

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 6, 1972

of potentials: that with careful molding and continuous attention, to his rearing, he could be fashioned into a well rounded human achiever. Conversely, without that attention, he could be crippled for life. They did not realize that the rearing of a child is the most challenging thing a woman could do which would give her a sense of fulfillment far beyond any other occupation. Men of course, have a role in this child rearing too, but it was recognized that the family could not be as all consuming for them since they still had their careers and their role of the bread winner. The women forgot that it is to them that the over-riding challenge of molding the child into a fearless personality fell. They also forgot that to do this, they had to sacrifice not just a career, but also themselves and a large part of their outside interests.

What they should have done, they have left undone, doing what they should not have done; coming together to fight for an undeserved "liberty." To me, their movement is not worthy of its cause and they will surely fail.

They are querrying the natural position of "helper" which has been bestowed upon them since their creation. They want to be "free," live their own lives, and be equal to men in everything. A condition which the creator did not make for them during creation. The Bible tells us in Ephesians 5: 22-24, "Let wives be subject to their husbands as to the Lord; because a husband is head of the wife, just as Christ is head of the church, being himself savior of the body. But just as the church is subject to Christ, so also let wives be to their husbands in all things." The object of the Women's Liberation Movement is a sharp contrast to these words of the Bible. They want to make a new Bible. They want to turn the world upside down and fashion it into whatever they want. This is fanatical and meaningless.

Should the government support them and give them the power to do what they want? NO! It should not happen in our time. Their mothers had known their duty, and they had done it, but they had built a fence around themselves to prevent them from doing theirs.

Let us break down this wall and make them realize that their place is in the home where they have to take care of the children and make out of them good citizens of tomorrow who will one day look back with pride and say, "Oh, I remember my mother." Let us make them realize that good memories are made of good works done by good people. That it is not fighting for an undeserved freedom that makes the world peaceful but building a peace loving and law abiding citizen out of their children.

The acceptance of the Women's Liberation Movement and all it stands for by the government will not bring peace and solution to the world's problems; instead it will bring social disruption, unhappiness, and increasing rates of divorce and desertion. This is a contrast to what the Bible tells us in First Corinthians 7: 10-11, "But to those who are married, not I, but the Lord commands that a wife is not to depart from her husband, and if she departs, that she is to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. And let not a husband put away his wife."

The Bible contains the words of God and if America is "A Nation under God," will she not be seeking her own destruction by going against the commandment of God? On these grounds, I am sure you will agree with me that the Women's Liberation Movement should not only be banned by the government, but also be completely eradicated and totally discouraged.

Thank you.

[Third Place]

IS WOMEN'S LIBERATION GOOD FOR AMERICA?
(By Joyce Hughes, May 26, 1972)

Men—I hate 'em! Arrogant, selfish, egoistical men! They think they rule the earth

with their masculinity. They force us to be their slaves—cook their dinner, scrub their floors, and have their babies. Then what thanks do we get? "Where's my shirt?" "The least you can do is have dinner ready when I get home. After all, a man has to work for a living." (At least he gets paid for his work.)

"YOU—run for city council? Why, you dingbat women don't even have sense enough to vote."

Men—I hate 'em! And what's more, I'm tired of being pushed around by them. You know what I think we ought to do? I think we ought to Revolt! Overthrow! Men—I hate 'em!

If I were to boldly state that I am for Women's Liberation, this is the attitude that you might expect me to take toward men. To borrow a colloquial expression, "tain't necessarily so." The hostility of the radical members of Women's Liberation may prove to be more damaging than helpful in attaining the ultimate goals of the organization. People with sufficient intelligence and breeding have learned to maintain control of their faculties, hence they do not stoop to radicalism which is the trademark of ignorant (though often educated) extremist. In our eagerness as women to break away into new areas of development we must not overstep our bounds and thus deprive ourselves of that which we most greatly desire—respect.

Being for the advancement of women in society is not synonymous with being against the male in his position of leadership and authority. The male status does not necessarily have to be lowered in order for the female status to be raised. Israel's famous grandmother and plain-speaking stateswoman Golda Meir, has proven that a woman may also possess the qualities of leadership.

While there is an active Women's Liberation Organization, it is interesting to note that there is no comparable Anti-Women's Lib movement from the male aspect of our society. As a whole, today's men seem willing to accept women into their ranks in the business world, professional occupations, and the educational fields. Their practical minds and competence, self-assurance, and intelligence attractive in feminine attire.

A woman does not have to be "manish" to be a part of the man's world, nor does she have to speak their language. They don't expect it because, after all, she's a woman. It is not only possible for a woman to maintain her femininity while at the same time performing her duties with executive efficiency, but also to her advantage.

All of this seems to indicate that women are waging psychological warfare, not against men, but against themselves. A woman's worst enemy is her concept of what is socially acceptable femininity. Because of suspicion and envy it is difficult for women to accept the fact that one of their number has mustered up enough courage to cast from her neck the Victorian Albatross. This image problem, coupled with the desire to be accepted by the members of one's own sex has washed many talents and ambitions down the kitchen sink along with the dirty dishwasher.

