

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

SARAH WEDDINGTON INTERVIEW
MAKERS: WOMEN WHO MAKE AMERICA
KUNHARDT FILM FOUNDATION

Sarah Weddington
Lawyer & Reproductive Rights Activist
7/15/2011
Interviewed by Nancy Armstrong
Total Running Time: 41 minutes and 7 seconds

START TC: 00:00:00:00

ON SCREEN TEXT:

Makers: Women Who Make America
Kunhardt Film Foundation

ON SCREEN TEXT:

Sarah Weddington
Lawyer & Reproductive Rights Activist

Sarah Weddington
Lawyer & Reproductive Rights Activist

00:00:07:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

I would like to start out just talking about your childhood, where you grew up, tell me about your upbringing, what that was like?

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

00:00:13:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

I had a very typical upbringing for west Texas. Munday, Canyon, Vernon, Lubbock, all the upper part of Texas. My father was a Methodist minister. He's now deceased. And so, we moved every four years. Now the good part about that was that you had people who were always being complementary. If you are the preacher's kid and you play a good game of ping-pong, somebody will compliment you on it.

00:00:43:00

I was always doing the devotional and the choir, being involved in civic things. Grew up, by age four and five, my father was teaching religion at McMurry College, now university, in Abilene, Texas. So I was used to singing before the various things at McMurry or... just being involved in lots of things. As I was older, I was the president of The Future Homemakers of America of Canyon High School.

00:01:18:00

I never learned to cook very well but I really learned a lot about leadership. I was the secretary of the student body at McMurry College. Now the Dean told me that women could not be president or vice president but that I could run for secretary. So my roommate and I decided what we would do—because we wanted to be more in control than just the secretary—is we ran my boyfriend for vice president, we ran her boyfriend for president, and we ran the school from my suite.

00:01:52:00

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

Then I was the first year secretary of my law school class, so I was involved in leadership activities, always. I had wonderful teachers in college, and I can't help but give them a lot of credit for what I've done. One was named Dr. Selma Bishop. She was my English teacher, and I think she had a red pen reserved only for my papers. And I would get those papers back with more linings and... But she taught me to write.

00:02:26:00

So when I got ready to write a book, or write a brief for the case Roe versus Wade, Dr. Selma Bishop and what she did for me was right with me. Dr. Caroline Couch Blair, who was my speech teacher- So for her, I did debate, I did extemporaneous speaking, I did poetry interpretation. All kinds of things. And so after I won Roe versus Wade, she called and she said, "Congratulations Sarah. We've done it again."

00:02:55:00

I do think that as you're growing up, the more things you can do, the more useful it may be as time goes by. So when I was General Council of US Department of Agriculture, I was able to go on a horseback trip into the wilderness of Montana to look at wild and scenic river litigation we were doing because I'd learned to ride on the plains of west Texas. And I think there's something about Texas.

00:03:25:00

Texans tend to think big, and so it didn't occur to me that I couldn't do something. And when somebody said, "You can't do that-" Like I was doing- When I grew up, if you said to me, "What did you want to be when you grew

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

up?" I would say I wanted- Well, they said you could be a secretary, a nurse or a teacher. All of those are wonderful things to be and I learned to type very well, but I decided that I would be a teacher.

00:03:54:00

I was going to teach eighth graders to love Baywolf. I tried, I did my practice teaching and decided I would do something else. And so I decided I wanted to go to law school, went to talk to the Dean of the college and he said, "You can't go to law school. No woman has ever gone to law school from this college. It would be too tough." So you know the day I decided I was going to law school, and did, and later there was an article in a local paper that said, "First McMurry Graduate Graduates Law School."

00:04:27:00

And I wondered what he was thinking that day. But I learned that when people said, "Women can't, women don't, women shouldn't," that often we should try. And many times when you try, you're able to do it.

00:04:41:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

How did you choose it and what did that mean for you?

