


The War That Won't Go Away

FOOD/POPULATION/WAR

DR. KISSINGER'S GLOOMY VISION



U.S. Secretary
of State
Henry Kissinger

2

THE WAR THAT WON'T GO AWAY

Stepped-up fighting in Indochina is again forcing the United States into agonizing decisions.



Wide World

3

NEW ERA DAWNS FOR SUEZ CANAL

Idle for 8 years, the strategic waterway may soon be reopened to shipping.

4

BUREAU REPORTS

Our bureau chiefs and correspondents examine current trends in their areas.

6

THE INCREDIBLE HUMAN POTENTIAL... The Missing Dimension in Knowledge

Third installment in a series detailing the purpose and meaning of human life.

8

FOOD/POPULATION/WAR

Scientists examine the monumental problems of food and population. What can be done for the world's starving millions?



13

GARNER TED ARMSTRONG SPEAKS OUT!

How politics reduces leadership to a petty tug-of-war between parties.



15

ORCHIDS AND ONIONS

The continuing love/hate relationship with our readers.

DR. KISSINGER'S GLOOMY VISION

by Jeff Calkins

The man the Gallup Poll says is the most admired in the world, Henry Kissinger, takes a very dim view of the future. "As a historian," he has said, "you would now have to predict that our kind of society would very probably not last much longer." The words of the American Secretary of State reflect a dour appraisal of the world's ultimate destiny.

On another occasion, the globe-trotting American Secretary of State told *New York Times* correspondent James Reston: "History is a tale of efforts that failed, of aspirations that weren't realized, of wishes that were fulfilled and then turned out to be different from what one expected. So, as a historian, one has to live with a sense of the inevitability of tragedy."

It is known that Oswald Spengler's book, *Death of the West*, has had a profound effect on Kissinger's thinking. In the early 1920's Spengler postulated that civilizations pass through a life cycle, and that by knowing where one was in the cycle, he could predict the shape of the future. *Death of the West* saw the occidental world as having matured beyond the creative stage into one of material prosperity. The future could bring only irreversible decline.

Kissinger sees the signs of Spenglerian decay becoming more apparent. All Western democracies, he asserts, suffer from a "crisis of authority," and therefore cannot act with decisiveness when confronted with hard and complex issues. "Governments aren't willing to make short-term sacrifices," he asserts.

It's a Small, Small World

No other figure is identified as a "globalist" as much as Henry Kissinger.

During his tenure as foreign policy superstar, the American Secretary of State has had to face an accelerated crescendo of worldwide convulsions — food, energy, resources, overpopulation — which have reinforced his historical pessimism. At the same time, the supranational character of these crises has impressed upon him the factor of global interdependency.

Kissinger's attentiveness to world interdependency stems from a fear that the inability of nations to handle crises beyond their immediate national scope, such as population and energy, could precipitate the end of industrialized, democratic society. "If we do not get a recognition of our interdependence, the Western civilization that we now have is almost certain to disintegrate, because it will first lead to a series of rivalries in which each region will try to maximize its own special advantages. That inevitably will lead to test of strength of one sort or another. These will magnify domestic crises in many countries, and they will then move more and more to authoritarian models."

Out of such a scenario comes Kissinger's call for global cooperation and sharing. "You cannot have a peaceful world without most of the countries and preferably all of the countries feeling that they have a share in it," he warns. But ironically, the *realpolitik* in which he is learned as a scholar and a historian is founded on a very negative interpretation of human nature which precludes the acts of international altruism for which he calls.

Learning from Experience

Kissinger's role as both scholar and statesman imposes upon him an unfortunate occupational schizophrenia. He is torn between the function of a public official, which, in his own words, is "to do the best you can," and all that he has learned in the academe.

During his confirmation hearings as Secretary of State, Kissinger frowned on the pessimistic approach to foreign affairs. "A shrinking spirit," he stated, "could lead us to attempt too little."

But since those hearings in October 1973, what the Germans call *Weltschmerz*, or world gloom, has obviously made deeper inroads into his thinking. As he told James Reston, "I think of myself as a historian more than a statesman. As a historian, you have to be conscious of the fact that every civilization that has ever existed has ultimately collapsed." □

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG
Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG
Managing Editor: Arthur A. Ferdig
Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn
News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg
Associate Editors: Gary Alexander, Charles Vinson
Art Director: Allen Metzger
Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lippross
Copy Editor: Jim E. Lea

Senior Editors: C. Wayne Cole, David Jon Hill, Herman L. Hosh, Charles F. Hunting, Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith
Bureaus: Bonn: John Karlson; Brussels: Ray Kosanke, Henry Sturcke; London: Peter Butler, David Price, Washington, D.C.: Dexter Faulkner

Correspondents: Auckland: Graemme Marshall; Johannesburg: Robert Fahey; Manila: Colin Adair; Mexico City: Enrique Ruiz; Sydney: Don Abraham; Vancouver: Dean Wilson
Contributing Editors: David Antion, Ron Horswell, Robert Ginskey, Gerhard Marx, Adli Muhtadi, John R. Schroeder, Keith Stump
Researchers/Writers: Amy Bowman, Jeff Calkins, Cynthia Carter, Graeme Henderson, Werner Jebens, George Ritter, Don Schroeder, Marc Stahl
Graphics: Art: John Dunn, Monte Wolverton, Garry Haggerty, Ron Lepeska; Photography: David Conn, Alfred Hennig, Phil Stevens, Warren Watson; Photo Files: Al Letter
Business Manager: Frank Brown
Circulation Managers: United States: Benjamin Chapman; International Editions: Leslie McCullough

Volume XL No. 4

Circulation: 2,788,943

WITHOUT SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: *Plain Truth* has no subscription or newsstand price. It is supported through contributions from our readers and those who have chosen, voluntarily, to become co-workers with us in this worldwide work. *Plain Truth* is non-profit, accepts no commercial advertising, and has nothing to sell. Contributions are gratefully welcomed and are tax-deductible in the U.S. Those who can be encouraged to add their financial support in the spirit of helping to make *Plain Truth* available, without price, to others. Contributions should be sent to *Plain Truth*, Pasadena, Ca., 91123, or to one of our offices nearest you (addresses listed on back cover).

Plain Truth is published twice monthly (except monthly in July and October) by Ambassador College, Pasadena, California, 91123. © 1975 Ambassador College. All rights reserved. Second Class Postage paid at Pasadena, Ca., and at additional mailing offices. PRINTED IN USA.

THE WAR THAT WON'T GO AWAY

Hard Choices for Washington as South Vietnam Slowly Sinks

The war that will not go away has arisen again to haunt the United States government and its military leaders. In recent weeks, successful sweeping Communist onslaughts against strategic South Vietnamese strongholds have threatened to reopen barely healed war wounds in Congress which must now debate the course of American reaction.

The disturbing question is: Will the U.S. allow South Vietnam, after the sacrifice of 55,000 American lives and the outpouring of an awesome \$150 billion in aid, to steadily succumb to North Vietnamese aggression?

Congress, feeling some lingering moral responsibility, may yet allow a few hundred million dollars more in aid to go to prop up the Thieu government's flagging defense machine. But it is certain that the new Congress, overwhelmingly Democratic and nearly as overwhelmingly liberal, will never approve another direct United States military involvement in Southeast Asia.

Sensing this mood, the Communists, it is believed, are now striving for greater military advantage, in preparation for a future all-out attack, or, if less than optimum conditions prevail, major political concessions. The most desired concession would be a coalition government which they could in turn sabotage and take over. In all this, the Communists know President Ford cannot afford to let the politically sensitive Vietnam issue spill over into the U.S. election year.

Cease-fire Farce

The cease-fire signed two years ago was a farce even before the ink was dry. Not one provision has been fulfilled, except that U.S. forces have been withdrawn and no longer are Americans shedding their blood wholesale. As a result, many Americans have felt the Indochina war was fading away.

In reality, in the two years since the cease-fire, over a quarter million Vietnamese on both sides have been killed, wounded or reported missing. Casualties in 1974 nearly equalled losses during the height of the fighting in 1972. An estimated 700,000 refugees have been uprooted by fighting in towns, villages and hamlets since the cease-fire. A dozen district towns, scores of bases and outposts have been captured or overrun by North Vietnamese or Viet Cong forces, including virtually all the outlying territory American forces once controlled.

Breaking every provision of the 1973 treaty, North Vietnam has infiltrated thousands of troops into South Vietnam, tripled its armored strength, and almost doubled its artillery pieces and aircraft artillery units. Communist fighting strength

is estimated over 220,000, compared to around 160,000 at the time of the cease-fire. The Communists have either built or repaired a dozen airfields in South Vietnam. They had no aircraft in the South at all at the cease-fire.

The infamous Ho Chi Minh Trail has been converted into a hard-surface, all-weather roadway, paralleled by a major pipeline to within 70 miles of Saigon. Another "duplicate" trail has also been built in South Vietnam. Both routes are guarded by enormous concentrations of antiaircraft weapons — automatic weapons and the latest SAM missiles.

Against the new Communist onslaughts the South Vietnamese Army has maintained a relatively good showing — considering lack of air support and piecemeal replacement of weapons and equipment. Due to greatly reduced American aid, ARVN ammunition, aircraft and forces must be used sparingly in mostly defensive rather than offensive actions.

Looking at the map of Communist strongholds in the South, one observer notes, South Vietnam looks "ready for a death of a thousand cuts."

Said another Western diplomat:

"It doesn't look good. There is an irreconcilable political difference between the two sides. We can only hope the Communist side will stop."

Unfortunately, there is no reason for such optimism. After three decades of fighting, enduring terrific manpower losses and other national sacrifices, it is foolish to feel the North Vietnamese will give up now when ultimate "victory" seems more possible than ever before — as long as the United States doesn't intervene directly or with massive aid again.

While the American public, plagued with domestic economic woes, would like to simply forget about Vietnam, U.S. foreign policy makers are coming face-to-face with some hard political realities. The loss of Indochina could not only have an impact upon the strategic defenses and commerce of the Free World, but it would also be a blow to the prestige, integrity and power of the United States regarding its other-worldwide commitments.

Will the ugly specter of Vietnam ever be put to final rest? Says one diplomat, "The only way the fighting will end is if all Indochina sinks into the South China Sea." □

Cambodia: The Tottering Domino

The ouster of left-leaning Prince Norodom Sihanouk by General Lon Nol in 1970 marked the opening of the Cambodian theater of the Indochina war. Since then the war has caused over \$2 billion in damage and destroyed half the country's hospitals, roads, bridges, cars, and trucks.

The present Lon Nol government of Cambodia controls no more than fifteen percent of its own territory. But in that territory live over three quarters of the nation's inhabitants, most of them in the city of Phnom Penh, the enemy-encircled Cambodian capital that has been swelled by refugees to a population of over four million.

Fighting has been raging around the capital city for over five years, but the big crunch began a little more than a year ago when Communist forces surrounded the city and attempted to bombard it into submission. The Western press carried daily reports of the city's impending fall, exhibiting an almost "let's get it over with" attitude toward what appeared to be just another phase in the nettlesome Indochina war. But Phnom Penh obstinately refused to surrender and held on.

Today, the Khmer Rouge, as the Communist insurgents are called, are engaged in a new offensive,

aimed at choking off the city's lifeline, the Mekong River. The strangulation has severely cut food and fuel shipments; rice and ammunition stocks may not last another month.

To many Americans, the Cambodian war is the distilled essence of the Vietnamese war. The U.S. military incursion into Cambodia in 1970 provoked the frenzied climax of antiwar demonstrations in America. Cambodia was simply the western frontier of the same dreary war.

Like South Vietnam, Cambodia is still sustained by infusions of U.S. aid. President Ford has already asked Congress for over \$222 million in military assistance, though it is very unlikely the full amount will be approved.

The fall of Cambodia can have only the most menacing implications for its larger neighbor. Over twenty-thousand North Vietnamese troops would be freed for action in South Vietnam, possibly hastening that country's demise.

Should the current Khmer Rouge offensive succeed in defeating the Lon Nol government and impose a North Vietnamese dominated regime, the handwriting could be on the wall for Saigon. Cambodia may just turn out to be the domino that knocks over South Vietnam. □

THE ROAD BACK



Copyright 1975 Los Angeles Times Syndicate

NEWSMAKER PROFILE


Ali Bhutto of Pakistan

"If India builds the bomb, we will eat leaves and grass, even go hungry, but we will have to get one of our own!"

So declared Pakistani Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in a strong speech last May as the shock waves subsided following the detonation of India's first atomic "device," purportedly for peaceful purposes. India's new-found nuclear status had dramatically altered the delicate power balance on the subcontinent.