There appears to be three main stumbling blocks to feminine progress. The first is the Victorian concept of femininity which conditions the child from infancy to accept the role of wife and mother as her ultimate goal in life without alternatives. Secondly, this conditioning drives many young girls to early marriage because of insecurity and the desire to identify with someone else. The third, soap operas, may seem trivial but serves as an indication of a deeper problem. Daytime dramas lead many women to be content to shroud their own dull and uneventful lives with televised fantasy. This is a disease which not only robs them of valuable time, but also of emotional energy that could be spent more constructively in endeavors of reality.

The causes behind these stumbling blocks are lack of courage to break away from outdated traditions and venture into new fields

of endeavor. Also lack of self-respect which causes one to exist like a parasite, unable to establish her own identity. And finally, lack of initiative, or in "cotton patch" language, plain old laziness. Many women are afraid to honestly admit to themselves what they really want from life. They are unwilling to set meaningful goals and put forth sufficient effort to reach those goals.

As tradition would have it when Adam and Eve were cast out of Eden it became necessary for them to share their fight for survival in whatever way seemed best suited for the circumstances. Even in our modern society, life outside of Eden is difficult and it is still, as Darwin defined it, a struggle for survival. The circumstances are different, but the need to share responsibilities remains the same. Sharing is not only a pragmatic and defensive mechanism, but when flavored with respect, understating and often romance, it becomes a very rewarding human experience.

As women we must find our true identity and self-expression without humiliating, emasculating, or making enemies of our men. Success is a word which has no gender. It is only as each of us develops to our full potential as individuals that our nation will be able to realize its true strength. We were created male and female, not to strife with each other, but rather to compliment each other by our very existence.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT NIXON ON RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

(Mr. MAILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the statement issued by President Nixon on May 10 regarding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The President issued his statement at the time authorizing legislation for the radios for fiscal year 1973 was submitted. I am happy to see that the legislation has been introduced by Chairman MORGAN and assigned the number H.R. 15002.

In view of the difficulty which the two Houses of Congress had in arriving at an agreement for authorizing legislation for the current fiscal year, I commend the approach which has been taken in the new submission and in the President's statement about it. In the course of the actions in the two Houses, it became apparent that there was a strong majority favoring continuation of the broadcasting activities of these two valuable organizations. It was also the majority opinion, as expressed in legislation passed by this House and in a resolution passed by the other body, that a study should be undertaken of the activities of the two radios and of their funding to assist us in formulating a permanent legislative framework for them.

The President's statement announces his intention to appoint a Presidential Study Commission for that purpose. This Commission, which will have a limited life, is to be specifically charged with the responsibility to consult exhaustively with the Congress in drawing up its recommendations. In drawing up these recommendations, the Commission will be expected to take into consideration the relationship of the broadcasting operations of the radios to the

June 6, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5299

national interest and to this Nation's foreign policy objectives. I believe these points are worth noting particularly.

I hope that the appointment of the Commissioners will soon be announced and that they can begin their work. We have had to consider the legislation for fiscal year 1972 and the authorization now being requested for fiscal year 1973 as interim arrangements because we were unable to reach agreement on the form which a longer term framework for the two radios should take. The Presidential Study Commission should go a long way toward helping us overcome those difficulties. I am sure Members will be interested in the President's statement, which follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
THE WHITE HOUSE,
MAY 10, 1972.

Under Public Law 92-264, which I signed on March 30, 1972, grants in support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were authorized through the end of fiscal year 1972.

The decision to continue Government support for these radios was approved by large majorities in Congress and reflects the judgment that has been expressed overwhelmingly by newspapers throughout this country and by leading citizens in all walks of life that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to perform a unique and valuable service. As I stated in a recent letter to the Chairman of the Radio Free Europe Fund, "... we have followed closely the work of RFE and are satisfied that it continues to serve a fundamental national interest."

I also said that "... the free flow of information and ideas among nations is indispensable to more normal relations between East and West and to better prospects for an enduring peace."

I have therefore asked the Secretary of State to submit today a bill which would continue Government support to the radios through fiscal year 1975. As with the fiscal year 1972 authorization, this bill would make the grants to the radios through the Secretary of State under such terms and conditions he deems appropriate.

A number of different views have been expressed in Congress as to how the radios might best be funded for the future. No consensus on this important matter has emerged. The House version of the fiscal year 1972 authorization and Senate Resolution 272 make clear that majorities in both Houses believe this should be given further study before a definitive solution is adopted.

To this end, I plan to appoint a Presidential Study Commission with instructions to render its report and recommendations by February 28, 1973, so that the Administration and Congress can take them into consideration in formulating authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1974. In making its study, the Commission will be particularly concerned to consult exhaustively with members of Congress.

In undertaking this task, the Commission will have the benefit and will take full account of the in-depth studies of each radio that were prepared by the Congressional Research Service at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee together with companion studies recently completed by the General Accounting Office. Two subsequent studies by the Congressional Research Service—one a survey and analysis of the available options with respect to future funding methods and the other an examination of the foreign policy aspects of these broadcasting operations—will also materially assist the Commission.