00:04:43:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

If yo had asked me in college, "What are you going to do with your life," I would've said, "I'm going to teach eighth graders to love Baywolf." I was an

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

English and Speech Secondary Education major. But when I was doing my practice teaching, I found eighth graders were usually more involved with each other and other parts of their life. Baywolf was not at the center of their interest. And so, I decided maybe I should find something else to do.

00:05:13:00

And there was one lawyer in our church. I went to talk to him. Mother suggested for me to see him, and he talked to me about being a lawyer. There were no women lawyers in the little towns where I had been. But he encouraged me to try it 'cause he said it requires writing, it requires speaking, it involves being involved with people, and those were things I had done. So I applied for law school, took the admission test. I was one of five women admitted to the University of Texas Law School in 1964.

00:05:51:00

So I went to law school and found that it was something- It was very interesting to me, reading cases, the kind of talk. I'll never forget there was one day in law school when my constitutional law professor, a man named George Schatzki, let me ask a question, and he said, "I don't know. I'll tell you tomorrow." I still remember that after all these years because I had such respect for the professors.

00:06:20:00

Worked my way through both law school and my campaign and everything else, but I look back and the law to me involved the things that I was interested in, that I was good at. I enjoyed the people I met in law school, some of them are still my best friends. And so in some ways, I think you try

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

something, not knowing that it's going to be just perfect for you, but trying it and it turns out to be great.

00:06:49:00

Now in law school, if somebody had said to me, "You are going to try a US Supreme court case in a few years," I would not have expected that. But when I got out of law school, I couldn't get a traditional job, so I ended up working for a professor at the law school and eventually was asked if I would work on a case.

00:07:12:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

How did you come to argue a case before the Supreme Court?

00:07:15:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

As I was working in what was called "Boys Town" at the University of Texas Law School at that point, almost everybody who was a professor, junior professor at various positions, were young men. So it was called Boys Town. And I was the first one, the only woman, to have an office in Boys Town. And when a group from the consciousness raising group said, "Could we tell women the good places to go, or would we be prosecuted as accomplices to the crime of abortion?"

00:07:52:00

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

I said, "I don't know. I'll go to the library and look it up." The law in Texas was that all abortion was illegal except to save the life of the woman, and no one knew exactly what that meant. Did that mean she had to die the next day if she didn't have one, or it would shorten her life, or what did that mean? And so doctors generally would not do any procedures for fear of prosecution.

00:08:20:00

What I discovered were some cases before that, that were very important. One was called Griswold versus Connecticut and it went back- 1965 was when it was decided by the US Supreme Court. Connecticut and other states had laws that said no one may have access contraception, and a woman in Connecticut named Estelle Griswold, who was director of Planned Parenthood in New Haven, Connecticut, with the doctor there, Lee Buxton, gave a married couple a contraceptive device-

00:08:58:00

-and they were arrested, prosecuted and convicted of being an accomplice to the use of a contraceptive device. That went all the way to the US Supreme Court, and the court in 1965 said there is a right of privacy under the US Constitution, that includes the decision of whether to bear or beget a child. And so contraception became legal, at least for married people. Now the law didn't mention married or single.

00:09:30:00

It's just that it was a married couple who were involved in the Griswold case. Not long after that Massachusetts, and some other states, passed a law

saying, “Okay, maybe we can't prevent married people from using contraception, but no single person may use contraception and if they do, it's a crime.” A man named Bill Baird gave a speech in Massachusetts at The University of Massachusetts, I believe, and afterwards he gave a tube of contraceptive foam to an unmarried woman.

00:10:04:00

He was arrested, convicted, of being an accomplice to the use of a contraceptive device by an unmarried person. And that went to the Supreme Court and the law was overturned on the basis that the right of privacy extends both to married and unmarried persons. So when I found those, it seemed to me that that right of privacy should also extend to the issue of whether to continue or terminate pregnancy.

00:10:38:00

That that shouldn't be the government's business, that should be an individual's decision. I also found that there were cases started in various places around the country. So when I filed Roe Versus Wade, it was not that that was the only case. There were a number of cases, different lawyers were filling. It was, however, the case that some cases, the right party failed to appeal and some- I mean, there were a whole variety of procedural problems.

