



News Service of the Southern Baptist Convention

460 James Robertson Parkway

Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Telephone (615) 244-2355

W. C. Fields, Director

Jim Newton, Assistant Director

---FEATURES

produced by Baptist Press

March 20, 1973

Joyce Brothers Says Religion Can Enhance Liberated Women

By Louie Andrews

FORT WORTH (BP)--She was the picture of femininity--poised carefully coiffeured, draped in soft pink.

Yet when she spoke, her cool, crisp voice of professionalism spoke a word in favor of liberated women.

For Dr. Joyce Brothers, however, the contrast in the way she looked and the words she spoke was no paradox. She's liberated herself, saying "I always have been." And she recommends it for all women.

The religious woman particularly is a natural for that kind of freedom, she said in an interview here while speaking at a Texas Baptist Christian Life Commission sponsored seminar at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

"You have to understand that the liberated woman is a woman who is in touch with herself, who has a feeling of self-worth, who knows that she likes herself...and respects herself," she pointed out.

Liberation, she said, goes back to the woman's self-image, and how the woman's father treats her as a child will dramatically affect, almost determine, that self-image.

Dr. Brothers, who holds a doctor of philosophy from Columbia University and is a licensed psychologist in New York State, defines her own system for liberation in her latest book, "The Brothers' System for Liberated Love and Marriage."

In it she lists steps a woman can take to "get in touch with herself. They are small steps but have great ramifications in lives around her," she said.

Religion is important for liberation, she said, because "women, indeed men or women, who can spend their lives with something more important than themselves have reached true liberation and true maturity and are truly the most fulfilled of all creatures."

When a woman is fulfilled, she becomes more of an asset to herself, those around her and society in general, the psychologist asserted. If she is a mother, her liberation affects her family, but affects it in a positive way.

Dr. Brothers explained that "if the mother is happy as a woman and doesn't want to be a man; if she is a complete woman and a fulfilled woman, then she gives the daughter and son a full picture of what a woman ought to be...not a sad and crippled creature."

Through a healthy concept of womanhood, then, "the mother gives a boy child a respect for women, which later carries over to a respect for his wife, and gives the girl child a desire to be a woman," she added.

The petite blonde, herself a wife and mother, supports the women's liberation movement but hastens to point out that "there is no real picture of the liberated woman and there's no one goal for women's lib.

All women's liberation is saying is there should be no doors closed to the woman...that she should be what is right for her."

Liberation for women, especially as she defines it, leaves religious women free go make of themselves what they feel the Creator would have them to be, the psychologist indicated.

-more-

They are free to define their talents, their capabilities, their opportunities and simply "get in touch with what is right for them."

The future for liberated women will mean escape from the kitchen, the household and even motherhood if so desired, Dr. Brothers said.

Women will be free to do whatever they feel destined to do. For some it is to marry and bring up a child; for some it is never to marry and never to have a child," she said. Or, "You can do both.

"No man says 'Am I going to have a family or a career?'" she added.

The psychologist also predicted that pressure from society will be relieved, perhaps due to the women's liberation movement, in the next decade.

"There will not be pressure for women who are only interested in careers to have a baby and there will not be pressure for women who are interested in child care alone to have a career," she explained. "And the woman who is interested in both will be able to do both.

"I think what we will find are fewer women having babies and those who have them will take care of them because they want them and do not feel the babies are interfering with career," she added.

Help for the mother who wants to be both homemaker and career woman will also be a key factor for the liberation of many women, she said. Child care centers and clinics and more help from the husband will be primary.

She emphasized that the person caring for a child must be "responsive, warm and loving... and consistent," but it does not have to be the mother or the father. The quality of time is more important than the quantity of time spent with children, she emphasized.

Even with outside help in rearing children, the traditional family unit--father as breadwinner, mother as stay-at-home anchor, and child--will not break down in the feminine struggle and/or victory for liberation, Dr. Brothers predicted. "It will evolve into cluster living, which is what we have now in various colleges."

Cluster living, several families dwelling in adjacent units, involves frequent visiting back and forth and a great deal of friendliness among the families, she explained. "When a child gets tense with his parents, he can go spend some time with someone else's parents. The kinship ties become friendship ties," she added.

Although friendship may replace kinship ties, Dr. Brothers affirmed her belief that the family unit structure is here to stay. "It's the best arrangement we as humans have found for the care of babies.

"But I think in the future there will not be a big deal of what is woman's work and what is man's work. Whoever does it, does it," she said.

"There will be more of the mother getting help from the whole community and the mother and father taking equal share in bringing up children," she concluded.

-30-

Supreme Court Hears
N.Y. Parochial Case

3/20/73

WASHINGTON (BP)--Three religious schools and three New York public officials challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court a federal district court decision that it is unconstitutional for a state to give public funds to religious schools in payment for expenses of keeping pupil records and in conducting school tests.

The Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty (PEARL), represented by Leo Pfeffer, noted church-state attorney, defended the New York court decision.

-more-

The U.S. Supreme Court combined three cases involving the same question. The parties appealing the lower court decision in the three cases were Cathedral Academy of Manhattan, Saint Ambrose School, Bishop Laughlin Memorial High School, Arthur Levitt, Comptroller of the state of New York, Ewald B. Nyquist, commissioner of education of the state of New York, and Warren M. Anderson, majority leader and president pro tem of the New York Senate.

At issue was the 1970 Mandated Services Act, which allocates \$28 million per year to New York's private schools for record keeping and for conducting school tests. The act allocates \$27 per pupil in grades 1-6 and \$45 per pupil in grades 7-12 in the state's nonpublic schools, more than 95 per cent of which are religious schools.

On June 1, 1973, a three-judge federal court in New York ruled 2-1 that the act violates the establishment clause of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This clause, made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment, says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

The state of New York was represented before the Supreme Court by Mrs. Jean M. Coon, assistant solicitor general of New York, and by Porter R. Chandler, a New York Attorney.

Coon and Chandler contended that the state of New York requires school attendance of the part of children and sets standards for both children and schools. They claimed that the only interest of the state in the records and in the testing is that the pupils get a certain quality of education. The state is interested only in the achievement of the pupils in that part of their education that is comparable to the public schools, they said.

On the other hand, Pfeffer asserted that the state funds were given directly to the parochial schools, which could use a portion of the money for purposes in addition to testing, and that the testing processes themselves are an integral part of the teaching program of the schools.

Pfeffer charged that only about one-third of the money given the religious schools went for the actual costs of testing and record keeping. This left two-thirds of the money to be used by the schools for any other purpose desired, he said.

His contention was that such allocations of public funds to church schools is unconstitutional both on its face and by the manner in which the New York act is applied.

The per pupil grants to the private schools are unrelated to actual costs and are given to the schools with no strings attached, Pfeffer continued. No audit of the schools' records are required and no supervision of the testing procedures are provided by the state, he pointed out.

Coon and Chandler contended that New York in paying for the testing programs was only reimbursing the schools for expenses incurred in complying with state-requirements.

Pfeffer's reply was two-fold: (1) the state is giving the schools two-thirds more than the programs cost the schools, and (2) the state is not obligated to pay for services required by law in private schools.

In addition to record keeping and testing, Pfeffer said that the state also requires adequate safety, sanitary, lighting, heating and other conditions for all schools, both public and private. These, he contended, could not be constitutionally provided by the public for religious schools.

The Supreme Court is expected to reach a decision on the New York Mandated Services Act by late June or early July of this year. The decision, whatever it might be, could be another landmark in church-state relations in the United States.

A case yet to be argued before the Supreme Court involves income tax credit to parents who pay tuition to private schools attended by their children.