



Zoom Meeting [Registration Link](#) for Tues. June 20th Noon-1:30 PM EDT

“When Will Women’s Voices Be Heard? When Will the Equal Rights Amendment Be Implemented?”

While Europe’s eye is fix’d on mighty things,
The fate of Empires and the fall of Kings;
While quacks of State must each produce his plan,
And even children lisp the Rights of Man;
Amid this mighty fuss just let me mention,
The Rights of Woman merit some attention.

- Robert Burns, from the Rights of Woman, 1792

Holly Joseph, CWI Treasurer, will introduce this urgent and most fundamental subject of “the Rights of Woman” in our own country – these United States – in our own times. This is a discussion of women’s voices being heard, with the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) being the prime focus.

Alice Paul (1/11/1885-7/9/1977) has been a preeminent champion of women’s rights in the United States. After having secured the right for women to vote through her tireless work and personal sacrifice to effect the ratification of the 19th Amendment on August 18, 1920, she then turned her attention toward achieving ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment in her belief that the vote alone would not be adequate for women to be full participants in American society. It has been modified since her original version but is now the following twenty-four words in the first Section:

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

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

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

After the ratification of the 19th (Suffrage) Amendment, Alice Paul’s efforts to get another Amendment to expand rights for women – this one establishing an expression of women’s equality enshrined in our Constitution---has not been as successful. In fact, Alice Paul did not live to see the Equal Rights Amendment included in our Constitution. A question for us to consider is whether we will all live so long to see it realized.

Over the years, many have tried to keep the ERA from passage on the grounds that it was unnecessary or even that it would be harmful. Yet polling has suggested wider societal support for the measure than is reflected in Congressional support, the last expression of that being the failure to get Senate approval on April 27, 2023, for the removal of ERA deadline. (The vote of 51-47 was not enough to overcome the filibuster despite a majority of Senators’ approval.)

Eleanor Smeal, President of the Feminist Majority Foundation, Feminist Majority, Publisher of Ms. Magazine and early President of the National Organization for Woman, will enrich the presentation with her vast knowledge of women’s programs as well as knowing Alice Paul and leading the fight for ERA for decades. **Nicole Vorrasi Bates, Esq.**, Founding Member and Executive Director of Shattering Glass, (www.shatteringglass.org) will share her perspective on the ongoing efforts to get the ERA into the Constitution. We ask that all of us reflect on when we were struck with the realization that girls/women were not equal with boys/men. For us feminists, the question is the following: “What are we going to do about it?” Achieving the enactment of the Equal Rights Amendment -- to establish gender equality in our country’s governing document – will unquestionably strengthen our democracy.

Remember to register to attend this June 20 CWI noon zoom meeting at this [Registration Link](#)

June 20, 2023 Slate for CLEARINGHOUSE ON WOMEN’S ISSUES (CWI) BOARD ELECTIONS

CWI BOARD MEMBER TERMS ARE 2 YEARS. The following CWI board members’ terms end June 30, 2023 but they have agreed to stand for election at the June 20, 2023 CWI meeting to continue to serve as CWI Board Members for July 1, 2023- June 30, 2025.

Specifically, if re-elected, Co-President Sue Klein has agreed to continue to serve as Co-President. Connie Cordovilla has agreed to continue as VP Membership. D. Anne Martin will continue as VP Organizational Management. Sherry Klein will continue as VP Technology. Alotta Taylor will continue as VP Diversity. Sheila Wickouski will resume a 2 year board member term along with two new Board members: Jan Erickson from NOW who will also serve as CWI Co-President and Denise Hyater Lindenmuth from the National Women’s Health Network (NWHN), who will serve as VP for Women’s Health.

Additionally, the following CWI Board Members will continue the second year of their terms: Holly Taggart Joseph as Treasurer, Jeanette Lim Esbrook, VP Legal Affairs, and Loretto Gubernatis, VP Public Relations.