It is evident that the choice of the method or mechanism for future funding of the

radios must depend upon a proper perception of the relationship of those operations to the national interest and specifically to this nation's foreign policy objectives. In my view, that relationship exists for one fundamental reason, but one reason only: namely, that it has always been and must always be part of our national purpose to promote free, responsible communication among nations, not just at the government level, but at all levels. Thus, these radios are not spokesmen for American official policy—that role belongs in broadcasting to the Voice of America. Rather, they are expressions of our profound conviction that a responsible, independent and free press plays an indispensable part in the social and political processes that look to better understanding and more effective cooperation, not only within a nation, but also among nations.

It is this conception, I believe, that lies at the base of the article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which declares it to be the right of everyone "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." International broadcasting is of course only a part of that process; our international exchange programs are another important part.

The Commission will render a great service by undertaking a critical examination of this subject and by providing the best possible basis for determining the methods by which support for these valuable organizations can be maintained without impairment to the professional independence upon which their present effectiveness depends.

While this Commission produces its recommendations, it is essential that the authorization providing support to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty be extended for fiscal year 1973. While I continue to believe that the Department of State is not the appropriate channel for grants to the two radios, I believe that discussions of the alternatives should be deferred until we have the benefit of the recommendations of the Commission. I therefore strongly recommend that the bill which we are submitting to Congress for a 1973 authorization be given favorable consideration before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

MR. JAMES G. STAHLMAN STEPS
DOWN

(Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, after three score years of service, Mr. James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of the Nashville Banner, has retired effective June 1, 1972.

Mr. Stahlman, rightfully known as the Dean of Southern Newspaper Publishers, has left an indelible mark on American journalism and a gap in the ranks of American newspaper publishers which will be impossible to fill.

A staunch individual of independent mind and judgment, Mr. Stahlman has carved a respected and esteemed name for himself for his forthright expression of editorial view and as a successful publisher who has led the Nashville Banner to notable journalistic achievement over his years of stewardship.

With the announcement of his retirement, Mr. Stahlman stepped out with the promise that he will continue to be heard from as he prepares the first of at least two books on the people, places, and events in his life.

Mr. Stahlman disclosed his retirement

in an open letter to "my friends and readers of the Nashville Banner" which appeared on the front page of the June 1, 1972, edition of the Banner and I include it in the Record at this point, commending his words and comments to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Stahlman was and is a powerful voice in American journalism, but his daily presence will be missed.

The article follows:

STAHLMAN COMPLETES 60 BANNER YEARS—
PLANS TWO BOOKS ON PEOPLE, PLACES,
EVENTS IN HIS EXCITING LIFE

(By James G. Stahlman)

To my friends and readers of the Nashville Banner:

By the grace of God, the tolerance of a fickle and sometimes intolerant newspaper constituency and the faithful and devoted support of cherished members of what has become affectionately known as "The Banner Family," I have come to one of the most emotionally difficult days of my life.

Today I complete sixty years of service to The Nashville Banner, forty-two of it as president and publisher, with every day dedicated to the cause of free and responsible journalism.

I had firmly charted my present course prior to the conclusion of my sale of this beloved newspaper to the Gannett Group. I had made it perfectly clear to my longtime friend, Paul Miller, whose personal and journalistic integrity had prompted me to select him and his able associates in the Gannett Group as my successor owners, that I would end my duties as president and publisher on the day that I had completed 60 years as an employe of this newspaper.

This is it!

These three-score years have taught me much. They have afforded me world travel, world friendships, world service.

They have placed me in high positions of honor and responsibility.

They have given me the opportunity to play a part in the history of this beloved country of ours, of this neighboring hemisphere which we have shared with Canadians to the North and our Latin brothers South of the border.

And in more far-reaching portions of the earth I have been privileged to serve my country in times of war as well as peace in numerous capacities.

I have witnessed and actively participated in some of the important scientific and industrial developments from the horse-car to Americans on the moon; from the early filament bulb to the devastating laser beam; from Marconi to Telstar; from Kitty-Hawk to the SST; from a reverent pulpit to a distressing era of agnosticism.

This has been the most exciting period of advance in the world's history—culturally, scientifically, industrially, sociologically, economically, politically.

Our progress has wrought much havoc. It has played hob with stable homelife, produced a disdain for the fundamentals, destroyed respect for law, order, the courts and constituted authority. It has brought the United States to a dangerous divisiveness and the world to the brink of self-destruction.

Through all these years, I have clung steadfastly to the belief that this blessed country of ours is still worth saving; that the freedoms of our people can be preserved; that there is more good than bad in mankind and that a forgiving, omnipotent Father can and will save those men and nations willing to defend that faith implicit in our national motto: "In God We Trust."

As I relinquish The Banner's helm, I shall not retire to some secluded beach. I turn over the flagbridge to a competent team—Wayne Sargent, Jimmy Armistead and Ken Morrell—all experienced in their respective