Though he has by no means abandoned his initial nuclear musings, Bhutto's primary concern during a two-day state visit with President Ford in Washington last month was conventional arms.


Following the indecisive 1965 India-Pakistan war, the United States embargoed sales of "lethal" military equipment to both nations. Bhutto tried unsuccessfully in 1973 to persuade President Nixon to lift the controversial embargo. Now, however, it appears President Ford is leaning toward granting at least



Plain Truth Photo

limited sales of defensive (anti-tank and antiaircraft) weapons to Pakistan, nominally an ally in the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). India has been receiving arms from the Soviet Union, its main supplier of military hardware.

On the arms issue, Bhutto confidently told Washington newsmen, "I am not unhelpful. We have been discussing this matter now for ten years." Pakistan's present request for military equipment, he emphasized, is for "exclusively defensive weapons, for legitimate defense needs. We live in a volatile part of the world . . . our country has been dismembered and the



BUSY SUEZ CANAL ten years ago. Will traffic resume soon?

Wide World

NEW ERA DAWNS FOR SUEZ CANAL

World Shippers Await Reopening

Idle for nearly eight years, the Suez Canal is expected to be reopened to international traffic sometime this year — if all goes well.

The strategic 103-mile inter-ocean waterway connecting the Red Sea with the Mediterranean has now been cleared of the mines and wreckage which has blocked it since the Six-Day War of 1967.

The task of cleaning up the debris of war began last April and was completed in late December by a combined force of Egyptian, American, Soviet, British, and

French salvage experts. Fifteen large sunken ships, nearly 100 smaller wrecks, and tens of thousands of explosives ranging from hand grenades to missiles were among the obstacles blocking the waterway.

The cleanup completed, the canal is presently being dredged to scoop away the years of accumulated silt and sand which has filled in the bottom third of the channel. When this work is finished in March or April, the waterway will be fully navigable by ships of up to 60,000 tons.

Political Problems

Whether the canal will be opened to international traffic at that time is another question. This will hinge greatly on further progress in Middle East peace negotiations.

Egypt's Foreign Minister Ismail Fahmi stated recently that his government would not reopen the sealink until it was convinced that the waterway is "safe for international shipping." This is taken to mean until Israeli forces, which Egypt considers a threat to the safe passage of ships, withdraw further into

ART BUCHWALD

"Cuba Si!"

(Editor's Note: The following parody is based on a recent news item about an American company under contract to train Saudi Arabian soldiers to defend their oil fields against armed takeover.)

WASHINGTON — The National Security Council was in executive session when a CIA man rushed in with a cable in his hand. "The Cubans have just made a big oil strike in the Bay of Pigs. It could be the biggest oil find in the Western Hemisphere."

"The dirty rats," someone said. "Wait a minute," said a man from the Defense Department. "That's no way to talk about the Island Bastion of Freedom in the Caribbean."

"Are you crazy?" the State Department man said.

"We're going to have to help them defend themselves," the Defense Department man said.

"Against whom?" a White House aide asked.

the Sinai Peninsula. Israeli troops currently occupy western portions of the peninsula only 16 miles from the canal and hold a large shore area guarding the southern entrance to the waterway.

Whether Israeli merchant ships will be allowed navigation rights through the canal along with other international traffic is another question. Egypt's President Sadat has reemphasized his position that as long as there is a state of war between Israel and Egypt such rights will be denied. It is believed

(Continued on page 4, col. 1)

people do feel we should take adequate measures to protect our security."

The United States also agreed during Bhutto's visit last month to send Pakistan 300,000 additional tons of grain under the Food for Peace Program. The new U.S. budget earmarks \$78 million in economic aid to Pakistan this year.

Popular Leader

Ali Bhutto, 47, has been lauded as a concerned, dedicated, and able leader of the Pakistani people, determined to bring unity, peace and prosperity to his poverty-stricken Moslem nation of 65 million. He possesses great energy, an urbane manner, a quick wit and a gift for oratory. His popularity among the great mass of people is very strong.

His detractors, however, impute to him a boundless ambition and personal opportunism, charging him with having sabotaged negotiations in 1971 with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to force a civil war with East Pakistan, knowing that if the nation stayed together he would have more trouble coming to power.

Whatever his motives, since taking over the leadership of his shattered nation over three years ago in the aftermath of the disastrous 1971 war over East Pakistan (now

Bangladesh) Mr. Bhutto has chalked up an impressive record of achievement. He has succeeded in repairing much of the trauma of military defeat. He has given his people a renewed faith in themselves and has turned Pakistan once more in the direction of parliamentary democracy — though one man rule and a controlled press is still the order of the day.

Olive Branches Extended

Speaking of the break between East and West Pakistan, the Prime Minister noted, "There would have been no Bangladesh if there had not been a Pakistan." He explained he had undertaken a number of initiatives — as yet unfruitful — to bring about a reconciliation and readjustment that would benefit both countries.

On India, Mr. Bhutto commented, "We have launched sustained efforts to make peace with India, and I have no doubt that the government of Mrs. Indira Gandhi will respond to these offers." Recent agreements on the return of some 93,000 Pakistani prisoners of war and the eventual transfers of minorities between Pakistan and Bangladesh are hopeful signs that a new and more cooperative relationship between the nations of the subcontinent may be possible.

Speaking in a recorded address to the nation before departing for India to meet with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in 1972, Mr. Bhutto said: "This past twenty-five years has been an era of confrontation and war in the subcontinent, with what result to the people of the region? They remain among the poorest, most underfed, illiterate, ill-housed and disease-ridden — the worst conditions in the world. It has been a heavy price and the heaviest has been paid by the poorest in the land."

Mr. Bhutto, a charming and soft-spoken yet forceful person, comes from a prominent landowning family and his wife from a wealthy Iranian family, but he nevertheless has tradition-breaking ideas about reducing the power hitherto enjoyed by the rich aristocratic class. His Pakistan People's Party (PPP) espouses socialism as the quickest route to national development.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has many "firsts" to his credit. He is the first major Pakistani leader to have received his university education in the United States (University of California at Berkeley). After graduating with honors in political science in 1950, he went to Oxford, where he earned his master's degree in law. He returned to Pakistan in 1953 to start a law practice.

Five years later at the age of thirty, he earned the distinction of becoming not only the youngest-ever Cabinet minister (of Commerce) in Pakistan but in the entire South Asian subcontinent. And five years after that — at age 35 in 1963 he became his nation's Foreign Minister.

When Mr. Bhutto assumed the reins of government in December 1971, in the wake of widespread anger at the defeat of Gen. Yahya Kahn's army in the 20-week war with India, Pakistan stood dismembered of one-half its territory. It had lost East Pakistan. The crushing burden of war had included Indian occupation of more than 5,000 square miles in West Pakistan; approximately 1.5 million persons had been displaced.

Returning from the United Nations in 1971 on his way home to form a new government, Mr. Bhutto said in a news conference, "We are going to have to build a new world again, and a new country again. Many problems face us. It is almost like the first chapter of Genesis."

In the almost 40 months since Mr. Bhutto took office, Pakistan has not only reached its quarter-of-a-century mark as a nation, but has passed from a state of uncertainty to one of renewed confidence. □

"Us," the Defense Department man said. "Remember, Cuba is only 90 miles away from Miami." "I say we go in and take the oil," the CIA man said.

"What?" said Defense. "That could kill a big plane sale. Cuba will need some very sophisticated fighters now that they have oil."

"Not to mention anti-aircraft weapons, tanks and armored carriers," his assistant said. "I wouldn't be surprised if they order a billion dollars' worth of arms."

"Wait a minute," said State. "Are we going to sell Castro war materiel?"

"Do you want the French to do it?" Defense asked.

"Or the Russians?" his assistant said.

"But we don't even recognize Cuba diplomatically."

"What has that got to do with selling them arms?" Defense wanted to know. "They've got oil. They're entitled to buy anything they want from us."

"Exactly," said Treasury. "We have to think of our balance of payments."

"He's right," said the White House. "After all, Castro isn't a bad guy."

"He'll probably need destroyers," Defense said. "We have some new ones being built now with fantastic radar on them. We were going to give them to the U.S. Navy, but the Navy can wait."

"I wouldn't be surprised if Castro wanted nuclear submarines."

"We've got them. They're on station now in the North Atlantic, but we could deliver them in 30 days."

"I don't want to throw cold water on a big military sale, but are we sure the Cubans can handle all this sophisticated materiel?"

"We'll train them, dummy," Defense said.

"You mean our soldiers and sailors will train the Cubans in weapons that they may use against us?"

"Of course not. Do you think we're idiots? We'll contract the training to a private company made up of Green Berets, ex-Marines and Naval Ordnance men. In that way we'll be once removed from the sale in case there is any flack from Congress," Defense retorted.

"I hope Castro likes what we have to sell him."

"He'll go crazy when he sees our catalogue. I wouldn't even be surprised if he wanted to buy our intermediate ballistic missiles."

"Missiles?" said State.

"Sure. They have the sites over there. All we have to do is stick them in the ground."

"When will they start getting oil out of the bay?" White House asked the CIA man.

"We figure about three months," CIA responded.

"Good," said Defense. "That will give us a chance to make up a presentation. We'll send Henry to Havana as soon as he gets back from the Middle East."

"Great man, Castro," said Treasury.

"A credit to the hemisphere," said White House.

State finally got the message. "They don't make world leaders like that any more." □

Copyright 1975, Los Angeles Times

SUEZ CANAL

(Continued from previous page)

that Israel will be barred from using the canal until she complies fully with the terms of U.N. Security Council Resolution #242 of November 1967, which calls for her withdrawal from captured Arab territories.

Needed Revenue for Egypt

For economic reasons, Egypt is hopeful that the canal's reopening will occur at the earliest possible date. Before it was closed in 1967, the canal was bringing Egypt revenues estimated at nearly \$250 million a year, which made up for a substantial proportion of her annual trade deficit. Egypt now more than ever needs this foreign exchange to bolster its sagging economy. The Egyptians also hope to rebuild and repopulate the severely war-damaged canal-side cities of Port Said, Ismailia, and Suez and to transform them into thriving free ports teeming with business, tourism, and industry.

Western Europe is also anxious for the reopening, as it will realize significant savings in shipping expenses and shorter delivery periods in comparison with the long route around the southern tip of Africa. Shipping time between Europe and the Far East will be reduced by nine days — a remarkable cutback in both time and costly bunker fuel.

A reopened canal will be in the economic interest of the entire world community, to varying degrees. Dislocations in world trade patterns resulting from the canal's closure in 1967 have cost the world economy \$1.5 billion a year in increased shipping costs, trade reductions, and other losses.

Enter the Soviet Navy

To Western eyes, a more ominous effect of the canal's projected reopening will be the considerable strategic advantages the Soviet Union will derive. With the canal open, it will become much easier for Moscow to increase the number of Soviet ships deployed in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean areas. Currently, ships of the Soviet Black Sea Fleet would have to sail 10,400 miles around the Cape of Good Hope to reach the Persian Gulf. When the canal reopens, the distance from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf will be cut by over two thirds the distance.

This development could easily intensify the growing naval rivalry between the United States and Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean area, which contains the vital sea lanes for tankers sailing from the Persian Gulf oil fields.

Despite these difficulties, the canal's reopening is considered in Washington to be preferable to a closed waterway. And in future years the canal is expected to take on even greater importance to the United States and the world as a whole. A Japanese firm has signed a billion-dollar contract with Egypt to widen and deepen the canal to accommodate supertankers of up to 250,000 tons by 1980 or so.

But in the meantime, the canal is temporarily a victim of snagged Mideast peacemaking efforts. □

BUREAU REPORTS

Common Market Finds Going Tougher With Producer Countries

BRUSSELS: Difficulties experienced between the European Economic Community and 46 developing nations in recent negotiations here underline the new, post-oil embargo relationship between the world's industrialized nations and the suppliers of their necessary raw materials.

European negotiators noted a tougher bargaining line on the part of many of their former colonies in the recent wrap-up session of the 18-month negotiations.

Most significant among the negotiating difficulties was the sensitivity on the part of the developing countries (designated the ACP countries, in Community parlance, for "African, Caribbean and Pacific") to any suggestion of political association with the EEC. Weak attempts at such ties had been offered by the EEC in the form of "consultations," but this was rejected by the ACP.

The ACP also demanded a new name for their "side" be chosen which more accurately reflects the changed nature of their trading agreement with the nine-nation market. Up until now, developing nations which had been part of previous agreements with the EEC had been called "associated countries." The developing nations feel that this term, in English, implies a relationship with political ties in which the "associated" nations are in a subordinate role. The ACP countries reject this implication and want a new term selected which signifies a more equal partnership.