Expectations for Board Members include:

1. Attend our monthly CWI noon Zoom meetings if possible. (They are Sept.-Nov. and Jan-June, usually on the 4th Tue of the Month.)
2. Claim a particular realm of expertise. At the moment we need gender experts with a focus on International, medical/health, diversity, governance, politics, arts, economics and labor/workforce issues.
3. Take charge of a meeting in your area of expertise as selected by the Board. This involves inviting presenters and helping to write the meeting invitation and summary and arrange other follow-up including that the speakers are given a 1-year gratis organizational/individual membership to CWI.
4. Agree to attend three Board meetings a year- 120-150 minutes in length --to discuss CWI meeting topics, membership growth, policy decisions and annual election cycles. Generally, these meetings are held in August, November and March or April. One of these meetings is typically an in-person lunch meeting and the others are on Zoom.
5. Advise the CWI President/s on supporting or not supporting sign-on letters on various women’s related issues.

Summary Of May 23, 2023, Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues Meeting on “The Importance of the Separation of Church and State for Feminists” Cohosted by Americans United for the Separation of Church and State

AU presenters discussed four issues that demonstrate why church-state separation is important for feminists—healthcare, social services, employment discrimination, and public education. A video recording of the meeting is available on this link <https://youtu.be/77lj5sCospl>.

Maggie Garrett kicked off the discussion by providing an overview of religion law.

If church and state aren’t separate, all of our rights—especially women’s rights—are threatened. While many religions—and perhaps even the majority of religious people in this country—support women’s equality, there is a strong, powerful voice of conservative, white Christian Nationalists who don’t. And they want the government to pass laws that reflect their regressive beliefs.

At its core, the separation of church and state is about equality. It ensures that all people—whether religious or not—are treated the same. And this allows all of us to live as ourselves and believe as we choose.



The First Amendment to the Constitution has two clauses that deal with religion.

The Establishment Clause says that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.” This guarantees the separation of church and state and keeps the government from **advancing, privileging, or disparaging religion—or non-religion**. In short, it’s designed to ensure that the government and religion maintain a healthy distance from each other.

The Free Exercise Clause says that the government “may not prohibit the free exercise” of religion. In 1990, the Supreme Court, in a case called *Employment Division v. Smith*, changed the protections provided under the Free Exercise Clause. After *Smith*, the government may enact **neutral and generally applicable** laws even if they burden religion, but can’t target religious practice for worse treatment—unless it has a compelling interest to do so.

Smith lessened Free exercise protections. A broad coalition, including organizations representing many faiths and denominations, legal experts, and many people from many faiths and denominations, and civil liberties advocates on both the right and left were concerned that this case would deny important religious freedom protections to people who practiced minority faiths. In response, the coalition worked to pass the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which was intended to restore the constitutional test that had existed before *Smith*.

But now RFRA is being frequently misused to harm other people. For example, it is being manipulated to allow discrimination against LGBTQ people and religious minorities, to deny people healthcare, and to allow taxpayer-funded foster care agencies to place religious litmus tests on potential parents and volunteers.

The panel addressed four major categories of church-state separation issues of particular interest to feminists: **healthcare, social services, employment, and education.**

HEALTHCARE

Dena Sher began the discussion about the use of religion to discriminate in healthcare with a look at *Hobby Lobby*.

Hobby Lobby is a for-profit corporation that runs a national chain of craft stores that employs tens of thousands of people. It sued the government because it claimed that because of the religious beliefs of the corporation’s owners, the corporation could not provide its employees with health insurance that covers all the FDA-approved forms of contraception as required by the Affordable Care Act and RFRA permits the corporation to deny its employees this insurance coverage.



In 2014 the Supreme Court ruled on Hobby Lobby’s case. In an unprecedented ruling, the Court, for the first time, used RFRA to grant a for-profit corporation a religious exemption, allowing Hobby Lobby’s owners to impose their religious beliefs on its company’s employees. The Supreme Court also changed the way RFRA works and as a result, it’s out of balance.

For example, RFRA should only come into play when there is a substantial burden on religious exercise. After Hobby Lobby, courts don’t really examine whether a burden that someone might claim really meets the test—courts too often just take people and companies at their word. Also, RFRA should not be used to grant exemptions that cause harm to others. The Supreme Court in Hobby Lobby paid lip service to this idea, but at the same time, didn’t acknowledge that stripping people of insurance coverage for contraception would cause them harm and undermine their access.

