you are also members of NC Women United and have shared information about the important work of the organization. Advocating for the rights of women and children across North Carolina, NC Women United provides support for all of our grassroots efforts.

NC Women United’s structure is coalition based. There are 27 organizations who are members supporting missions similar to that of BPW across the state. To recognize the dedication of our membership organizations, NC Women United is sponsoring its inaugural Member Showcase. I am so proud for Triangle BPW to be the first hostess. Several membership organizations as well as Triangle will have exhibit tables. The event will serve as an opportunity for these members to showcase their organizations. NC Women United President Alison Kiser and Triangle BPW President Mary Kim along with other organizational leadership will address the audience. Announcements will be placed in local publications inviting women who are interested in our mission and would like to participate. Triangle BPW is hoping to use this event as a vehicle to share more information about BPW and to recruit members.

On Thursday, March 11, 2010, networking will begin at 6:00 p.m. followed by 5-minute presentations from 5 membership organizations. There will be lots of time for networking, discovering what other groups are doing, and meeting our guests. I invite you to attend! Let’s show the other membership organizations who has the best members. For more information and registration, please contact Michelle Evans (Phone: (919) 684-6739; Email: mi-

WOW!! what a “WEE”: Women Empowered & Enlightened Event
Rhonda Hunter, Vice President

Wayne-Duplin, you really know how to pull out all the stops. Thank you for making the first WEE a true success. The venue was outstanding and all the special touches were well received and appreciated by all the special ladies and BPW members that had the opportunity to be with us on Saturday. More than a few of the guests were interested in becoming members.

A special thanks to Gail Harper, BPW/NC President Elect; Sandra Torrens Wayne-Duplin President; and a hard working Wayne-Duplin BPW Club for all your unified efforts in making this a memorable event for all.

An extra special time was had on Friday evening as everyone began arriving at lakeside home of Verna Taylor, former BPW/NC President. We enjoyed great food, fun, and fellowship. Thank you, Verna, for making our stay so welcoming.

I hope this piques your interest about WEE Events and look forward to receiving your BPW’s Bid to host the Spring WEE. Submit your bid right away to Mary Shelton Drum.
7. Do some states have state ERAs or other guarantees of equal rights on the basis of sex?

Only a federal Equal Rights Amendment can provide U.S. citizens with the highest and broadest level of legal protection against sex discrimination. However, the constitutions of 22 states – Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming – provide either inclusive or partial guarantees of equal rights on the basis of sex. (As a point of historical comparison, by the time the 19th Amendment guaranteeing women’s right to vote was added to the Constitution in 1920, one-quarter of the states had enacted state-level guarantees of that right.)

States guarantee equal rights on the basis of sex in various ways. Some (e.g., Utah, Wyoming) entered the Union in the 1890s with constitutions that affirm equal rights for male and female citizens. Some (e.g., Colorado, Hawaii) amended their constitutions in the 1970s with language virtually identical to the federal ERA. Some (e.g., New Jersey, Florida) have language in their state constitution that implicitly or explicitly includes both males and females in their affirmation of rights. Some states place certain restrictions on their equal rights guarantees: e.g., California specifies equal employment and education rights, Louisiana prohibits "arbitrary and unreasonable" sex discrimination, and Rhode Island excludes application to abortion rights. Ironically, five states with state-level equal rights amendments or guarantees (Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Utah, and Virginia) have not ratified the federal ERA.

State-level equal rights jurisprudence over many decades has produced a solid body of evidence about the prospective impact of a federal ERA and has refuted many of the extreme claims of ERA opponents. Further information on state ERAs is available in "State Equal Rights Amendments Revisited: Evaluating Their Effectiveness in Advancing Protection Against Sex Discrimination" by Linda J. Wharton, Esq., in Rutgers Law Journal (Volume 36, Issue 4, 2006).
Prior to the 2009 State Convention, BPW members in good standing were able to vote on issues impacting the State Federation only by attending the State Convention. At our State Convention in June, the North Carolina bylaws were amended to provide voting for all members on issues impacting the State Federation even if they were not able to attend convention. The following bylaws changes were adopted by the Convention body so that all members may vote in the future.

ARTICLE XIII – ELECTIONS
Section 8. Polls shall be open during dates and hours determined by the executive committee and may vary depending on whether voting will be by mail, e-mail, facsimile or electronic proxy using software designed for this purpose.

ARTICLE XIII – ELECTIONS
Section 9. No member shall have more than one vote and shall cast their own vote. At the request of the elections committee and with the approval of the board of directors, ballots may be cast by mail, e-mail, facsimile or electronic proxy using software designed for this purpose.

ARTICLE XV – EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Section 2.

(f) Establish the dates and hours the polls will be open for voting either in person, by mail, e-mail, facsimile or electronic proxy.

ARTICLE XXV-AMENDMENTS
Section 1. These bylaws may be amended at a business meeting at the annual state convention, or by a special voting session called at the request of the Executive Committee and approved by the board of directors. Amendments may be proposed by the executive committee, the board of directors, by a local organization or by the bylaws committee.