00:11:11:00

And so eventually, there were two cases accepted by the US Supreme Court on the issue of who gets to decide whether a woman will have an abortion—the woman or the state. And one was Texas, which is the law I just described, and the other was Georgia, which had what was then called the liberalized

law. So it said there can be no abortion except for rape, incests, fetal deformity, or to save the life or health of the woman. And then there were a number of procedural things that related to the procedure.

00:11:50:00

And so, those two cases were accepted by the US Supreme Court and those two cases became the focus of people interested in this area around the country. So ours was Roe, which is a false name for a real woman who was pregnant and didn't want to continue the pregnancy. Roe versus Wade. Wade was the district attorney of Dallas and we had sued him because he was the person responsible for enforcing the anti-abortion statute.

00:12:26:00

We went before a three judge federal court in Dallas and the court ruled that there was a right of privacy, that it should be an individual decision, not the governments. And the next morning, Henry Wade had a press conference and he said he didn't care what any federal court said, he would continue to prosecute. Well, the court had said that they weren't going to grant an injunction.

00:12:55:00

I had asked that the court tell Henry Wade to stop prosecuting doctors and they said they weren't going to tell him that because they thought he would abide by a three judge federal court decision. He had the press conference saying, "I don't care what they say. I'm going to continue to prosecute," and he did not mean to help us. But he did, because the Supreme Court is more likely

to accept a case if a three judge federal court has declared a law unconstitutional but it's continuing to be enforced.

00:13:27:00

And so we got to skip the first circuit where you would usually have to go. We got to appeal directly to the US Supreme Court and we had filed the case in 19- Well, we were working on it in 1969, filed it in '70. Our first hearing before the US Supreme Court was in the fall of '71. Instead of a decision of really telling us what the law was going to be, how the Constitution applied, we got a decision that we had to come back and reargue it.

00:14:04:00

There were three different things that were said might be the reason. But one was that there were seven judges in 1971 and the court thought it was such an important case that there should be nine judges to hear it as there normally are on the Supreme Court. So we went back and argued it again, October of 1972, and then we got the decision, January 22nd, 1973.

00:14:32:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

When did you realize that you would be the one arguing the case?

00:14:35:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

In terms of when did I know it would be the Texas case that would be before the court, it's when I got a notice from the Supreme Court. We had filed a

brief, a paper, saying, "Please accept our case. We want to argue this before the Supreme Court." And eventually I got a notice from the Supreme Court that said that my case would be accepted. I think it also told me the Georgia case would be heard the same time, but if the court didn't tell me, I knew very quickly that would be the case.

00:15:05:00

So we would be the two cases from all over the country, out of all the cases pending, that would be heard by the US Supreme Court. And immediately we were the focus of all the attorneys, of all the groups, because there were lots of public groups who were very involved in working with trying to change the anti-abortion statutes. They all focused on this so it became the focus. Now I went to New York because a man named Roy Lucas had said that he would be glad to help with the case.

00:15:39:00

So I came up here, which is where he had an office, and got here and discovered there were a couple of law students who were here working on the case. And so... there was no progress. I was so frustrated. And I had just finished putting my husband through law school, so I called and asked if he would come up and help us and he did. We were working on Patchin Place, Number 33 Patchin Place.

00:16:08:00

And eventually I went back to Texas, started waiting. The Supreme Court gave us the date and then the issue was who's going to argue. Mr. Lucas suggested that he should argue the case. Well... And I was trying to figure out how all

that should be. Because on the one hand, it's really a woman's issue and so a lot of people were saying a woman ought to argue this case.

00:16:34:00

There was some other lawyers here in town, in New York, who felt that Mr. Lucas was not well received by the U.S. Supreme Court the one time he had argued there and it would be inappropriate for him to be the one. I had talked to the Supreme Court Clerk to see if we could have permission for him to argue part of the case and me to argue part of the case, and they said, "No." A Supreme Court case is one hour, thirty minutes per side.