Unsuccessful attempts by Community members to win iron-clad guarantees for their investments in ACP lands also revealed the new relationship. These negotiations followed soon after the recently adopted U.N. resolution "legalizing" expropriations of foreign business interests. Since the ACP consists of nations which formulated and voted for that resolution, the EEC met with little success in this sphere. A weakly worded paragraph calling for "due consideration" of European interests was added to the agreement.

The talks were not made any simpler by the fact that the nine-member Community, often at odds among itself, was faced by 46 nations of widely diverse interests and geographical positions. This was the first major negotiation these 46 nations had ever entered jointly into with each other! For the EEC, the negotiations meant a long list of agricultural products — but for each individual nation of the ACP, one of those products might be the key to their whole economy.

In spite of the difficulties experienced in the months of arduous discussions, which expressed the "new realities" of the post-colonial and post-oil embargo world, the agreement reached still leaves the Common Market the world's foremost trading bloc. The United States and other users of raw materials must increasingly take note of this fact.

— Henry Sturcke

Australian Unemployment Highest Since Depression

SYDNEY: Australia's Department of Labour and Industry recently released the nation's unemployment figures for December. Registered as unemployed were a total of 267,000 workers — the highest figure since the Depression of the 1930's.

December saw the ranks of the jobless increase by a massive 76,000. Economists are now predicting Australian unemployment will approach a worrisome 500,000 (8.5% of the work force) by the middle of this year. It is hoped, however, that the numbers will begin to fall in the latter half of the year.

In terms of the percentage of the work force unemployed or even of the absolute numbers without a job, the Depression — when an estimated 25% of the work force was unemployed — was much worse than the present situation. But in Australia, where full employment is virtually regarded as the norm, the comparison is unavoidable.

Critics of the government blame the unemployment partially on the recent credit squeeze which raised interest rates, reduced liquidity and pushed many firms toward bankruptcy, or at least to the point where they are not investing in new plants.

Just what are the causes of unemployment in a nation that has a tremendous agricultural base and a wealth of minerals is a very complex question.

The government stresses the worldwide nature of the current recession. If Australia's trading partners buy less Australian products — meat for instance — then unemployment is the logical outcome. Many native economists find it difficult, however, to see why an isolated country like Australia, which largely escaped the effects of increased oil prices, should now be so dramatically affected by conditions overseas. The slump is home-grown, they say.

The two measures recently adopted by the government were to increase the size of the Commonwealth Public Service and to impose import quotas on textiles, shoes, and a few other manufac-

turing industries. This is designed to create civil service jobs and help prevent further layoffs due to inexpensive overseas imports. However, as many economists are pointing out, the inflationary effects of these measures may be the worse of the two evils in the long term.

So, for the moment at least, Australians are waiting it out, expecting things to become worse but hoping that by the middle of the year the employment scene will begin to improve dramatically.

— Garry de Jager

Canada's Boom Flattens Out

VANCOUVER: In comparison with the other economies of the West, the economy of Canada appears exceptionally healthy.

Natural resources is one big reason. The world market continues to make heavy demands for Canada's incredible mineral wealth. In addition, abundant agricultural harvests make Canada one of the four remaining net exporters of grain in the world.

"Most economists agree," noted one Canadian magazine recently, "that no matter what occurs during the next few years — and a good number of them think things will get worse before they get better — Canada is the best place to be."

Amid this economic euphoria over Canada's relative strength, however, troubling signs of weakness are appearing. The market for mineral resources will be strong only as long as customer nations can pay for them. Even the developed nations are hard pressed to balance their budgets, confronted with quadrupled oil import bills. A world economy facing severe recession means a vastly shrunken market for Canadian resources and manufactured goods.

Even more ominous, there is too much foreign investment in Canada for Canadians to be isolated from others' woes. Recent confrontations with the United States over proposed deals between Canadian companies and Cuba highlighted this problem. The Canadian economy is handcuffed to that of the United States — and the key has long since been thrown away.

Even the Canadian trump card, agriculture, may not play out. Weather patterns for western Canada show the area becoming increasingly drier. Practically no moisture was recorded during the summer of 1974, and very little this winter. Water tables and reservoirs are dangerously low, threatening hard times for irrigated farm land.

Overall, a hemisphere-wide cooling trend is obvious to local farmers and ranchers. Growing seasons are now noticeably shorter than only a generation ago. Farmers and ranchers are far from confident that their incomes are secure for this year.

Compounding the gloomy farm forecast, grasshoppers are predicted to swarm over much of southern Alberta.

Time may be running out on Canada's nearly uninterrupted postwar prosperity. Sums up one Canadian observer: "Canada's good luck may be no more than a time lag, brought on by the fact that other national economies have to slow down first before demand declines for Canadian products."

— Cecil Maranville

China "Votes" for Strauss

BONN: Franz Josef Strauss, the controversial Bavarian politician, churned up waves on the German political scene when he became the first German politician ever to be received by Chairman Mao Tse-tung of the People's Republic of China.

The historic meeting, which took place during a two-week visit to China in January, was undoubtedly the high point of Strauss' long and stormy political career. The "audience" with Chairman Mao was made all the more significant in view of the fact that only two other non-heads of government have ever been welcomed personally by China's supreme leader: U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Edward Heath, who at the time of his visit was head of the opposition Conservative Party in England.

It doesn't take much to discern why the Chinese were so hospitable to Strauss. The leader of Bavaria's conservative Christian Social Union (CSU) has never hidden his contempt for the Soviet Union and has been an outspoken critic of détente. These views fit right in with those of Communist China's leaders, also sternly opposed to Soviet foreign policy. In addition, Premier Chou En-lai has on several occasions openly voiced his favor of Western European unity. A strong and vigorous Western Europe in China's eyes would act as a powerful deterrent to alleged Russian designs on China.

There seems to be no doubt whom the Chinese would like to see seated in the saddle of government in West Germany after that nation's general elections in the autumn of 1976 — none other than the rotund Bavarian, and with good reason.

The present West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt said recently that Bonn desires "good and normal relations" with the People's Republic, but added that German relations with the Soviet Union were of greater importance at the present time. His comments came after a call from Herr Strauss for more consideration of China in Germany's "Ostpolitik," which up to now has mainly involved the Soviet Union and her Eastern European Communist partners.

Herr Strauss has said he will confer soon with Chancellor Schmidt, who is planning a trip to China himself this spring. Perhaps Franz Josef can give him a tip or two on how to behave behind the bamboo curtain. Such advice is about all he can give.

— Paul Kieffer

Freezing the Dead Is There Life After the Thaw?

by George Ritter

"Freeze now — live later." Or better yet, "Freeze — wait — reanimate." That's the slogan of the Life Extension Society, whose members are actively involved in trying to cheat man's ultimate enemy — the grave.

Proponents of this "never-say-die" concept known as cryogenics are hoping that sometime in the future science will be able to unravel the mysteries of life and revitalize their frozen corpses. Already several bodies of former cryogenics enthusiasts have been placed "on ice" in specially designed coffins supercooled to several hundred degrees below zero. A number of others have signed up for similar treatment upon their demise.

Some Chilling Obstacles

Living cells subjected to the freezing process normally suffer irreparable damage because of the formation of ice crystals. To eliminate this problem, an "antifreeze" substance must be infused into the organism being frozen. The trouble is that it's almost impossible for the antifreeze to permeate all the cells involved in an organism like the human body. Different parts of the body also have different optimum cooling rates. Consequently, proper refrigeration could not take place unless a wide variety of freezing rates were simultaneously employed on the same corpse. But most parts of the body can't be frozen fast enough. The brain cells, for instance, are believed to deteriorate minutes after death. Yet freezing of a normal human body at a controlled rate could take at least an hour.

The thawing-out process is fraught with

just as many difficulties. The first cells to be thawed may deteriorate before other more remote cells can be warmed up. Because of such difficulties, not even simple organs have remained functional once they have been subjected to the freeze-thaw cycle.

As if this weren't enough, no one has the foggiest notion of how to reanimate a cadaver, frozen or otherwise. And somebody would have to figure out a cure for whatever fatal malady caused the person's death before he could survive a return from his sub-zero grave.

The Real Life Giver

But these medical problems, as formidable as they are, don't really get to the crux of man's attempts to conquer death. There is another dimension to *homo sapiens* that can only be dealt with by his Creator, not by science or by the techniques of cryogenics. It was described in the thirty-second chapter of the book of Job, when one of the patriarchs exclaimed: "There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

It takes more than chemicals to generate human life. When God formed Adam's body out of the dust of the ground, Adam did not "become alive" until God had "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life."

The spirit and breath of life are God's to give — not man's. And when death occurs, man loses this God-given essence. As Solomon wrote in Ecclesiastes 8:8: "There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain

the spirit; neither hath he power in the day of death . . ."

And in Ecclesiastes 12:7, Solomon again speaks of what happens at death: "Then shall the dust [body] return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

As far as man is concerned, the state of death is final, and there is no human recourse against it. According to the patriarch Job: "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away: so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more" (Job 7:9).

And again Solomon in Ecclesiastes 9:5-6: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have

they any more a reward. . . . Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun."


Only God, in the final analysis, can restore the dead to life. And not through cryogenics — but rather through a future resurrection. That resurrection is one of the central themes of the Bible and an integral part of God's plan for mankind. It is described throughout the Bible in places like I Corinthians 15, I Thessalonians 4, Revelation 20, etc. When that momentous event occurs, then and only then will death finally be conquered. □



Most Admired Woman — Billie Jean King has scored a smashing victory as the "World's Most Admired Woman" in a survey of teen-age girls from all over the U.S. Two out of five girls selected Ms. King from a master list of fifty names, citing not only her skill on the tennis court but also her role in gaining equality for women. Golda Meir ranked second, followed by TV star Mary Tyler Moore.

Ambassador College

At Ambassador College students learn the meaning and purpose of human life. They learn lasting values, values that make life truly happy, fulfilling and worthwhile. As character building institutions, Ambassador Colleges at Pasadena, California and Big Sandy, Texas teach students how to live, as well as how to earn a living.



Major courses of study offered at one or both campuses of Ambassador College are agribusiness, business administration, chemistry, communications arts, computer science, English, general studies, history, home economics, liberal arts, mass communications, physical education, Spanish, speech, theology.

Please send me an Ambassador College catalog. (Check one) Big Sandy

Please send me an application for admission. (Check first choice of campus). Pasadena Big Sandy

Name _____


Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

() _____

Phone _____ (U.S. & Canada)

Clip coupon and mail to: Admissions Office, Ambassador College, 300 W. Green Street, Pasadena, California 91123, U.S.A. In the U.S.A., you may call toll free 800-423-4444. (In California call 213-677-5503).



Among the many extra-curricular activities, intercollegiate athletics are a central feature. The importance of mental, physical, and spiritual development are emphasized at Ambassador College.

While the classroom is the focal point of higher learning, at Ambassador College there is not only mind development but also that of personality, culture, and emotional maturity.

The INCREDIBLE HUMAN POTENTIAL...

The Missing Dimension in Knowledge

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Part III

DOES IT make sense to you — when humanity has been endowed with such tremendous mental power — that more than HALF of all people on earth should be illiterate, living in abject poverty, near starvation, in filth and squalor; that in one country of 26 million people, only 3% can read and write and per capita income is only \$69 per year?

Does it make sense to you that human civilization has developed modern science, higher education, the world's religions and its great governments, yet all these are in total ignorance of the way to world peace? None of these can tell us what man is, whether he was put on earth for a purpose, what that PURPOSE IS, where he is going or how to get there.

Does it make sense to you — with the human endowed with such great powers — that the world should be filled with so much unhappiness, troubles and evils?

Did God Almighty the Creator purpose and ordain all of this?

We may blame it all on human nature, but did God create man with this evil to harass him?

It's time to clear up this mystery. It's time we understand. It's time we come to the answer of these supposedly unanswerable questions that seem to baffle all human thought.

Man Has Rejected This Knowledge

What is the most necessary of all knowledge to know?

It is the knowledge of what man is; the knowledge of why he is — the PURPOSE for which humanity was put on earth; the knowledge of the way to achieve that purpose — of the way to world peace, peace between individuals, groups and nations; the knowledge of the cause of all the world's troubles and evils; the knowledge of the solution to all these problems; the knowledge of the true values — what is important and what is unimportant.

That is the missing dimension in knowledge. Look at the situation as it is now — our present, pulsating twentieth century. Supposedly this is the day of enlightenment and mass production of knowledge. Both modern science and higher education have rejected the sole source of this basic knowledge — revelation — and no religion has given us this most-needed knowledge, though it is all contained in the book generally supposed to be the source of belief of at least three of the world's great religions.