And *Hobby Lobby* was not an anomaly. There is a case in Texas where a court said a for-profit employer has a RFRA right not to cover PrEP, an HIV prevention medication, for its employees. And a nurse who works at a Veterans Administration hospital in Texas and has already been given an accommodation not to provide abortion care is trying to use RFRA to stop the facility from providing abortions at all.

Following *Hobby Lobby*, we began to think about how to restore RFRA. The result of this work is the Do No Harm Act, which was recently reintroduced in Congress by Reps. Bobby Scott, Steve Cohen, Jamie Raskin, and Mary Gay Scanlon and Sen. Cory Booker.

The Do No Harm Act amends the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) and restores it to its original intent. The bill will preserve RFRA’s power to protect religious freedom while clarifying that it may not be used to harm others, such as permitting discrimination or denying access to healthcare. **RFRA should never be used to exempt anyone from laws that protect other people’s basic civil rights.**

Under the Do No Harm Act, people could still use RFRA to protect religious exercise. For example, it still could be used to permit Sikhs and Muslims to wear beards or other articles of their faith while serving in the military. **But RFRA could not be used to bypass federal laws in ways that harm other people.**

Catherine Feuille continued the discussion about healthcare but talked about abortion in the post-*Dobbs* world.

When the Supreme Court overturned *Roe* in *Dobbs* in June 2022, states immediately began putting bans on abortion in place. In response, reproductive-rights advocates filed cases in state courts using a variety of approaches to restore the right to abortion.

Americans United, along with National Women’s Law Center, filed one of these state court challenges in Missouri. Our case is the only one that challenges an abortion ban based on the state constitution’s version of the Establishment Clause. Our argument is that, in enacting these abortion restrictions, the Missouri legislature enshrined in law a particular, narrow, Christian belief about when life begins and is forcing everyone to abide by that belief—making the abortion bans and restrictions an unconstitutional establishment of religion. Missouri has more robust protections for church-state separation in its constitution than the federal Establishment Clause does.



We brought the case on behalf of fourteen clergy members representing seven different denominations because the Missouri legislature is imposing a religious belief about abortion that is very different from their own. Indeed, the legislators were very clear about what they were doing. They wrote into the abortion ban statute that “Almighty God is the author of life.” And when they were debating the various bills, they made overtly religious statements in support.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Catherine explained that discrimination by foster care agencies is a big issue in social services. State governments contract with private foster care agencies, which are often religious, to help match prospective parents with children in the foster care system.

But some foster care agencies might refuse to work with same-sex parents, unmarried parents, parents of the “wrong” religion, etc. This kind of discrimination has highly gendered implications. For example, single women make up almost 25% of adoptive parents, compared to single men, which make up only 3.2%—discrimination against unmarried parents falls disproportionately on women. And same-sex couples are seven times more likely to raise adopted and foster children than straight couples and at the same time, nearly 20% of foster youth are LGBTQ—and they benefit from affirming parents.

Americans United is challenging discrimination by taxpayer-funded foster care agencies in several cases. In *Maddonna v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*, we represent Aimee Maddonna, a Catholic mother of three who wanted to volunteer with children in foster care as a path to foster and adopt a child. A taxpayer-funded agency in South Carolina, Miracle Hill, turned her away because they only allow fellow evangelical Protestants to work with foster children. They require volunteers and foster parents to sign their evangelical Protestant Statement of Faith and to

attend one of their approved churches. Miracle Hill has turned away 25-30 other families, including other Catholic families, Jewish families, and same-sex couples.

Instead of denouncing this discrimination, the administrations of President Donald Trump and South Carolina Gov. Henry McMaster doubled down, sanctioning the government-funded religious discrimination. In January 2019, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services used RFRA to issue a blanket waiver allowing all government-funded foster care agencies in South Carolina to reject parents and volunteers who don't share their religious beliefs without being penalized by the federal government; McMaster issued a similar order in March 2018.