00:17:04:00

And the clerk said, "If one person argued half the case, say fifteen minutes, and then the other person gets up to argue, and a Justice wants to ask a question, you couldn't say, 'Well, you can't ask that...'. Just make it too complicated." So the clerk said, "No. Just one person." So I'm still agonizing about this, and I call the clerk to talk about it and I said, "I'm trying to decide who's going to argue the case." And she said, "Well we know who's going to argue the case."

00:17:35:00

And I said, "You do!?" And she said, "Yes. Mr. Lucas has sent us a notice that he will argue the case." Once I knew that, I knew who was going to argue it and it wasn't Mr. Lucas. It turns out that the person who decides who will argue the case are the plaintiffs, and so in this case, we had an unmarried pregnant woman, we had a couple who were afraid of pregnancy and talked about their need to know that it was their decision,-

00:18:09:00

-and then there was a doctor who had intervened, which means asked to be a plaintiff in the case, and he was under pending criminal indictment for allegedly having performed an abortion. And so the clerk said, "Plaintiffs decide." So I talked to each of them. They knew me. They didn't know him. They said, "No. You argue it." So I sent in the notice that said, "I will argue the case."

00:18:34:00

And then I started getting ready, spent hours reading. And the day before the argument I came to Washington. And Harriet Pilpel, a lawyer from New York but who was the lead council for Planned Parenthood, met me and arranged at the Press Club in Washington D.C. for all kinds of lawyers who were working on cases all over the country to come and do what we call a moot court.

00:19:04:00

They would act like they were the U.S. Supreme Court, ask questions, I would answer. People would say, "Well, it might be better if you said a little more of this or emphasized that," or, "We think Justice so-and-so is more interested in this issue. You ought to be sure and cover that." And so they really helped me prepare. And then in the Supreme Court, the person arguing a case normally is given six seats that you can say who's going to sit there.

00:19:35:00

I had called and said, "This is such a big case. So many people are interested. Could I please have twelve seats?" And they had said yes. And then the

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

Attorney General of Texas, one of his top lawyers was gonna be arguing against me, but I called and he wasn't using all of his seats so I got a few more. So all of the lawyers who came to help me prepare also got seats in the Supreme Court for the argument.

00:20:02:00

And it was such an exciting but also tense argument. I couldn't go to sleep the night before 'cause I was playing in my mind, "What if they ask me such and such? What should I answer?" All the things that might happen. And so I was up very early getting ready to go over to the court, be there to talk to people who were coming. And then Supreme Court arguments starts at ten o'clock, so into the courtroom seated a few minutes before ten.

00:20:36:00

And when it's time for the court to start, you have three rows of what look like church pews with fancy padding that people- some who've come first come first serve to sit there, some who are in those seats that have been designated, and then there's a gold railing and lawyers who had admitted to Supreme Court practice get to sit there. And it's interesting 'cause a lot of weddings, if you're there for the bride, you sit on her side, if you're there for the groom-

00:21:05:00

Well, in the Supreme Court, if you're there for the plaintiff, you sit on their side, if you're there for the defendant, you sit on that side, so those seats were packed. When I got ready to sit, to my left was an area for 300- no, 100 members of the press. The entire courtroom holds about 300. On the left- to

my left would be the Attorney General's people, and then beyond that a section for family and friends of the Justices.

00:21:35:00

You're in a room with thirteen kinds of marble, really high columns, a very high ceiling with gold gilts and greens and blues, very vivid colors. No further than from me, to say five feet away, would be the bench where the judges would soon be sitting- Justices. And when it's time, ten o'clock, the marshal comes out in striped pants and cutaway tails, and says, in essence, "Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! All ye, please rise and face the cooooooourt."

00:22:13:00

Everyone stands. The curtains behind the bench part. The judges are silhouetted in their black robes and they start marching in. Take their seats. Their clerks put their materials in front of them. And the hearing in Roe versus Wade started.