Look at the situation as it was more than 1900 years ago. Jesus Christ came from heaven with a message from God containing this knowledge. But even most of those who believe on him disbelieve the message he brought and demanded his crucifixion for declaring it. His apostles went forth proclaiming the message; they too, with one possible exception, were martyred. Before the end of the first century, Christ's gospel message was suppressed and a spurious "gospel" proclaimed.

Go now all the way back to the beginning of humanity on the earth. Our very first parents rejected this same revealed knowledge imparted to them by their Maker in person. They disobeyed what he said. They disobeyed by stealing the forbidden fruit. They took to themselves the knowledge of what is good and what is evil. All humanity has followed their example ever since.

The Eternal God nevertheless has made

Does it make sense to you why the human mind is so capable it can produce the incredible computer and the accomplishment of sending man to the moon and back, yet is utterly helpless in fact to solve our problems here on earth?

this vital revealed knowledge and truth available to any willing to BELIEVE what he says — in his inspired book, the Book of books — the Holy Bible. This book has actually become the world's best seller. But this precious book has been interpreted and misinterpreted, distorted, twisted, misrepresented, misunderstood, and maligned as no other book ever has.

Humans have written uncounted millions of books. People BELIEVE what these books say, though they may be partly, mostly, or totally in error and devoid of truth.

People take these books literally to mean what they say. Yet of the Bible they will say, "You surely don't take the Bible literally, do you?" They will not believe this book means what it says. It is the very Word of the living God, but they refuse to believe what God says.

And thus disbelieving humanity continues stumbling on its way, piling up the mountains of human woes, discontent, unhappiness, sorrow, pain, suffering and death.

Yet the Eternal God of truth and mercy makes available even today — in this end-time of the present evil world — this vital missing knowledge to those willing to believe what he says and to obey it.

Forty-eight years ago ON PROOF, I came to BELIEVE AND OBEY.

And in his Word the living God has opened my mind to the awesome human potential — to the missing dimension in knowledge; to the CAUSES of all humanity's evils and to the WAY to world peace and how it finally is going to come. And the same God of all creation is now opening before me the doors to unusual favor in the eyes of heads of state all over the world as an ambassador without human portfolio for world peace and a builder of bridges for peace between nations.

The Vast Universe — and Man

In this book of all books, God reveals himself as Creator of all, not merely the earth and man, but the entire limitless universe. On a clear, cloudless night one may behold the star-studded sky. The Maker of mankind is also the Creator of all. Is it possible there is an unrealized connection between the galaxies with their mighty suns, their planets — and man?

In this true story of the missing dimension in knowledge and of the incredible human potential, I deem it well to look first to the Creator's overall purpose. Prepare yourself for exciting new knowledge — the incredible awesome potential for which humanity was created and put here on earth.

Winston Churchill said before the United States Congress that there is a purpose being worked out here below. Few indeed know what that purpose is; yet it is plainly revealed.

And it's the most exciting, most wonderful, hope-inspiring truth that could be revealed.

God — Creator of the Universe

Did you ever wonder about the countless millions of shining stars you have seen on an

otherwise black, cloudless night? Sometimes they appear like a stupendous skyrocket which has just burst out into a glittering cluster. Many of them are tremendous suns incredibly larger than our sun. Probably most of them are surrounded by planets, like our sun is surrounded by Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and the other planets or our solar system.

Haven't you wondered about them? Are any of them inhabited? Did they evolve, as most scientists — astronomers, biologists, geologists — theorize? Were they created by an all-intelligent, all-powerful Creator Being? Were they created and set in space FOR A PURPOSE? Do any of the planets contain any kind of life, or are all like our moon — dead, decayed, lifeless, wasted, empty, uninhabitable? And if they are in a dead state of decay and lifeless, WHY would an intelligent Creator have created them thus? Or did he?

These are indeed intriguing questions. Scientists are extremely interested in knowing more about these uncountable gigantic bodies out there in space. Science does not know much about the origin of all these mighty bodies in space. There are many theories — many guesses — many hypotheses — as to how they were formed — but not based on natural fact.

Science generally rejects REVELATION as a basic source of knowledge. Although astronomers for hundreds of years have been curious about the stars in the sky, many devoting their lifetimes to this study through constantly improved telescopes, yet they knew nothing about the purpose — or whether there is a purpose.

In Pasadena, California, a short distance from Ambassador College is the world-famous Jet Propulsion Laboratory (known as JPL), operated by California Institute of Technology, devoted primarily to U.S. government and space projects. There they design and produce unmanned spacecraft to be sent into outer space to photograph and send back pictures of other planets in our solar system. Recently (December 1974) one came comparatively close (26,000 miles) to Jupiter. It sent back photographs that revealed additional knowledge about this largest of our planets. They did not give any proof of existing life or of conditions capable of sustaining life.

More recently (February 9, 1975) astronomers at the University of Arizona claimed to have discovered through a telescope evidence of water on Jupiter. This I consider highly doubtful.

Of course, the planet Mars has attracted the widest attention. Haven't you wondered if Mars is inhabited — what kind of life might exist there? This very question has supplied the theme for science-fiction movies and a television series viewed by millions.

On July 4, 1976 — the 200th anniversary of the United States as a nation — something is planned to happen on Mars. An unmanned spacecraft named the "Viking," in appearance something like a huge, ungainly tinkertoys, is due to land on Mars and send back to earth photographs from the very surface of Mars.

But does human life or some other form — either much superior to man, or much inferior — exist on Mars or any other planet? Science does not have the answer. But the many photographs sent back to Earth from spacecraft flying much nearer Mars, Venus, Jupiter and Saturn than our planet Earth at least INDICATE a total absence of life on any of these planets — or conditions capable of sustaining life.

All indications are that only our planet earth is a life-supporting planet. Others appear to be like our moon — dead, decayed, wasted and empty. Our earth is part of the solar system which is part of a single galaxy called the Milky Way. There are many other galaxies on beyond our Milky Way. They extend in space distances so vast the human mind cannot conceive of them in terms of miles, meters, or any measure of distance except light years.

So even though science knows comparatively little about the limitless universe, revelation tells us something amazing beyond words about them.

The first verse in the revealed Word of God, says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and earth." The word "heaven" in the A.V. should be translated "heavens," since the original Hebrew is in the plural.

The ancient King David of Israel wondered about the stars and was inspired to tell us God created them.

Created — But Why?

David was inspired to write, "Oh Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens. . . . When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him?" (Psalm 8:1, 3-4.)

It may be that King David was not given the revelation of the real connection between man and the stars of outer space, for he continues: "For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas. O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!" (Psalm 8:5-9.)

David here limits man's dominion to the present — that which God gave mankind in the creation of man — the solid earth, the earth's atmosphere, and the waters and sea (as in Gen. 1:26-28).

That is the dominion man has now. In the New Testament, written much later, far more is revealed.

In the book of Hebrews we read: "For unto the angels hath he [God] not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak" (Heb. 2:5). The theme of the context here is "the world to come."

There is but one earth, but the Bible speaks of three worlds, ages, or civilizations on the earth — the "world that then was" (the antediluvian world from Adam to Noah); this "present evil world" (from the Flood until Christ's return, yet future); and "the world to come" (which starts when Christ comes and sets up the kingdom of God).

(Continued on page 14, col. 3)

WEEK ENDING MARCH 8, 1975

Teaching the World to Read

by Dexter Faulkner

The fact that you can read this page sets you apart dramatically from much of the world's population. It is impossible to determine exactly how many people are illiterate, but conservative U.N. estimates put the present total at around 800 million people over the age of 15.


That means about one third of the world's adult population — or about four times the population of the United States — cannot read or write.

This lack of education condemns those millions to a less-than-human status. The illiterate third world subsistence farmer cannot decipher simple agricultural instructions which might save his crops. The illiterate Latin American woman cannot protect her children from disease which a poster plainly explains how to prevent or cure.

To remedy this tragic situation, the World Bank in Washington, D.C. has just published a sweeping criticism of education in developing countries and offered over \$350 million to help change things.

World Bank President Robert S.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN in Nairobi, Kenya, East Africa, listen attentively as a classmate recites during an English-language class.



Ford Foundation

McNamara, in his foreword to the report, writes that "developing countries have greatly expanded their educational systems over the past quarter of a century. But much of the expansion has been misdirected. The results are seen in one of the most disturbing paradoxes of our time: while millions of people from among the educated are unemployed, millions of jobs are waiting to be done because people with the right education, training and skills cannot be found."

In a 73-page report, *Education Sector Working Paper*, the bank complained that schools in developing countries favor city dwellers and middle-income and upper-income groups at the expense of the urban and the rural poor.

The schools' efforts so far "have been insufficient to provide education for more than half of the children and adults in developing countries," it added. It goes on to report that in 25 of the world's poorest countries, only one third of elementary school-aged children are enrolled.

Also, argues the report, the education that is offered tends to be irrelevant to development needs, often ignoring those practical skills which eventually occupy 60% to 80% of the population.

Among the World Bank's specific recommendations were the following:

- There should be at least a minimum basic education for all as fully and as soon as available resources permit.
- That further education and training beyond the basic level should be provided selectively in order to improve the performance of economic, social and other developmental roles.
- That a national system of education should be viewed as a comprehensive learning system.
- In the interest of both increased productivity and social equity, education opportunities should be equalized, making education available among different geographical, ethnic, social, sex, income and age groups.

But will the developing countries face up to the need for change?

The risks involved in highly innovative action are substantial to the bank, and even more so to the borrowers. The report also predicated that very few countries will attempt to undertake the radical changes which many observers consider necessary.

It is estimated, however, that if trends continue, the number of illiterate will increase to 865 million by 1985.

To echo the words of U Thant: "The complexity of the problem of illiteracy calls for the intervention of the most modern of educational technology... and it calls for the mobilization of all available financial resources." □



Why NOT?

by David Jon Hill

Pretend You're God

Put yourself in God's place. What if you were God?

What would you promise people? What would your purpose for human life be? What rewards would you hold out for the faithful? What deterrents to misconduct would you enforce? As God, what would your formula for life be?

Would you favor a system replete with taboos on the eating of meat, and then cause hungry people to worship the animals they could not eat? Would you promise those same people the ultimate reward of the great nothingness of Nirvana, where each individual loses his conscious identity by merging into the great One, living forever but not realizing it?

Or would you espouse a central doctrine which demanded belief on pain of death — and then title your religion *Peace*? Would you, in this setting, recommend multiple marriages (up to four at any one time), or would you put the female of the species at a sub-human level by allowing males to divorce by merely saying they want a divorce three times? Would your final gift to true believers in this religion be life eternal spent lying in a hammock between two palm trees in the midst of a beautiful garden, while being fed grapes, dates, and camel's milk by voluptuous maidens?

If that's unappealing, you as God could invent a religion dominated by a powerful hierarchy of human beings, self-commissioned to spare no pain of the body in order to save the soul. The end result of such a difficult religious life would be to gaze upon a beatific vision of your glory for eternity, having no other purpose than to sing your adulation eon upon eon. As God, your deterrent to misconduct in this religion would be to threaten eternal suffering in unimaginable agonies, suffering in the flames of hell, forever frying but never burning up.

Surely you wouldn't be a God like that!

Pretend you're God. Why not? If you embodied perfect love, if your life was eternally self-sustaining, if you were a majestic, all-powerful creator God, if you were filled with consummate joy, if you knew all the secrets of health, peace and happiness, if you could create anything your mind could imagine, if you summed up all the laws of harmonious government — wouldn't you like to share, totally, your own nature and life with your worshippers? Wouldn't you want to invite the brotherhood of man into your family, your own kingdom, as equals? You could call them your sons and really mean it! You could change them into spirit beings just like yourself, have them see and know you just like you really are, have them share in your creation, government and family. They could be busy, useful, and purposeful for all eternity. You could expand your family infinitely. And if some wanted no part of this great goal, you could just quickly end their wretched mortal existence in a moment and return them to the unconscious nothing from which they came — merciful, loving, kind, reasonable!

Wouldn't you like to be a God like that?

The truth is, the great living God who made all things including you is like this. He has one purpose — having you join him and his son in their family-kingdom, sharing their ever-living glory, forever, being God as they are God.

THE KING JAMES BIBLE— MOST POPULAR TRANSLATION

by John R. Schroeder

• "A masterpiece whose cadenced phrasing is an indestructible part of Western culture... can be found in perhaps two-thirds of America's homes" (*Time*).