The lawsuit seeks to stop the state and federal government from authorizing and encouraging religious discrimination with taxpayer dollars. At its heart, the case is about two of our country's most sacred principles: defending religious freedom for all and protecting vulnerable children. It is a violation of the Establishment Clause to permit taxpayer-funded agencies to discriminate against prospective foster parents and volunteers based on their religion. And no child should be denied an opportunity for a loving, stable home when one is available to them.

We have two similar cases. In *Rutan-Ram v. Tennessee Department of Social Services*, we represent the Rutan-Rams, a Jewish couple that were turned away from a Methodist foster care agency that required foster parents to sign a statement of faith. And in *Marouf v. Becerra*, we represent a same-sex couple who live in Fort Worth and want to provide a home for an unaccompanied refugee child but were turned away because they didn't "mirror the Holy Family."

Dena continued the discussion of the misuse of religion to discriminate in social services.

The government funds many critical services that people, especially women and families, need in their daily lives—such as food banks, homeless or domestic violence shelters, job training centers, and elder care providers. And the government has long partnered with faith-based organizations to do so. The faith-based providers always followed the same rules as secular providers—for example, the faith-based organizations couldn't include religious activities in the services it provides.

During the George W. Bush administration, the federal agencies that distribute millions, if not billions, of dollars annually to fund social services implemented a series of regulations that were intended to blur the line separating church and state. So, it became easier to pressure people seeking services, who are often vulnerable, to participate in religious programming.

The Obama administration updated the regulations and put in important protections for people who use social services. For example, they could ask for an alternative provider if they felt uncomfortable with a religious provider. Unfortunately, the Trump administration stripped those protections and even suggested that faith-based providers can cite religion to ignore program requirements on who the program serves or what services can be provided. The Trump rules made it harder for people to get the services they need, and undermined the effectiveness of vital government-funded social service programs.

The Biden administration has proposed undoing many of the Trump changes and restoring many safeguards. The proposed regulations take important steps towards re-centering people in need, restoring their religious freedom protections, and ensuring they can access critical services. These proposed regulations will help ensure that people who use social services will not be pressured to participate in religious activities or be required to meet a religious litmus test in exchange for the help they need.

EMPLOYMENT

Catherine led off the discussion about discrimination in the workplace by discussing the ministerial exception. The ministerial exception is a doctrine made up by judges in response to the wave of employment protections that came with the passage of laws like Title VII, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The ministerial exception is a carveout in employment discrimination law that says if an employee serves a vital religious function (like a priest), religious employers must be able to hire and fire them at their sole discretion because the religious groups need to be free to choose their own faith leaders. **When properly and narrowly applied, the ministerial exception upholds the separation of church and state by keeping government out of core religious decisions.** But religious conservatives have been trying to expand this doctrine in two frightening ways—in who counts as a minister and what kinds of legal claims are barred.

If religious extremists get their way, the ministerial exception would apply to every employee of every religious organization—from the church pastor down to the janitor. Sometimes the employers do this by slipping a clause into an employment contract labeling them as ministers, even if their job has no religion functions at all. And it's not just churches, but **religiously affiliated schools, hospitals, nonprofits, summer camps, and so on. This would threaten employment protections for more than 2 million workers.**

If this doctrine were expanded as broadly as some are pushing for, it would mean that **any one of those 2 million employees could be fired for literally any reason—for getting pregnant, for being diagnosed with breast cancer, for being a woman who was vocal about gender discrimination in the workplace.** Those are all real examples of ministerial exception cases, where the courts said “Tough luck. Even though those actions violate federal employment protections, your employer gets an exception.”

As for legal claims, it used to be that the ministerial exception would just prevent plaintiffs from prevailing on hiring discrimination and wrongful termination claims—but it's been expanding into new types of claims apart from hiring/firing, including workplace harassment claims; wage and hour regulations, which disproportionately affect women; contract disputes; and even defamation.

Many cases, including some where AU represents workers who were wrongfully terminated, are working their way through the courts.