00:22:35:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

It's one thing to know that you have to be composed and be self-possessed, it's another to do it under extreme circumstances. Where do you think that came from inside of you? To be able to not just want to do it, but to nail it.

00:22:48:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

I was lucky because I had been in public to speak so much. From the time I was four and five, I was in front of the public. When I ran for the legislature, I was in front of the public. So being in front of the public, I had a good bit of experience with. The other thing was I had spent so many hours getting ready that I felt very prepared to speak to the judges.

00:23:20:00

But the other part is when you really are in a situation where you know your words will have impact in so many situations for so long- You have done moot courts with- I mean, I had done moot courts not just the day before with lawyers from all over the country, but I had done moot courts with some of my law professors, with other lawyers, with women who were in that consciousness raising group, with law students, with all kinds of people who were very generous with their time to help me get ready.

00:23:54:00

And then I think when it comes down to it, you just calm yourself and you say, "I've got to do the very best I can. I want to win this case." And it was like, I was so nervous until I stood. And once I- Oh, and I had done a notebook. I had these sheets with things I could flip. Like the provisions of the Constitution, background cases, other cases, so I could- If I needed to know when *Griswold versus Connecticut* was, I had it right there. I could flip that note. I was ready with everything.

00:24:33:00

The truth was I never got to look at any of that because once you get started, you're so involved in answering the judges and thinking about what you have

to do. But once I was up, I was totally calm. I was not nervous at all. Now when I walked out of the courtroom after the hearing, somebody asked me a question. I had no idea. You're so into it that when the hearing was over, I couldn't- I had to say to people, "Did I get this in? What did I say? What did they ask?" You're so nervous that you're so concentrated that it's really hard for you to remember everything.

00:25:12:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

Tell me about the moment you heard the decision.

00:25:14:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

Things were going crazy. People were coming to see what was happening. My whole office was- I don't think we were screaming, but I'm sure it was a lot of noise being made. People coming- And then the phones were going crazy because other members of the press were calling, people from other parts of the country that had been active in helping were calling. I mean, it was pandemonium all day, and then that night, there was finally a time to just sit and think about it.

00:25:44:00

If anybody had said then, "You will still be talking about this in thirty-eight and a half years," never would have believed that. I knew there would be a time when services would begin to be provided, when the public would

accept that women got- that couples got to decide about contraception, people got to decide about contraception, that women should make decisions about what their reproductive life would be.

00:26:16:00

It never occurred to me it would be the major issue that it is today, with almost every state legislature involved in deciding all kinds of provisions, not that make abortion illegal, but that make it very hard to have access. It would be a major issue in the Congress. It would be a major issue in political races. And so here we are at thirty-eight and a half years later, and it is one of the most important and most crucial issues in American life.

00:26:54:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

Just generally, what were the principles, who wrote it, what was in this decision?

00:26:58:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

Roe versus Wade was written by Justice Harry Blackmun. Harry Blackmun had been a council to Mayo Clinic before he went on the bench, and had been somebody who had worked with doctors in a hospital, very knowledgeable about medical issues. One of the interesting sidelines is that he had been the best man for Justice Berger at his wedding. They were called the Minnesota Twins.

00:27:27:00

They were both from Minnesota, they often had similar attitudes about things. So Berger appointed Blackmun. The Chief Justice gets to decide who rights an opinion if he, as Chief Justice, is on the majority side. So he appointed Blackmun to write the opinion. Blackmun wrote an opinion that started out talking about the history of the concept of privacy, and then talked about the Constitution and some of the constitutional issues that are involved.

00:28:01:00

And basically said that in an instance where a person is so much affected by an issue, it should not be the government's decision, it should be a matter of privacy for the woman- for the people involved, to make that decision. Blackmun went on and said this does not mean that there can be no regulation about abortion. It's not really a part of the opinion, but it's sort of advisory language that he put in.