• "An enduring link, literary and religious, between the English-speaking peoples of the world" (*Sir Winston Churchill*).

• "The history of the Authorized Version has been told so often that I will not attempt to retell it, and its beauties praised so lavishly that I will not praise them" (*C. S. Lewis*).

The publication of the Authorized Version was undoubtedly the greatest achievement of King James I of England. His own comment clearly manifested its critical need: "I profess," he said, "I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English"

(F. F. Bruce, *The English Bible*, page 96).

The King James Bible is a lasting monument to the creative genius of a committee of all-but-forgotten Bible scholars. However, most translations owe a debt to previous translations to one degree or the other. The King James is no different. The translators themselves commented: "... So if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being helped by their labours, do endeavour [sic] to make that better which left so good; no man we are sure, hath cause to mislike us..." (*Our English Bible in the Making*, p. 54).

The Wycliffite Bible, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, the Great Bible, and the Geneva Bible (all predecessors) had their parts to

play in the formation of the Authorized Version.

But so successful was the scriptural scholarship and literacy of the KJV that all previous English versions eventually found their way into the ecclesiastical archives.

The prime mover behind the translation was, of course, King James I. He wanted an English translation that didn't succumb to gross partisan interpretations, an abundance of disfiguring marginal notes, and embarrassing doctrinal bias. In 1611, the translators officially presented the fruit of their scholarly work to James I.


It is not commonly known that the KJV has since undergone a series of revisions (1613, 1629, 1638, 1653, 1657, 1762, 1769). However, these textual changes have been very minor in impact, leaving for the most part a fixed and static translation.

After nearly three hundred years without a significant revision, other translations became vitally necessary. Changes in the

English language made new versions mandatory for the modern world. Archaeologists were uncovering an abundance of new information about the culture and language of Old and New Testament Palestine. F. F. Bruce, noted British scholar, comments: "... The advances which have taken place during the past three and a half centuries in knowledge of original languages and text of the Bible have made its revision imperative" (*The English Bible*, p. 112). If the reader will remember the old English used in the quote from the King James translators earlier in this article, he will easily appreciate the imperative need for acceptable alternative translations in modern English.

In addition to the Authorized Version (presently found in most English-speaking homes), the up-to-date reader of the Bible would do well to have at least one other reliable modern translation. Fortunately many translations and paraphrased versions are available on our modern market. □


FOOD / POPULATION / WAR



Graph by Ron Lepeska — Wide World Photo



UPI



ANCHOVY FISHERMEN, PERU

UPI

The Politics of Desperation

by Keith Stump

In the face of skyrocketing fuel, fertilizer, and food costs, crop failures and bad weather, the nations of the developing Third World — threatened with bankruptcy and starvation — may be forced to turn to the "politics of desperation" in an attempt to alleviate their acute situation.

John H. Steinhart, Professor of Geology and Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, fears just such a development. Dr. Steinhart was one of several leading scientists participating in a symposium on *Science and Foreign Policy: The Food-Energy Relationship* at the 141st annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held in January in New York City.

"There have never before been as many hungry, miserable people in the world," Dr. Steinhart emphasized. Many experts estimate that over a billion people worldwide — one in four — are suffering malnutrition.

Because the underdeveloped nations are not heavily energy intensive in their agriculture but rely primarily on human and animal labor, Dr. Steinhart noted a tendency on the part of some observers to minimize the impact of higher fuel costs on them.

For the underdeveloped countries,

Plain Truth editorial staff members Gene Hogberg, Keith Stump and Robert Ginskey recently attended key news conferences and symposia at the annual meeting of the American Association for Advancement of Science held this year in New York. Their reports on these pages analyze the latest — and very troublesome — trends in the fields of food and natural food policy as seen by some of the top scientific thinkers in the areas. Coupled with their analyses is an in-depth look at the state of American agriculture, plus an on-the-spot report from food-short, politically explosive India.

the capital outflows for oil have been smaller than for the industrialized nations — only about \$24 billion last year. "Yet," stressed Steinhart, "for such industrial development as they have accomplished, and for such fuel needs that they have [fuel for tractors and irrigation pumps, for example], they're at least as dependent on Middle Eastern oil as anyone. More than half their commercial energy needs are derived from imported oil from the OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] nations. The cost of oil has about tripled for them. With their precarious financial situation, the problem has been *disastrous*."

Cost of Imported Food Up — Aid Volume Down

On top of all this, surplus food from the industrialized nations has simply become too expensive for the poorer nations to buy to supplement their own inadequate production. According to Dr. Steinhart, "the admittedly poor diet of an Indian peasant would have cost \$200 at U.S. market prices in 1972 — a country that has a per capita income of \$90. Since the OPEC price increases, this disparity has worsened."

But what about food given away or subsidized by long-term loans? "Industrialized nations," Dr. Steinhart observed, "incurring record balance-of-payments deficits, will have further deficits as they attempt to respond to human misery by subsidizing food shipments to poor nations." He noted that the dollar outflow for the Western industrialized nations for oil alone in 1974 was about \$95 billion.

United States "Food for Peace program" shipments dropped to 1/3 of its 1972 level in 1974, Dr. Steinhart noted, adding that the industrialized nations are "between a rock and a hard place" — between their moral and humanitarian inclinations on one side, and the further deficits they would incur should they attempt to respond to human hunger by subsidizing food shipments. A prime example of this is the United States, which registered an \$8 billion balance-of-payments loss for 1974.

Even aside from this balance of payments problem, the United States sim-

(Continued on page 12, col. 1)

"Lavish Banquet" Feeds the Wealthy in a Hungry World

by Gene H. Hogberg

Few people in the affluent, well-fed nations realize how much of the food on their abundant tables comes from other areas of the world — often at the unintended expense of the poorer, food-short, overpopulated parts of the globe.

At the most important news conference held during the recent American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) convention in New York, noted food authority Georg Borgstrom zeroed in on this particular aspect of the growing diversity between the world's rich and poor.

Dr. Borgstrom told newsmen at the January 28 news conference that Europe, Japan, the U.S.S.R., and the United States are increasingly dependent on a massive flow of imported foods and feed to maintain their lifestyles, and that such a flow inevitably means less food is available for the poorer developing countries.

As a prime example of this, reported the Michigan State University Professor, four fifths of the ocean-catches are moving into the well-to-do nations. Half of the catches during the peak fishing period of 1970-71 moved as fish meal into the animal feeding troughs of the affluent world. The massive fish hauls off the Peruvian coast did not go to solve the problem of hunger in South America. Rather, the catches were sold — and the subsequent fish meal used mostly as protein supplements for the American cattle and poultry industry.

What about the prodigious American soybean harvest? Hasn't it helped alleviate world hunger? Dr. Borgstrom answered: "The soybean crops have long been touted as a major U.S. contribution to alleviating world hunger, yet around 3/4 of the exports went to Europe, 1/5 to Japan, and the remainder was divided up between the two minute countries of Israel and Taiwan. Less than 2 percent ever went to the hungry world. This includes charity sendings through CARE, Meals for Millions, OXFAM and similar."

Dr. Borgstrom, author of the book, *The Hungry Planet*, also added that

America's net contribution to the world household is frequently overrated by not recognizing the fact that the United States is top ranking as a buyer of beef as well as of fish and fish products. Its importation of dairy products corresponds in amount of protein to the total milk production of Norway. One need only look at the continually increasing number of foreign cheeses displayed in American grocery stores.

"Ghost Continents" Feed the Affluent

Dr. Borgstrom placed the world food production and distribution imbalance in an interesting dimension.

"Europe is little aware of the two huge 'ghost continents' on which it depends — each corresponding to around 50 million hectares [125 million acres] of highly cultivated land," Borgstrom asserted.

One of these "ghost continents" is the *land* in other countries used to produce food for export to the affluent nations of Europe. Each year the European nations buy in the world market more plant (not animal) protein than the whole Indian subcontinent is eating. Europe's other "ghost continent" is the *ocean*, since it produces fish for "export" to affluent nations.

Similarly, Borgstrom pointed out that "Japan is relying on more than 'six Japans' via trade — 640% of their tilled acreage with about half that figure coming from the ocean!"

Enter Russia

The world food picture was further distorted in 1972 when the Soviet Union entered heavily into the world grain market. Massive purchases of U.S. feed grains — virtually wiping out the American surpluses — were made, stressed Borgstrom, "not to keep hunger away from the daily Soviet scene but to secure and enhance further the ascending nutritional affluence of that giant." The Soviet Union has undertaken a massive improvement program

(Continued on page 12, col. 3)



Wide World

“End of Cornucopia” for U.S. Agriculture?

by Catherine Lerza

[Reprinted from an article in the *Journal of Current Social Issues*, Winter 1975 Issue.]

Early this past summer, Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz confidently predicted that the United States position in the international community would continue to be bolstered by the vast amounts of grain pouring out of the cornucopia of the Midwestern Corn Belt. “Food is power,” he told the press as he unveiled the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) predictions of a record 1974 corn crop of 6.4 billion bushels.

That was July. By mid-August, USDA economists, gloomily surveying the sun parched, drought-ridden Midwest, revised their optimistic statistics: a 4.7 billion bushel crop, 12 percent below last year’s production levels. Butz told the public that the livestock feed situation was “critical,” and that food prices might go up as much as 14 percent over the next year.

The Secretary was consistently right about one thing: Food is power. And if an abundance of food is a mainstay of U.S. preeminence in world affairs, our position is more vulnerable than anyone in the federal government would like to admit.

The vulnerability of the U.S. agricultural system is the result of our ever increasing dependence on energy-intensive agricultural technology, a growing reliance on processed foods, and the development of genetically engineered, “green revolution” hybrid crops which demand vast doses of water, fertilizer and pesticides. The rise of corporate agriculture has encouraged the use of unecological farming practices which fly in the face of every known “law” of natural systems.

With frightening regularity, scientists are realizing that the U.S. agricultural system uses more energy than it produces. It depends completely on mammoth infusions of petroleum and natural gas in the form of fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and various drugs and chemicals used to produce livestock.

Without a continuing flow of cheap fossil fuels and petroleum-based agri-chemicals, we may discover that the fabled American cornucopia is almost empty.

Farm Revolution — How Beneficial?

Despite this year’s poor showing, the USDA proudly hails American agriculture as the most productive in the world. The Department’s 1970 Yearbook fairly burst with pride in its description of the transformation of the American farm scene: “Farmers are now purchasing way more products, goods and services, as they must if they are to have today’s modern technology . . . [Forty years ago] they were still providing most of their own production needs — horsepower (and its feed), soil fertility (clover-rotation), livestock feeds, crop seeds and workers. Today’s farmer buys prodigious amounts of his production needs — fertilizers, formula feed, hybrid seeds, insecticides, herbicides, tractor fuel — and employs a myriad of custom services such as machine harvesting, fertilizer and pesticide spraying and airplane crop dusting.”

Since 1950, while this change was occurring, the number of acres under cultivation in the United States has remained constant, about 325 million acres, but the number of people living and working on these farms has dropped by 50 percent. The number of farms in operation has been reduced by three million (and continues to drop at the rate of 2,000 per week) since the 1940s. But, and this is the USDA’s *pièce de résistance*, farm production has gone up 60 percent.

Massive Energy Expenditure

The scenario sounds unbelievably rosy thus far, but a closer look at the components of this production increase reveals the basic vulnerability of the system. According to the USDA’s own figures, fertilizer (usually made from petroleum or natural gas) use has in-

creased 10-fold since 1946, and the use of fossil fuels to power farm equipment has grown 50 percent. And the use of energy on the farm is only the beginning. Research done by Eric Hirst, now of the Federal Energy Administration [indicates] that food-related energy use grew 3.3 percent between 1960 and 1970 — a rate double that of population growth.

Georg Borgstrom, the noted author of *The Hungry Planet* and a professor of food science and human nutrition at Michigan State University, has computed that the energy input into an acre of soybeans grown in Iowa was 2.3 to 3.5 times greater than the food energy produced by the soybeans. Even more appalling are his calculations of comparative energy use in food production. “The difference in calorie intake between the U.S. and India is not, as generally assumed, 1,310 calories per day, but rather 9,182,” he wrote in a recent issue of the Swedish science journal, *Ambio*. Borgstrom explained the gap by comparing the amounts of energy consumed in the plants and animals ingested by the average Indian and the average American, as well as the energy used to produce the feed eaten by meat-producing livestock. The average American consumes 10,017 calories worth of primary energy daily, while the average Indian consumes only 773. Borgstrom notes, “If the energy intensive farming of the kind practiced in the United States were applied worldwide, this would require some 35 to 40 percent of the total world energy account.”