Dena explained that discrimination in employment isn't limited to religious employers. Other kinds of employers, including for-profit corporations, want to be able use religion to discriminate against their employees and applicants. In 2020 in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, the Supreme Court affirmed that Title VII's bar on sex discrimination includes sexual orientation and gender identity. At the same time, however, the opinion noted that employers might be able to use RFRA to get out of Title VII's requirements. Since then, **at least one federal court has ruled that for-profit businesses can use RFRA to discriminate against LGBTQ employees and applicants—in violation of Title VII. We expect more of these cases to come.**

EDUCATION

Maggie talked about several issues involving public charter schools.

Charter schools are understood to be public schools; they must abide by the Constitution and by nondiscrimination laws. In 2022 in *Carson v. Makin*, the Supreme Court held that if the state funds secular private schools it must fund religious private schools that teach religion. Following this decision, there is a strong push to declare that charter schools are private schools. The result would be that charter schools could discriminate and teach religion—and still get taxpayer funding. The implications are quite serious.

For example, a North Carolina **charter school imposes a dress code that requires girls to wear skirts** “to preserve chivalry” which the school explained means that a woman is “regarded as a fragile vessel that men are supposed to take care of and honor.” The ACLU challenged this dress code on behalf of three female students, asserting that prohibiting girls from wearing pants or shorts violates both Title IX, which prohibits discrimination based on sex in federally funded educational activities, and the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution, which limits discrimination by state and local governmental entities. In *Peltier v. Charter Day School*, the ACLU prevailed on both questions before a full panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. This should be a simple case, but the school asserts that it is essentially a

private school and hence not obligated to comply with any of the requirements of the U.S. Constitution and has appealed that question to the Supreme Court, which is currently deciding whether to hear it next term. If North Carolina charter schools are not state actors, then it is likely that churches and other religious entities will seek to establish publicly funded charter schools in North Carolina and argue that *Carson v Makin* obligates the state to authorize them.

And in Oklahoma, a Catholic school has applied to be a virtual charter school. The application says that it will **“operate the school as a Catholic School.”** The school will be a “place of evangelization” that “participates in the evangelizing mission of the Church.” **It will teach religion to all its students.**

The school is also trying to dodge nondiscrimination laws that apply to public charter schools. If it becomes a charter school, the school says it will adhere to federal laws and statutes, but “only to the extent the teachings of the Catholic Church allow” and that “are not inconsistent with the faith or moral teaching of the catholic Church.”

Oklahoma is a test case and on June 5, 2023, a state board approved the Catholic charter school. Following this decision, we should anticipate additional efforts to fund the teaching of religion and discrimination in charter schools across the country.

QUESTIONS

Q: How can we change course on this and ensure our elected officials support the separation of church and state?

A: Americans United is a 501(c)(3), so we cannot endorse or oppose candidates for office. But we are launching a national campaign focused on building a recommitment to the separation of church and state.

The fundamental right to be treated equally under the law depends upon the separation of church and state. This foundational American principle ensures we all can live as ourselves and believe as we choose. When religious extremists and their lawmaker allies try to force everyone else to live by their beliefs and to use religion as a license to harm others, they threaten our freedom to live as ourselves, which widens inequality in our communities and country. Our nation promises everyone the freedom to believe as they want, but our laws cannot allow anyone to use their religious beliefs to harm others. Separation of church and state frees us to come together as equals and build a stronger democracy.

Q: Can you talk a little about the recently released Department of Education guidance on prayer and religious expression in public schools?

A: The Biden administration updated the guidance, which was first issued in 1996 and had been changed in 2003 and 2020. The newly updated guidance centers the religious freedom of public-school students and reaffirms, public schools must be open and inclusive for students of every religion and none.

Perhaps most importantly, the guidance emphasizes that public school employees, including teachers and coaches, may not coerce students to pray. Nothing about the Supreme Court’s 2022 decision in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School District* that involved a public high school football coach praying after games changes the fact that the Constitution prohibits public schools from sponsoring prayer. This line has always been clear: Public school employees and officials cannot take advantage of their power and position to impose their personal religion on a captive audience of schoolchildren.

Q: Can you talk about religious schools that accept vouchers in the DC private school voucher program?