00:28:35:00

And there was controversy about whether that was appropriate or not, but he basically said if a state does decide to regulate, they could regulate in the sense of making restrictions about abortion in later pregnancy. A few other things like that. So it was Blackmun who wrote the opinion. It was basically looking at history and then looking at the current situation, the number of women who had illegal abortions, people leaving the country,-

00:29:09:00

-and then why he felt that the right of privacy included reproductive issues and then that he wasn't saying there could be no regulation what-so-ever, but giving some guidelines about what it could be. There were two judges that were dissenting, and those judges were basically saying that they felt that the state could regulate and that the Texas law was appropriate.

00:29:37:00

So it was seven to two. The makeup of the U.S. Supreme Court has changed through the years and that's part of the reason we really worry now about what is going to be the future of the Supreme Court and how the judges rule. We know there are more judges on the Supreme Court now who say, "No. There is not a right of privacy in this regard."

00:30:02:00

Usually it's a four-four vote with one Justice Kennedy, on some issues, being in the middle. So whatever Kennedy decides, is very important. But you've had several new judges recently and so we don't know how they're going to decide on everything.

00:30:21:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

On the negative side, any backlash?

00:30:23:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

The decision was received by a lot of people who said, "How great. We are so glad. Now we've got other issues we've needed to work on." There certainly were those who were very opposed, and so within a few months, certain religious groups—Catholic, you would not be surprised by that—had begun to organize against the decision. There were some other religious groups that were- There had been a lot of religious groups who were pro-choice. So there were a lot of groups that began to organize, and very slowly, the issue became more and more concentrated and more and more in the headlines.

00:31:05:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

What do you think is the most important impact of the case? What did the ruling mean in a broader sense for women?

00:31:11:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

The ruling in the broadest sense meant that women were told the U.S. Supreme Court recognized that the Constitution gave to them—not to the government, not to the state governments, not to the federal government, not to governments—the decisions of what their response would be, what their decisions would be if they found they were pregnant. Now certainly women should have all options to carry the pregnancy to term, to terminate the pregnancy, carry the pregnancy to term, give the child up for adoption.

00:31:50:00

It was part—in my opinion—of trying to recognize that the woman has to decide what will be the future of her body and that nobody else should be able to tell her what she can do. Because there was a time before Roe versus Wade when government tried to tell women that they had no option of terminating a pregnancy, and we know what happened. And that was that many women ended up in hospitals, IOB, carrying a pregnancy to term that they did not want to carry with all kinds of negative social consequences.

00:32:26:00

Sometimes psychological consequences, medical consequences. But through the years, the controversy just gets more and more intense. We had in '04, a March in Washington for women's lives. It's only time I've talked to a million people on The Mall of the Capital. And there were so many people there, mostly women but a lot of men as well. There were picketers, there were protestors, just as there are in various state capitals when these issues are up.

00:33:03:00

So the conflict is getting more and more in the front lines. It will be, I think, one of the big things talked about in the next presidential election, in elections of all kinds of people, as we have state, local, county, federal elections coming up.

00:33:22:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

What's your biggest concern for Roe v. Wade moving forward?

00:33:26:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

There are two primary concerns about Roe versus Wade moving forward. One is that the Supreme Court could change. If you had a President appointed who was opposed to Roe versus Wade, as President Bush was, he could appoint people- he or she could appoint people opposed to Roe versus Wade to be on the US Supreme Court and you could end up with a majority of the court being against Roe and overturning Roe at a future time.

00:33:59:00

The other thing you could have, which is what's happening- is what I see happening now, is that legislatures are passing so many restrictions, so many things that are- Oh, like Texas has passed a bill saying no woman may have an abortion unless first, she has a sonogram, and then a doctor must describe to her everything that's happening in her body to the fetus, let her hear the sound of a heart beat.

00:34:31:00

It was passed by people who are not worried about her medical situation or psychological situation. They're trying to make her decide not to go forward with an abortion. Women have- Often laws are being passed that women have to have counseling within so many hours before the procedure. There are things that make it harder and harder for women to afford even contraception.

00:34:58:00

So there's lots of things happening with particular states, some federal legislation, that make it very hard for women to have the right to make decisions of their own. So those are the two aspects of how this right to make your own decision could be undermined, and in some cases, really made a part of history but not a part of the present.