Section 2. Proposed amendments shall be documented and sent to the state president and the bylaws chair at least 30 days prior to a meeting of the board of directors. A special meeting of the board of directors may be called for the purpose of reviewing proposed bylaw amendments.

Section 3. The board of directors shall review all proposed amendments and shall determine those amendments to be presented to the eligible voters for consideration. Such amendments should be printed in the TAR HEEL WOMAN prior to the call for a vote.

Section 4. An amendment properly presented to the board of directors but not approved for presentation to the convention body or amendments proposed too late for the procedures in Section 2 and 3 may be brought to the convention floor by a majority vote. Such proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to the secretary at the beginning of the first business session and shall be read/presented to the convention body prior to the close of the first business session. If consideration of the amendment by the convention body is approved, it shall be appended to the agenda for a subsequent business session.
8. Since the 14th Amendment guarantees all citizens equal protection of the laws, why do we still need the ERA?

The 14th Amendment was ratified in 1868, after the Civil War, to deal with race discrimination. In referring to the electorate, it added the word "male" to the Constitution for the first time. Even with the 14th Amendment in the Constitution, women had to fight a long and hard political battle to have their right to vote guaranteed through the 19th Amendment in 1920. It was not until 1971, in Reed v. Reed, that the Supreme Court applied the 14th Amendment for the first time to prohibit sex discrimination, in that case because the circumstances did not meet a rational-basis test. However, in that and subsequent decisions (Craig v. Boren, 1976; United States v. Commonwealth of Virginia, 1996), the Court declined to elevate sex discrimination claims to the strict scrutiny standard of review that the 14th Amendment requires for certain suspect classifications, such as race, religion, and national origin. The Court now applies heightened (so-called "skeptical") scrutiny in cases of sex discrimination and requires extremely persuasive evidence to uphold a government action that differentiates on the basis of sex. However, such claims can still be evaluated under an intermediate standard of review, which requires only that such classifications must substantially advance an important governmental objective (rather than bear a necessary relation to a compelling state interest, as strict scrutiny requires). The ERA would require courts to go beyond the current application of the 14th Amendment by adding sex to the list of suspect classifications protected by the highest level of strict judicial review.

9. Aren't there adequate legal protections against sex discrimination in the Equal Pay Act, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, Titles VII and IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, court decisions based on the 14th Amendment, and more?

Without the ERA in the Constitution, the statutes and case law that have produced major advances in women's rights since the middle of the last century are vulnerable to being ignored, weakened, or reversed. By a simple majority, Congress can amend or repeal anti-discrimination laws, the Administration can negligently enforce such laws, and the Supreme Court can use the intermediate standard of review to permit certain regressive forms of sex discrimination. Ratiﬁcation of the ERA would also improve the United States' global credibility in the area of sex discrimination. Many other countries have in their governing documents, however imperfectly implemented, an afﬁrmation of legal equality of the sexes. Ironically, some of those constitutions - in Japan and Afghanistan, for example - were written under the direction of the United States government.

The ERA is necessary to make our own Constitution conform with the promise engraved over the entrance of the Supreme Court: "Equal Justice Under Law."

Continued on page 10
WOW!!! Have you seen BPW/NC’s website lately?? The URL address has changed. You can find us at www.bpw-nc.org. Our very own Rhonda Hunter, BPW/NC Vice President and former Secretary, has been hard at work adding some new features to our website. You can see from the pictures that the Home Page has lots of connections to information. Most of the information is available by merely clicking on the topic of interest.

BPW/NC has a New Updated Website

Virginia Adamson, Secretary

WOW!!! Have you seen BPW/NC’s website lately?? The URL address has changed. You can find us at www.bpw-nc.org. Our very own Rhonda Hunter, BPW/NC Vice President and former Secretary, has been hard at work adding some new features to our website. You can see from the pictures that the Home Page has lots of connections to information. Most of the information is available by merely clicking on the topic of interest.
In addition there is a new secured area of the website. To be able to reach this area each member must first register for access to the website. Simply click on the link “I would like to join” in the Web Login area at the bottom left of the Home Page. You will be taken to the Membership Request Page. Fill in the information and click on “submit”. Your request is sent to our Webmistress. Once your membership is confirmed you will receive a confirmation email.

The hope is to be able to register for events online in the future. We'll keep you updated on new features.
10. How has the ERA been related to reproductive rights?

The repeated claim of opponents that the ERA would require government to allow “abortion on demand” is a clear misrepresentation of existing laws and court decisions at both federal and state levels. In federal courts, including the Supreme Court, a number of restrictive laws dealing with contraception and abortion have been invalidated since the mid–20th century based on application of the constitutional principles of the right of privacy and the due process clause of the 14th Amendment. The principles of equal protection or equal rights have so far not been applied to such cases at the federal level. The presence or absence of a state ERA or equal protection guarantee does not necessarily correlate with a state’s legal climate for reproductive rights. For example, despite Pennsylvania’s state ERA, the state Supreme Court decided that restrictions on Medicaid funding of abortions were constitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court in separate litigation (Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 1992) upheld Pennsylvania’s restrictions on the abortion procedure under the federal due process clause.