A: The DC private school voucher program is the only federally funded voucher program in the country. Like all other voucher programs, though, it predominantly funds religious schools and even though the voucher should not fund discrimination, we have found a lot of statements of faith on these schools’ websites.

Although promoted as “school choice,” private school vouchers do not provide real choice to students and parents. The “choice” in voucher programs actually lies with the private schools, which may turn students away for a variety of reasons often including disability, sexual orientation and gender identity, religion, academic achievement, and economic status.

In contrast, public schools are open to all. Public schools educate nearly 90% of our country's students and are a cornerstone of our communities. Private school voucher programs undermine our nation's public schools by diverting desperately needed resources away from the public school system to fund the education of a few, select students in private, often religious, schools.

Private school vouchers fail to improve students' academic achievement. Indeed, they often cause students to perform worse than their peers who aren't in the voucher program: recent studies of the Louisiana, Indiana, Ohio, and Washington, DC, programs show that voucher students experienced significant declines in their academic performance. The impact of accepting a voucher on academic achievement in these programs is on par with or worse than the learning loss caused by Hurricane Katrina and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Private school voucher programs have a sordid history. Rooted in attempts to evade desegregation orders in the wake of *Brown v. Board of Education*, they still fund discrimination today. Despite receiving public funds, voucher schools do not abide by the same civil rights laws as public schools. Students who attend private schools with vouchers are also stripped of protections for their civil rights and liberties. Students with disabilities are especially underserved by vouchers. Voucher schools do not provide the same quantity and quality of services available to students with disabilities in public schools and even deny students with disabilities admission or subject them to inappropriate or excessive suspensions or expulsions.

In addition, voucher programs often lack even the most basic accountability standards and oversight requirements to ensure that taxpayer money is not being wasted.

Q: How do we fight the rewriting of history and manufactured controversies like Critical Race Theory (CRT)?

A: There is so much happening that it can be overwhelming to think about how to fight back. This is an issue that seems to be unfolding at the state and local level. It's possible to make change at the local level, like with school boards. Also keep in mind an interesting stat: most people get their news from local sources, like their local paper. Thus, engagement with local reporters and letters to the editor are really important ways to reach members of your community.

Events of Interest to Feminists (Times are Eastern) Most events are virtual.

Thanks to Montgomery County NOW for sharing information on many of the events.

Tues June 13, 3 pm.-4:30 pm. Women in Sports Careers. Women's Bureau. Virtual. [REGISTER HERE](#)

Wed. June 14. 5pm. A Student Leader Forum on Affirmative Action: What's Next. Virtual. Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and many others. [Register](#) Now

Wed. June 14. 6:30 pm Celebration of Juneteenth: Reynauld Smith's History of the Holiday. Virtual. Montgomery County Women's Democratic Club [FOR MORE INFO AND TO REGISTER](#)

Thur. June 15, 6:-7 PM NWHM Presents! The Continued Legacy of Title IX. Conversation with Eileen Tamura and Sherry Boschert. National Women's History Museum. [Register](#)

Thur. June 15; 8 pm Virtual Welcome Call Training. Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America: [FOR MORE INFO AND TO REGISTER](#)

Sat. June 17 and Sun June 18 and Fri June 23. View Washington's feminist history from a LGBTQ+ perspective on a walking tour that highlights stories of defiance, resistance, and triumph. Smithsonian [FOR MORE INFO AND TO REGISTER](#)

Tues. June 20, Noon to 1:30 pm. CWI election meeting and discussion of strategies to ensure ERA is in the Constitution as the 28th Amendment and will be fully implemented. [Registration Link](#)

Tues. June 20, 1:30-5 pm. Hybrid Event iOme College Challenge Forum. New Perspectives: An Intergenerational Discussion on Retirement Solutions. WISER Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement. [REGISTER](#)

Tues. June 20, 6:30-8:30 pm WDC Biennial Meeting & Officer Election Congressman Jamie Raskin & Lt. Gov. Aruna Miller Glen Echo Park Bumper Car Pavilion & Reception. Montgomery Co. Women's Democratic Club.