00:35:25:00

And I worry about that because once again, I think we would end up seeing the tragedies and all the difficulties of a prior time, and that women with money would leave the state they're in to go wherever they had to go to get procedures and women without money would end up having no choices. I hope that never happens.

00:35:46:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

In retrospect, is it a strange feeling that you reach one of the pinnacles of your career at age twenty-six?

00:35:52:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

It is. It is hard to think that I did what may be the thing for which I am best known at twenty-six. I argued twenty-six and twenty-seven. I was twenty-seven when the case was decided. And so in some ways, I am historic. We're talking about something I was working on starting in 1969. And it's

strange because you assume as you age, as you go through life, that you will do things that are more and more important.

00:36:27:00

Now I do think what I did in the state legislature was important because I helped pass the Equal Credit Bill. We changed things that related to rape laws. In the White House working with President Carter and under his direction, we put more women into federal judicial posts, into federal administrative posts. We helped to change the laws that related to women in military, to give women more options.

00:36:55:00

We started funding for domestic violence, trying to prevent and to treat domestic violence. So there are a lot of things I've done through the years, but certainly Roe versus Wade is the thing for which I will always be best known.

00:37:13:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

So let's talk about your role in the push for ERA, and what do you think is the core reason it failed at the time?

00:37:19:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

When I look back at the ERA- When I was running for office, I called for the ERA to be passed. And in Texas, it was passed. We were one of the early states. But we had to get 38 states to approve it for it to become law. And we

got close, but we lacked, I think three. Now, President Carter assigned an extension of the time for the ERA to be ratified.

00:37:48:00

And so I do have a picture of the President signing that with many important women of the period surrounding him. But even in the extended period, we had not- we were not able to get all of the states that we needed to ratify. I think, in part, it was because people would say, "Oh, if the ERA passes, women will be drafted." Well, I don't think that's true at all. I mean, men aren't drafted now.

00:38:14:00

So I think there were a lot of things that were false, but people didn't realize they were false. I think today, it will still be hard to get the ERA ratified. There has been a bill introduced just recently to pass the ERA, and I'm hoping it passes and I'm hoping it's ratified. But I think there are so many issues now that we're dealing with, and we get so many people saying things I don't think are true, that it's made it hard to get ERA passed.

00:38:48:00

NANCY ARMSTRONG:

What's the most meaningful piece of advice you've ever received?

00:38:52:00

SARAH WEDDINGTON:

KUNHARDT **FILM** FOUNDATION

I think the most meaningful piece of advice I've ever had is my father's sermon called, "Have an Attitude of Gratitude." Because I think more, we as individuals are grateful for the good things that have happened, the more good things tend to happen. And so that attitude of gratitude, I think- And I could list so many things for which I am grateful. I'm grateful for my university professors who taught me so many things,-

00:39:23:00

-my law professors that gave me so many opportunities, a lawyer named Ed Wright from Little Rock, a lawyer from Texas named John Sutton, who showed me a kind of human relations. I was young, I was an inexperienced lawyer, we were working with a group of very important- the guy who started Eastern Airlines, a guy who'd been a supreme court justice, but when I would walk up to the group, Ed Wright would say, "Now, Sarah, you haven't tried a case like this, but-"

00:39:52:00

And he would- just by saying my name, he made me feel so included. And that was part of my being grateful. There have been so many people who've helped me through the years. My former students, who have often encouraged me in moments when I was discouraged about different things. And what they accomplish, I'm so grateful I've been able to work with very talented university seniors who are just great young people, and I am so grateful to have had that chance.

00:40:24:00

KUNHARDT **FILM** / FOUNDATION

The chance to be part of this program. There's a great quote one of my students used in a speech in my class that said, "The only things that last forever are words." And I think, as the words of this program are available for people, they will last forever. As I start to write another book, it's something that will last, and so I'm very grateful to be part of sending words out to others that I hope will find them useful and meaningful.

END TC: 00:41:07:00