Missouri enforces significant restrictions on abortion despite its state constitution’s equal protection clause. State equal rights amendments have been cited in a few state court decisions (e.g., in Connecticut and New Mexico) regarding a very specific issue – whether a state that provides funding to low-income Medicaid-eligible women for childbirth expenses should also be required to fund medically necessary abortions for women in that government program. Those courts ruled that the state must fund both pregnancy-related procedures if it funds either, in order to prevent the government from using fiscal pressure to exert a chilling influence on a woman’s exercise of her constitutional right to make medical decisions about her pregnancy. The New Jersey Supreme Court issued a similar decision based on the right of privacy and equal protection, with no reference to its state constitution’s equal rights guarantee. State court decisions on reproductive rights are not conclusive evidence of how federal courts would decide such cases. For example, while some state courts have required Medicaid funding of medically necessary abortions, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of the federal “Hyde Amendment,” which has for decades prohibited the federal government from funding most or all Medicaid abortions, even many that are medically necessary.

11. How has the ERA been related to discrimination based on sexual orientation and the issue of same-sex marriage?

Opponents claim that the ERA would require government to permit same-sex marriage, but the U.S. Supreme Court has never defined discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation as a form of sex based discrimination. The Defense of Marriage Act currently prohibits the federal government from recognizing same-sex marriages and denies federal benefits to spouses in such marriages. Even without an ERA, a lawsuit was filed in March 2009 to have that law overturned on equal protection.
grounds. At the state level, where most laws dealing with marriage are passed and adjudicated, the legal status of same-sex marriage is not correlated with whether or not a state has an equal rights amendment. Recent developments indicate that state laws and court decisions are evolving toward acceptance of the principle of equal marriage rights without regard to sexual orientation.

Some states with ERAs have maintained the legal definition of marriage as a union between a man and a woman. In 2006, the Washington Supreme Court ruled that a state law limiting marriage to one man and one woman does not violate the state constitution. Alaska and Hawaii amended their constitutions to declare marriage a contract between a man and a woman. A Maryland statute stating that "only a marriage between a man and a woman is valid" has survived a legal challenge. Florida voters in 2008 amended the state constitution to ban same-sex marriage. The Supreme Court of California legalized same-sex marriage in 2008 under the principles of privacy, due process, and equal protection, but then upheld a voter-passed Proposition 8 to ban same-sex marriage, saying that the vote amended rather than revised the state constitution (a technical point at issue) and that same-sex couples through civil unions had all the same civil benefits as heterosexual partners except the designation of "marriage."

Other states with ERAs have legalized same-sex civil unions or marriages. The Supreme Court of New Jersey ruled under state equal protection guarantees that same-sex couples must be afforded the same access to the benefits of marriage as opposite-sex couples, and the Legislature responded by legalizing civil unions. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts held that limiting marriage to opposite-sex couples violated the individual liberty and equality guarantees of the state constitution. Connecticut in 2005 was the first state to legalize civil unions without a prior court decision, and in 2008 the state Supreme Court ruled that same-sex couples have the right to marry. In 2009, New Hampshire passed a same-sex marriage bill, and, pursuant to a state Supreme Court decision, Iowa became the first state outside of New England to legalize same-sex marriage. Vermont is a state without an ERA but with legal same-sex marriage. Ironically, a 1986 vote to add an ERA to the state constitution failed in large part because of opponents' claims that it would legitimize same-sex unions. Nevertheless, in 1999 the Vermont Supreme Court decided under the common benefits clause of the state constitution that same-sex couples must be provided the benefits and protections of marriage in the form of civil unions, and the Legislature responded by passing a civil union statute in 2000. In 2009, the Legislature passed a same-sex marriage bill over the governor's veto.
THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Continued from page 11

12. How has the ERA been related to single-sex institutions?
Even without an ERA in the Constitution, Supreme Court decisions in recent decades have increasingly limited the constitutionality of public single-sex institutions. In 1972, the Court found in Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan that Mississippi’s policy of refusing to admit males to its all-female School of Nursing was unconstitutional. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor wrote in the majority decision that a gender-based classification may be justified as compensatory only if members of the benefited sex have actually suffered a disadvantage related to it. In the Court’s 1996 United States v. Commonwealth of Virginia decision, which prohibited the use of public funds for then all-male Virginia Military Institute unless it admitted women, the majority opinion written by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated that sex-based classifications may be used to compensate the disadvantaged class “for particular economic disabilities [they have] suffered,” to promote equal employment opportunity, and to advance full development of the talent and capacities of all citizens. Such classifications may not be used, however, to create or perpetuate the legal, social, and economic inferiority of the traditionally disadvantaged class, in this case women. Thus, single-sex institutions whose aim is to perpetuate the historic dominance of one sex over the other are already unconstitutional, while single-sex institutions that work to overcome past discrimination are constitutional now and, if the courts choose, could remain so under an ERA.

This series of FAQ’s about ERA will be continued in the next issue of The Tar Heel Woman.