Tues. June 20, 6:45 pm Virtual Lecture. Gender Sexuality, and the Fairy Tale. Folklorists Sara Cleto and Brittany Warman uncover some surprisingly unconventional old fairy tales and discuss how modern writers' LGBTQ+ twists on tradition can be wonderfully disruptive to our expectations of stories that begin with "Once upon a time." Smithsonian [FOR MORE INFO AND TO REGISTER](#)

Sat. June 24, Women's March, Washington DC and other locations to establish National Day of Action.

Wed. June 28. 4-5:15 pm. The Gender Wage Gap and Occupational Segregation: Tackling the Undervaluation of Human Services Work and Care Work. IWPR and Equal Pay Today

Fri. June 30-Sun. July 2, National NOW Conference, Arlington, VA. You can register for the 2023 NOW National Conference. This year we are meeting in Arlington, VA at the Doubletree by Hilton Crystal City. [Register Here](#)

Fri July 21-Sat. July 22. ERA Centennial Convention, Seneca Falls, NY [For more information and to register](#)
If you live in Maryland, DC or Virginia and would like info about transportation and/or housing for this trip, contact info@mcmdnow.org and we'll connect you with those planning group packages.

Sun. July 30, 3-4pm Virtual. Women's History Book Club: The Secret History of Home Economics. National Women's History Museum. [Register](#)

CWI's newsletter is endowed in loving memory of our previous longtime editor, Roslyn Kaiser

Newsletter edited by Sue Klein

CWI BOARD OF DIRECTORS, JULY 2022 - JUNE 2024

OFFICERS: Co-Presidents, Sue Klein and Connie Cordovilla who is also VP Membership; Treasurer, Holly Taggart Joseph; Secretary, Sheila Wickowski; VP Public Relations, Loretto Gubernatis; VP Legal Affairs, Jeanette Lim Esbrook; VP Technology, Sherry Klein; VP Organizational Management, Anne Martin; VP Diversity, Alotta Taylor; VP Health Equity, Amy L. Hinojosa, Director, Linda Fihelly; Ex Officio: Co-President, Harriett Stonehill.

Copyright© 2023 Clearinghouse on Women's Issues (CWI). All rights reserved.

700 Seventh St. SW, Suite 3, Washington, DC 20024 Tel. 202/438-5655

<https://womensclearinghouse.org>



Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues Membership Form

<https://womensclearinghouse.org/>

The CWI membership year is: **July 1-June 30**. Multi-year and Gift memberships are encouraged and discounted! Please fill in beginning and end years (e.g. 2022-2025 for a 3-yr membership). Members will receive CWI newsletters and meeting announcements as well as other feminist news and event notifications. Membership dues and contributions are tax-deductible to the extent provided by Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP

NAME _____ EMAIL _____
STREET ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____
PHONE: H/W _____ CELL _____

OR

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

ORGANIZATION NAME _____
STREET ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____
Organization website address (URL): _____
NAME & EMAIL of Org. Rep.: 1) _____
PHONE _____ CELL _____
NAME & EMAIL of Org. Rep.: 2) _____
PHONE _____ CELL _____

Membership Years Covered: 202_ - 202_ (Check your Membership Type)

	Individual	Organization	Young Adult (< 30 yrs. old)	Virtual (outside DC area)
One-year	\$25	\$40	\$15/yr.	\$20/yr.
Two-year	\$45	\$70	Gift Membership (insert information in individual or organization membership)	
Three-year	\$65	\$100		

Membership Dues Amount: _____
Tax deductible donation: _____
TOTAL ENCLOSED = _____
Date of Payment _____

- Mail form & check to Connie Cordovilla, Membership Chair, CWI, 7439 Patterson Rd., Falls Church, VA 22043-1332; or
- Pay through PayPal, by selecting the desired membership option on our website’s membership page <https://womensclearinghouse.org/membership/> & please send this form by mail to the above address or email it to MembershipChair@womensclearinghouse.org; or
- Bring a check, payable to CWI, and this completed form to a CWI meeting. (Form Revised: 10/13/20)