It appears that there is something seriously wrong with the American agricultural system. Since 1910, United States agricultural efficiency, as measured in energy, has decreased 10-fold. At the turn of the century, according to University of Wisconsin researchers Carol and John Steinhart, the American farmer used less than one calorie of energy to extract one calorie of food energy from the soil. Their research indicates that farmers now spend close to 10 calories of energy for every one obtained in food. As an ironic slap-in-the-face to American “efficiency,” the Steinharts also note that many “primitive” societies obtain anywhere from five to 50 calories of food per calorie invested in agricultural production.

Diversity Gives Way to Monoculture

Diversity is the backbone of a healthy ecosystem, serving as nature’s insulation against disease, inclement weather and pests. But American agriculture (read agribusiness) has, in the past three decades, abandoned diversity and opted instead for homogeneity. Centuries of plant evolution have been replaced by laboratory developed hybrid seeds, and natural ecosystems featuring a broad variety of plant species have been preempted by thousands of acres of single crops.

In the days before this genetic uniformity, farmers in different parts of the country planted the seeds right for their climate and soil conditions — a seed that was the end product of thousands of years of genetic development. An ominous portent of the future occurred in 1970 when a blight-carrying virus infected the corn crop of the nation and felled 15 percent of it. Almost every field of corn in the nation was equally vulnerable to the disease, the protection of diversity having been eliminated.

In the days before hybrids and agri-chemicals, farmers grew corn in three-year rotation cycles of corn-oats-clover in order to regenerate soil nutrients. (Clover acts as a nitrogen fixer in the soil.) Farmers used little or no fertilizers and planted about 10,000 seeds per acre, according to USDA statistics. By 1970, farmers had replaced crop rotation with 150-pounds-per-acre applications of nitrogen fertilizer and were planting 25,000 seeds per acre. Yields-per-acre had jumped to 90 or 100 bushels. But this increase, attributed by the USDA to hybrid seeds alone, actually was the result of extensive fertilization and more efficient planting technology.

Soil Fertility — What’s That?

The USDA has consistently failed to tell the public the truth about the effects of this system on the soil, the nation’s most basic and valuable resource. Although chemical fertilizers have been in existence since the 1840’s, their widespread use did not begin until the mid-20th century. Their presence has brought about a change in the definition of soil fertility.

Once fertility was a measure of soil structure and nutrient content, the result of years of careful farming and maintenance. The word “fertile” today often refers only to the amount of three important water soluble nutrients in the soil — nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. These nutrients are the ones most commonly found in chemical fertilizers. Forgotten are healthy soil structure, water content, trace minerals and the presence of organic matter (humus) — all ingredients of fertile soil. The importance of these three elements to food production has been so over-rated that the soil itself has often been ignored. According to Michael Allaby and Floyd Allen in their book *Robots Behind the Plow*, “Nitrogen-phosphorus-potassium fertilizers became a substitute for land.”

Allaby and Allen have documented other effects excessive use of chemical fertilizer has had on the soil. “As the use of artificial fertilizer increased, less

and less organic matter has been returned to the soil, while reserves of humus (organic material in the soil) have been mined away," they write. The amount and kind of organic material in the soil determines soil structure which, in turn, dictates the way in which water moves through it. If the structure of the soil does not allow adequate circulation of water (and the nutrients it contains) plants cannot absorb these nutrients, no matter how abundant they might be. Chemical fertilizers break down soil structure and can actually promote erosion.

Tragic Loss of Topsoil

Fertile topsoil is now a disappearing resource in the United States. Noted ecologist Barry Commoner estimates that the organic content of Midwestern soils has declined by about 50 percent in the last century, while a 1970 National Academy of Science report claims that the nation has lost about one third of its topsoil. Where topsoil was once several feet thick in the richest areas of the Corn Belt, it is now only seven inches deep.

As the soil declines in quality, the use of fertilizers increases. Arid areas of California, Texas and Arizona, once showcase examples of how farm technology can "make the desert bloom," are now suffering production declines. These "declines" are the result of over-cultivation, over-irrigation and over-fertilization. Farmers are encouraged, however, by the USDA and agricultural producers to use more fertilizers to keep yields high.

In some portions of Texas's Rio Grande Valley, Allaby and Allen report, fertilizer application rates have reached 800 pounds an acre. As many critics of corporate farming techniques have pointed out, such enormous doses of fertilizer make soil unnecessary; crops could just as easily be grown hydroponically (in nutrient-laden water). Soil becomes nothing more than a means by which to prop plants up.

The Efficiency Myth

In the name of efficiency, hybrid grain has replaced traditional seed stocks. This "efficiency" is largely a myth, however. . . . This is particularly true in regard to protein. Quality has frequently deteriorated considerably, showing up in declining protein levels. What do declining levels of protein in corn mean to the rest of the food economy? For one thing, it means that livestock fed this corn must be given diet supplements of protein-rich fish meal and soybean meal. There is nothing "efficient" about feeding protein. (The system is more than inefficient, however: much of our fishmeal has come from the coastal waters of Peru, a country where protein deficiencies are rampant among the population. Some research indicates that the United States imports enough fish protein to alleviate one-half the protein shortage in all of South America.)

This "efficient" replacement of hybrid for natural seed stocks has resulted in increased dependence on herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides and insecticides. Cotton and corn, in particular, cannot survive without the

(Continued on page 12, col. 3)

Nuclear Blackmail for Food?

"Lifeboat" Theory Stirs Anger in India

by Norman Cousins

NEW DELHI — A short distance outside New Delhi, I saw a long file of protest marchers walking slowly in the direction of the capital. Most of them were young adults. They were identified by their placards as teachers, students, farmers, shopkeepers and commercial workers. One of the placards said: "Hungry People Are Human, Too."

Another sign: "Is India Going to Be Thrown on the Rubbish Heap?"

I learned that the reason for the march was the increasing discussion in the Indian press over reports that Western nations, including the United States, are getting ready to turn their backs on India's need for mammoth food supplies. The reports suggest that Western policymakers feel there's no way of preventing mass famine and that no amount of aid could solve the basic problem.

The person whose name has been frequently linked with this hard-line approach to the developing nations is Garrett Hardin, professor of biology at the University of California. According to the reports, Prof. Hardin believes that the Western nations should resist efforts to help famine-threatened countries. He uses the lifeboat analogy. If the survivors take more than a certain number on board, everyone will go down.

Prof. Hardin's ideas and the shocked reaction of the young people walking toward New Delhi served to dramatize what is rapidly becoming the most important issue before contemporary civilization. The attitudes of the rich and the poor toward one another are setting the stage for what could become the most decisive showdown in history. Robert Heilbroner, in "An Inquiry into the Human Prospect," foresees the possibility of atomic blackmail by hungry nations, now coming into possession of nuclear secrets, if they don't get a larger share of the world's wealth.

That issue is not a misty, distant prospect but is already taking shape, as was evidenced by the protest marchers near New Delhi. It was not difficult to understand their feelings. It was not that they believed they were *entitled* to help from the outside world, but that they were now being told, in effect, that they are not worth helping. They were protesting lifeboat analogies and a notion that some people have the right to decide whether others shall live.

I left the protesters and drove back to my New Delhi hotel with its well-appointed lobby and lounges. The dining room was filled with the hum of polite conversation. At the far side of the room was the rotisserie, with its exotic meats and fowls being roasted on open spits.



ACME

Food vs. Fodder - Grim Choices Lie Ahead

by Robert Ginskey

In an increasingly hungry world, attention is inevitably focused on animals and their relation to man's food supply.

Agricultural animals consume prodigious amounts of food but return only about a fraction in the form of meat, milk, and eggs. As a result, food experts are quick to point out that animals and animal products are almost always a luxury — a luxury for which humans, in lean times at least, pay a dear price.

Certain animals actually compete with man for the available food supply. The pig, for example, consumes grain which humans can eat directly. In marked contrast to the pig, however, cattle have a unique ability to digest cellulose, a substance widely available in grass, but non-digestible by man. This means that cattle and other ruminants can produce human food from forage, and yet not compete with man for food, nor in many cases for the land upon which the forage is grown. For this reason, there is a

It wasn't necessary to juxtapose the protest walk against the kind of life being lived in the cities of the Western world. Within India itself all the combustible contrasts were in full view.

The greatest danger with the Hardin approach applies not to India but to the West. For Hardinism can become a wild infection in the moral consciousness. If it is possible to rationalize letting large numbers of Asians starve, it will be no time at all before we apply the same reasoning to people at home. Once we discover how easy it is to share without finching at famine in Calcutta or Dacca, it should be no trick to go unblinking at the disease-ridden tenements in Harlem or Detroit or the squalor of the shacks in Appalachia. □

Copyright 1975, Norman Cousins. Dist. by Los Angeles Times Syndicate.

growing call in scientific circles to return cattle to the pasture — where they are most efficient — and drastically scale down feedlot operations in which the animals are fed prodigious amounts of increasingly more expensive feed grains.

"Let 'em eat grass," wrote an agricultural development expert recently in the *Christian Science Monitor*. He decried the 40 million tons of grain and 5 million tons of soybeans and other high protein concentrates fed to U.S. cattle in 1974.

Biggest Luxury — Pets

Dr. J. Thomas Reid, Head of the Department of Animal Science and Professor of Nutrition, Cornell University, reported to fellow delegates at the American Association for the Advancement of Science that by the year 2025, the only animal protein available to man might be fish and the meat and milk produced by ruminants and other herbivores feeding largely on grass. Other animals, such as the pig, will simply be too expensive to raise.

As world food shortages become more acute, stressed Dr. Reid, even pets may become more difficult to justify.

"In the U.S.A., there are over 71 million household dogs and cats," Reid told reporters at an AAAS news conference, "and they consume as much energy as 47 million people require." (Other scientists estimate the dog and cat population to be upwards of 100 million.)

Such pets compete directly with people for food, have a birth rate seven times higher than humans, and cost over \$2.5 billion per year just for the food to feed them — six times that spent on baby food.

Reid concludes that in coming years, some difficult, if not traumatic decisions must be made by all of mankind, especially those accustomed to high levels of animal protein consumption — not to mention pet lovers.

As food becomes an ever more precious commodity, the role of animals in man's food chain and even in his everyday life seems destined to radically change. The debate over food versus fodder is only beginning. □

Politics of Desperation

(Continued from page 9)

ply does not have the massive surpluses available for widespread aid as it has had in years past.

In view of all of these factors — and should they worsen still further — the only way out for the developing countries of Asia and Africa, concluded Dr. Steinhart, may be the "politics of desperation."

Within this framework there could be some banding together of producers of primary metals, or perhaps other commodities, in an attempt to duplicate OPEC's success in extracting more money for their resources. Strategic metals such as copper, tin, chromium, and bauxite — the supplies of which are largely found in the developing nations — could very likely be involved in future cartel action.

Another scenario frequently proposed is that of the hungry nations — some of which, like India, are coming into possession of nuclear secrets — engaging in nuclear blackmail to extort direly needed food, especially if industrialized nations adopt the "ethics of the lifeboat" as is being urged in some quarters. This refers to the proposal that the United States and other grain-rich nations stop "wasting" precious food on the "hopelessly" poor and overpopulated countries and concentrate on those who can be helped.

The analogy of a lifeboat is often used: If the boat is filled too full, it will sink and the lives of all will be lost, so it is better to bar some from the boat so the rest might survive. In other words, give food only to those nations in which famine is not "inevitable."

This concept has provoked great controversy within the United States and throughout the world in general.

Alternatives

What can be done to prevent the underdeveloped nations from resorting to the "politics of desperation"? A primary necessity is the expansion of food production both in the developed and developing nations.

But, as Dr. Steinhart observed, expansion of land under cultivation in the U.S. in the next 25 years appears unlikely. Additional land brought into agriculture by the year 2000, he explained, will be almost exactly balanced by that lost to urbanization and other development and that lost to erosion and soil depletion. "And improvements in per acre yield have been tapering off in recent years, and future improvements must be weighted against the fact that new lands brought into agriculture in the U.S. are marginal by present standards and the land lost to development includes some of the most productive lands."

Key: Improving Agriculture in Developing Nations

Some experts believe that the only way the underdeveloped nations can really overcome food shortages in the long run is by producing more themselves. What can be done in those nations to increase the quantity of food available?

Roger Revelle, Director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University and another participant in the AAAS symposium, stressed that virtually all cultivatable land in the poorer countries is already under cultivation. Though some agriculturalists would take exception with this, all would nevertheless agree that the effort has to be directed primarily toward increasing per acre yield, for which there is great potential, according to farm experts. Revelle, recently returned from India, cited inefficiency, inadequate capital, and lack of basic agricultural education as problems standing in the way of this.

Another critical problem area for consideration, noted by other members of the symposium, is that of tremendous losses of crops in the field, in storage, and in distribution.

"Losses from agricultural crops are fantastic in developing countries," said Dr. Walter Lynn of Cornell University. He cited birds, fungi, insects, bacterial infections, and rats as but a few of the problems. Available food, stressed another panelist, could be increased by as much as 50% by dealing with the problems of pests and storage!

The panelists emphasized that, in their opinion, the global food problem is as much — if not more — a problem of allocation and distribution as a problem of supply, and urged the implementation of effective distribution and allocation systems.

Can't Overlook Population

Discussions on world hunger always get back to the basic question of world population. Putting the brakes on population growth in the famine-ridden countries is viewed, at least in the industrialized world, as a major necessity in dealing with the world food problem.

"With the basic limits of the world on land and water, I would agree with those who would say that some control of population growth is essential for the long-term well-being of humanity," emphasized food expert Edwin Martin, Deputy U.S. Ambassador to last November's World Food Conference in Rome and a participant in the symposium.

Nevertheless, world population is increasing virtually unabated, and the large growth rates in the poorest nations of the world show few if any signs of decreasing. Current estimates put world population growth at the rate of 2% annually, or something over 75 million people a year. For many poor countries, the rate is about 3%. India's yearly population growth alone is around 13 million.

Some have proposed that food assistance be tied to population control, giving aid only to those countries which are seriously engaged in family planning and contraception promotion programs. But at the U.N. World Population Conference in Bucharest last year, programs of family planning received, in general, a cold shoulder from representatives of the developing nations. Some even labeled birth control programs "racial genocide."

Regardless of how it is done, population growth will be slowed, Dr. Steinhart emphasized, adding, "There is nothing in sight with real promise of cutting back population, except possibly some of the disasters themselves." □

"End of Cornucopia"

(Continued from page 11)

protection of these agrichemicals. However, as ecologists from Rachel Carson onward have convincingly documented, many animals living in rural areas cannot survive with pesticides. The pesticide-linked reproductive failures of predaceous birds, the suppressed growth of female white-tailed deer, and the altered behavior patterns of trout and mosquito fish have all been widely documented, as have the increased resistance of target pests to their chemical killers and the danger these chemicals present to humans.

Feedlot Fiasco

Another "efficient" mode of production instituted by agribusiness is the animal feedlot where thousands of animals are confined to cages or pens for intensive feeding before butchering. Livestock used to graze in open fields or farmyards, replenishing the soil which nourished them with their manure. Today, animal feedlots produce over 750 million tons of wastes every year — wastes which cannot [easily] be returned to the soil and instead become a major contributor to water pollution. One 10,000 animal lot produces sewage equivalent to a city of 164,000 people.

The use of "efficient" feedlots on a wide scale has occurred in concert with America's steadily rising consumption of beef and chicken. According to the 1970 USDA Yearbook, per capita beef and chicken consumption doubled between 1950 and 1970. This increase has caused a growing use of grain crops for animal feeds. Francis Moore Lappe, in her incisive book, *Diet for a Small Planet*, says that one-half the grain produced in the U.S. is fed to livestock, while only about one tenth of the usable plant protein is returned to humans as protein in edible meat.

In an article in *Chemistry* magazine, Lappe wrote, "We feed 86 percent of all our corn, barley, oats and grain sorghum and over 90 percent of our non-

"Lavish Banquet"

(Continued from page 9)

in order to expand its livestock production. "Can the world afford a phenomenon like the Soviet Union eating as well as we are doing?" asked Borgstrom.

The Feast for the Few

The most critical aspect of the food crisis, stressed the MSU agronomist, is that the developed world has used its economic power, as mirrored in mounting purchasing power and growing affluence, to further strengthen its food empires.

"We talk about feast or famine for the future billions," said Borgstrom. "Very few realize that in the midst of this crucial crisis we in the affluent world threw the most lavish banquet the world ever saw . . . Never in my lifetime have I seen a period so devoid of common sense and farsightedness as in these seventies." □

exported soybean crop to livestock. In addition to this vast amount of plant food which could be eaten with greater benefit by people, American livestock are fed hundreds of thousands of tons of fishmeal and over a million tons of milk products every year."

Reliance on these energy-intensive, environmentally damaging farm techniques has grown along with the average size of farms in the U.S. Victims of the infamous "economics of scale," the small farmer cannot compete with agribusiness behemoths such as Tenneco, Del Monte or Safeway.

But rising fuel costs and materials shortages may eventually force even agribusiness to return to natural production techniques. Last winter, the president of the Fertilizer Institute termed the fertilizer shortage "the most depressing situation I've ever known." One way out of this situation, is, of course, a return to farming methods which emphasize labor rather than fuel.

Some ways in which agriculture can return to ecological (and economical) production methods are:

— A return to the use of manure and crop rotation systems as replacements for chemical fertilizers.

— The replacement of current preventive pesticide doublings with a treat-only-when-necessary pesticide application policy. Such a switch would reduce pesticide use and could decrease energy consumption by 35 to 50 percent below present levels.

— The widespread introduction of biological control of pests.


— A partial return to human labor on the farm, coupled with the introduction of renewable, decentralized alternative sources of energy to power farm activities. Wind power and hydro-power can easily be reinstated on many farms, while the development of solar power and the generation of methane gas from animal wastes could substantially lower the impact of rising fuel costs on the farmer and lessen the impact of farm technology on the land.

Ironically, the major agribusiness corporations cannot afford to make these energy and environment savings changes — the "economics of scale" prevent them from doing so. Across the country, a few small farmers, hoping to avoid the financial squeeze of rising fuel and materials prices, are taking the organic plunge.

But until the economic realities of high fuel prices and materials shortages hit corporate farmers the way consumers, small farmers and less developed nations have been hit, they will continue to squander food and energy resources and degrade the rural environment.

In a time of rising population and dwindling resources, neither the nation nor the world can afford to encourage an agricultural system which allows environmental degradation, profligate energy use and inhuman technology to masquerade as "efficiency." □

Catherine Lerza is co-editor of Environmental Action magazine, the publication of Environmental Action, Inc. She has been working on agricultural and nutritional issues for several years. The original article in Journal of Social Issues has been slightly edited for reason of space.



**Garner Ted Armstrong
SPEAKS OUT!**

The Politics of Politics

It was during the Johnson administration. A leading weekly news magazine, editorializing on Mr. Johnson's chances in the upcoming elections, viewed the President's chances from the perspective of the violent antiwar demonstrations, the civil rights movement, the arms race, pollution, and, most especially, the Vietnam war.

As that November drew ominously nearer, the magazine blandly prophesied that the Vietnam war would almost certainly be brought to some sort of conclusion.

The reason?
Mr. Johnson would most certainly "not dare" face the voters in the upcoming elections with "a war on his hands."

That incredible statement, almost instantly lost in the casual, normal, sometimes boringly repetitious analyses by the media, public surveys, and editorial speculations about the next presidential election, was a singular indictment. Without intending to, it had plainly charged that presidents in office may either begin wars, protract wars, or halt wars through various means, commonly at their disposal, if the personal stakes are high enough — in this case, an election.

But what an indictment!
Surely it can't be true? Surely, once having soared to the towering pinnacle of leadership of a huge nuclear power, a President of the United States is *above* partisan or personal politics, isn't he?

Surely those occupying the highest offices of national governments must be people who think, reason, and act on a much higher plane than laymen.

Surely, they must be imbued with vision; they must be men of great wisdom, discretion, maturity, judgment, vast knowledge and unusual ability. Most of all, they must be utterly selfless, placing national interest, and, even beyond that, the interests of humankind itself *far* above party, personal office or even life?

I have never been able to understand politics, nor politicians.

Today, the President of the United States comments with a fair measure of sarcasm how truly ironic it seems that he finds it easier to negotiate with the nation's enemies than with the Congress of the United States.

Though neither an elected official nor a clear choice of the majority, he nevertheless has been forced to shoulder the most awesome and important responsibility on the face of the earth. In the conduct of that responsibility, and most particularly as it concerns foreign policy, one would assume the President would be given every conceivable cooperation, every conceivable loyalty, every conceivable help.

Not so.
There are at least five (or is it 17 or 23?) future presidential hopefuls waiting in the wings. Those who aspire to be leaders of the nation take every opportunity to attack President Ford.

A trip to Vladivostok to talk to Soviet leaders about future arms limitations?

He should have been spending more time "tending the shop" at home.

A needed break from the enormously exhausting duties of the

presidency on the ski slopes of Colorado?

He was attacked for wasting time and lampooned and ridiculed in cartoons and editorials alike.

Mr. Ford's recent attempts to stimulate the economy brought forth particularly vicious attacks from all quarters.

Congress has clearly set itself on a course of stubborn refusal to cooperate with Mr. Ford, most likely *no matter what* programs or policies he espouses.

While it may seem a dangerous assumption, I have no doubt that had Mr. Ford advocated the immediate rationing of gasoline, the same Congress now attacking his proposed gasoline tax and surcharges would have attacked gasoline rationing just as vigorously.

Was the weekly news magazine correct after all? Do those in high elective office often place personal desire for power and a "place in history" *above* the most urgent concerns of humankind and of the nation?

Some of the lessons of Watergate are difficult to overlook. Visionary? Discretionary? Filled with wisdom, judgment, and lacking in self-interest — thinking only of the nation and all of humankind?

Negative.

Though we may naively assume those in towering positions of incredible power in this nuclear age are endowed with these characteristics, it is painfully instructive to learn that private talks in the offices of the highest officials on earth can resemble those of the lowliest group of gossips on the golf course.

I couldn't help but be impressed by the earlier irony of the famous "kitchen debate" during the Eisenhower administration in which the then Vice-President, Richard M. Nixon, found himself in cheerful repartee, albeit with obviously serious overtones, with party chief Nikita Khrushchev.

The discussion rambled banteringly from Khrushchev's challenges

about American "tail fins" on automobiles, as opposed to Russia's "bigger rockets," and Mr. Nixon's much-publicized defense of American technology.

While it sounded more like two boys arguing over the comparative merits of their respective "bull's eyes" and "aggies" in a marble-shooting match, this was later hailed as an example of international diplomacy *par excellence* and one of the oft-cited instances of Mr. Nixon's alleged experience in foreign policy during the Kennedy-Nixon television debates.

So, while cherished school-boy dreams of yesteryear may lead one to assume the highest elected officials of gigantically powerful nations are men of such sage wisdom, mature judgment and ultimate discretion that their minds and manners truly function on a plane far superior to that of the average layman, both the shocking lessons of recent history and the present spectacle of a Congress grasping Gerald Ford's coattails, with heels dug firmly into the ground and mulish determination to fight him every step of the way, would instruct us otherwise.

Today, the United States of America faces the gravest test in all its history, even as it approaches its bicentennial anniversary.


With the specter of a deep depression looming just ahead, the energy crisis, global pollution, the population explosion, the arms race, wars all around the world, and the threat of imminent war in the Mideast, soaring joblessness, and an avalanche of crime that reaches into the private lives of every American, one might assume it would be a time for a prayerful Congress, on its knees, to be soliciting divine aid in the conduct of its duties and responsibilities. Though Congress may disagree — and quite conscientiously so — with certain of Gerald Ford's programs, one would think Congress would be busily pursuing the course most easily negotiable, the most immediately reconcilable, and if not satisfactory to either party, at least the most comfortably compromising under the circumstances.

Instead, it appears the Democrats are determined to fight to the end.

The only trouble is, it may be far more than the end of Gerald Ford's tenure in the White House.

To me, politics stinks. It will always stink, unless or until one can see the clearest proof of national and humanitarian interests placed toweringly above that of selfish party-spirit or desire for personal status and attainment.

Personally, I have no optimism that such humanitarian instincts will soon dominate the minds of our next crop of presidential hopefuls. □



THE WEIGHTLIFTERS



In Brief

by Stanley R. Rader

VIENNA: Bill Tilden once said, when speaking of tennis, "never change a winning game, but always change a losing one." Perhaps Mr. Kissinger has that in mind when he considers the broad strategical concepts that are so dear to him and his carefully architected foreign policy as he commences his latest journey to the Middle East.

Ostensibly Mr. Kissinger is on an exploration mission, and he has this time deliberately stressed that he is not seeking final answers or conclusions from his personal efforts, although he will be seeking areas of compromise, particularly between the Israelis and the Egyptians, in accordance with his heretofore highly publicized "small, step-by-step" approach, which President Ford and President Sadat, as well as Prime Minister Rabin, have supported in statements made just prior to Mr. Kissinger's departure.

But is it not more probable, with "time pressing," as President Sadat said recently and with the opposition party in Israel demanding an election before any concessions are made in Sinai, that Mr. Kissinger is looking for something on a much grander scale — "a permanent solution" — to be achieved by Mr. Kissinger's abandoning of his "small, step-by-step" approach in favor of a Geneva-type conference dictated to and controlled by both the United States and the U.S.S.R.? Is it not significant that Mr. Kissinger and his counterpart, Mr. Gromyko, plan a meeting in Geneva after Mr. Kissinger completes his tour of the Middle East?

When one realizes that the foreign policy of the United States, as designed, orchestrated and implemented by Mr. Kissinger under both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Ford, is designed to prevent the Middle East area from being dominated by the U.S.S.R., by insuring that peace prevails in the area, and to prevent an alliance between the Arab nations and Europe from becoming the third great world power, it is really easy to see why Mr. Kissinger is motivated to maintain the delicate equilibrium between the United States and the U.S.S.R., not only in the Middle Eastern area, but in the entire world. One can also see that the U.S.S.R. would also prefer the status quo.

The U.S.S.R., of course, is not without alternatives, should Mr. Kissinger (and Mr. Gromyko) be unsuccessful. Mr. Gromyko, in fact, has been busy mending fences in Egypt and shoring up the confidence of Syria, while continuing to support the rebels in Ethiopia and South Yemen — all of which poses a great threat to the Red Sea becoming permanently too "red" and the Arabian Ocean becoming more and more under the control of the Arab states with the support of the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, the United States has not failed to make its alternatives plain. It has directly and indirectly warned the Israelis that Israel cannot count upon unlimited support and it has warned the entire Arab world that military intervention has not been excluded. In fact, the powerful United States aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, has been dispatched into the area. A formal request has been made to the United Kingdom for the sub-leasing of an important island, with its naval base, off the coast of Oman — an island which controls the passage of the most oil tanker traffic in the world. The United States has delivered to Israel missiles capable of launching nuclear warheads, and a special, little-known installation within territory controlled by Israel has been given particular attention by the Pentagon.

As Mr. Armstrong and I travel throughout the same countries, we discuss at great length the problems of the Middle East and the world with not only the important leaders of each country, but also with all of the informed and knowledgeable people from the fields of education, industry and culture. They are also concerned about the many problems confronting Mr. Kissinger, and everyone has expressed the hope that he can unblock what appears to be an impending stalemate and that he will be successful in renewing and maintaining the momentum for peace, because we have all learned that in that explosive area stalemate has produced a series of military attempts to solve the problems of the area, and another such effort might destroy mankind.

Mr. Armstrong is specifically asked over and over again what he foresees for the world in the future, and he has told world leaders and others (just recently in Bombay, Cairo, and Israel) that, until mankind learns its lesson, things will get worse before they get better, but that mankind will not be permitted to destroy itself. As an ambassador for world peace, he, meanwhile, strives mightily to bring to peoples everywhere their heritage — a message of hope and inspiration. He continues to stress that the way of get and of competition between peoples and nations will have to be replaced by the way of love and cooperation.

The INCREDIBLE HUMAN POTENTIAL...

(Continued from page 6)

This verse speaks of angels as if the world had been put in subjection to angels; in fact, in the very beginning of this book of Hebrews, the first chapter, it is speaking of Christ and angels and the relation of angels to humans. This must be explained a little later.

But bear in mind the general theme here, or context, is the quote: "the world to come, whereof we speak" — not this present age, now coming rapidly to its end! Continue on in verse 6: "But one in a certain place testified, saying..." Then follows a quotation from the first six verses *only* of the eighth psalm.

In this psalm, David continued showing specifically that God has now placed in subjection under man the solid earth, the earth's atmosphere or air, and the sea. But now the writer of the book of Hebrews is inspired to follow with something radically *different* — something to happen in the world to come!

This revealed knowledge of God's purpose for mankind — of man's incredible awesome potential — staggers the imagination. Science knows nothing of it — no religion reveals it, so far as I know — and certainly higher education is in utter ignorance of it.

Nevertheless, it is what God says he has prepared for them that love him (I Cor. 2:9-10).

I have said before that God revealed necessary knowledge to our first parents, but they didn't believe what he said! Some 4,000 years later, Jesus Christ appeared on earth with a message direct from God the Father in heaven, revealing the same necessary knowledge — but only a handful believed what he said, though many professed to "believe on him" (as in John 8:30-31, 37-38, 40, 45-46).

Today science, religion, and education still do not believe WHAT HE SAID.

I will explain this — and why — a bit later. But so many of these interrelated points cannot be explained all at once.

But now let's see what he said in this passage in Hebrews, beginning where Hebrews leaves off quoting the eighth psalm: "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his [man's] feet. For in that he [God] put all in subjection under him [man], he [God] left NOTHING that is not put under him" (Heb. 2:8).

Is it possible God could mean what he says ("all things")? *Nothing* excluded?

In the first chapter, the Moffatt translation of the Bible renders the Greek word translated "all things" as "the universe."

In other words, for those willing to believe what God says, he says that he has decreed the entire universe — with all its galaxies, its countless suns and planets — *everything* — will be put under man's subjection.

But wait a moment! Before you disbelieve, read the next words in the same eighth verse: "But now we see not yet all things [the endless universe] put under him [man]." Remember (verse 5), this is speaking of the "world to come" — not today's world. But what do we see now, today? "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels [or, "for a little while lower"] for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour." Man, other than Christ, is NOT YET "crowned with glory and honour."

But see how Christ is already crowned with glory and honor. Continue: "For it became him, for whom are all things [the entire universe] and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings... for which cause he [Christ] is

not ashamed to call them brethren" (verses 10-11).

In other words, Christians having God's spirit are joint-heirs with Christ to INHERIT all that Christ already has inherited. He is now in glory! He has already inherited the entire universe. He *sustains* it by his power. Man, if he is converted, having God's holy spirit (Rom. 8:9), is now only an HEIR — *not yet* a possessor.

But see now how Christ already has been crowned with glory and honor — and is already in possession — has already inherited. Begin with Hebrews, chapter 1:

"God... hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things [the entire universe], by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding [sustaining] all things [the entire universe] by the word of his power..." (Heb. 1:1-3).

The living Christ already sustains the entire universe by his limitless divine power. The passage continues to show his superiority over the angels — he is the begotten and born Son of God — angels merely individually created beings. Angels are now administering spirits (invisible to us), ministering to us — to us who are now in lower status than angels — but who are heirs of salvation, when we, like Christ, shall become *born* sons of God (Heb. 1:4-14).

Outer Space — Planets Now Dead

Now put this together with what is revealed in the eighth chapter of Romans.

Here it speaks of Christ as God's Son: "... that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29). Humans, having God's holy spirit, are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ — who, alone of all humans, has already been born as God's sons by a resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:4). He is the FIRST of the human family to be born into the family of God — the kingdom of God. He is our pioneer who has gone on ahead. We shall follow at the resurrection of the just at Christ's return to earth in supreme power and glory.

In this book of Romans, verse 9 says if we have within us the holy spirit of God we are his begotten sons, but if we do not have his spirit we are none of his — not Christians at all. But verse 11 says that if we have God's holy spirit growing within and leading us we shall be raised from the dead by his spirit — (or if living when Christ comes we shall be changed from mortal to immortal).

Now continue: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God... The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, if so be that we [in this life] suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us..." (Romans 8:14-18).

Continue, Revised Standard Version: "For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; for the creation [all the suns, planets, stars, moons] was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God. We know that the whole creation [stars, suns, and moons now in decay and futility] has been groaning in travail together until now; and not only the creation but we ourselves [we spirit-begotten humans], who have the first fruits of the Spirit [the very FEW now being called to salvation — the "firstfruits"] groan inwardly as we wait for the adoption [birth] as sons" (verse 19-23).

orchids & onions

Orchids and Onions: What's it all about? In two words, it's constructive comment. Constructive not only to Plain Truth staff, but also to our six million readers. In this column, we will publish reader feedback, the pros and cons — the orchids and the onions — as well as helpful or interesting commentary on related issues.

You, our readers, are invited to throw your orchids and onions our way (that's where the buck stops).

The initial reaction has been overwhelmingly spontaneous and constructive, though Plain Truth format change has evoked the most immediate comment — the vast majority favorable. There were some few — one or two cases — where the hyperventilating reader obviously ate the onion himself and sent us an envelope filled with bad breath. These haven't yet discerned the difference between ax-grinding and constructive criticism. But give them time.



Managing Editor

letters

The article in *Plain Truth* for the week ending Feb. 8th was so interesting that I wish it had been longer. It was factual, gen-

erally unbiased and concerned a most intriguing subject — prophecy. For those religious persons who accept only some parts of the Bible and some of the beliefs of Christianity, prophecy is probably one of the areas of interest and consideration.

Your having to categorize certain ideas into broader categories had an unfortunate effect on keen perception of the subject. Organized religions, for example, must demand that a person's thinking or... ideas... be mostly within prescribed boundaries or it is completely outside.

Jeanne Dixon, whom you mentioned in your article, though a practicing Catholic, would probably be classified as occult because she has too many beliefs and practices which Christianity cannot accept.

And within the category "occult" are a number of ideas which are thought of as [belonging] together only because each does not belong anywhere else....

Jerry R. Anderson,
Minneapolis, MN

I was just reading the new *Plain Truth* (quite a comedown from the magazine you used to publish) and your article, "The Incredible Human Potential," leads me to two questions:

- (1) Doesn't Genesis 3:6 say that Eve — not Adam, as you state — committed the first sin by eating the fruit and then giving it to Adam to eat?
- (2) You spoke at length about how you'd

tell us what the "true Gospel" message of Christ was, but you never once told us, in fact, what that is. You talked at it, around it, about it — told us how Satan deceived the world, etc., etc., but never once said exactly what that Gospel of Christ's was (is).

Now in one simple paragraph (25 words or less) would you spell out exactly what you feel the Gospel is, without beating around the bush in column after column as you did in the article?

George Hoogasian,
Memphis, TN

• *Certainly Eve was the first mortal that sinned. Satan and one third (who knows how many millions that is) of the angels hold the distinction of being rebellious and sinful previous to Eve. Adam, of course, was next. But win, place or show, all were losers. Regarding question two: Remember that Mr. Armstrong's article is only the first installment of a complete series. Patience please. This installment is loaded. But if you're looking for a quick clue, I suggest you read Jon Hill's column "Why Not?" on page 7. Ed.*

In the latest PT article entitled, "How Liberated Can You Get?" I felt something more needed to be said regarding liberation of women. The article insinuates that a woman must be married before she can be fulfilled or liberated. If some would rather get their fulfillment from a career — just as a man has the opportunity to do — does this make her less of a woman? Can't she still fulfill the basic characteristics mentioned in Proverbs 31 as well as qualities of a good Christian without being married?

There seems to be too much pressure in every peer group and society in general to get married. Does this pressure have anything to do with the rising divorce rate? Are people being "forced" into marriage in order to get a better job, credit, etc.? This applies to men as well. Could it be possible

that everyone is not necessarily made to live in the marriage state?

Was the apostle Paul out of line when he said, "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I" (1 Cor. 7:8)? Notice verse 38: "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better."

Must we categorize people who are not married as lacking in hormones, drive, sex appeal, etc.? Are we that limited in our scope? We are not here to judge each other but rather to be a light and example to the world. Can't a single person fulfill this role?

Why don't we let each person decide on their own whether or not they will marry and avoid embarrassing situations, jokes, and insinuations concerning not being married?

Reader,
Mississippi

... *Plain Truth* is facing up to facts of the times, and it's not the paper it's printed on that holds any meaning, but what is printed therein.

Mrs. Lyle H. Hopkins,
Mason City, IA

I have just read "Orchids & Onions" which I enjoyed. You deserve an orchid, for instead of giving up your magazine, you changed the format — much less expensive, but more often, reaching more people. BRAVO! Don't give up the ship! Lots of Orchids!

Howard L. Spencer,
Canandaigua, NY

... I especially like the new format of the PT. Since I'm not one who enjoys long, wordy articles, these short, hard-hitting to the point ones are very interesting. It seems easier to get it read since I have a very short attention span.

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Simons,
Fargo, ND

What an amazing marvelous revelation of knowledge.

No more amazing, awesome, eye-opening passage could be written.

It is so astonishingly revealing one doesn't fully grasp it just reading quickly through.

First I quoted from verse 29 of Romans 8 stating Christ was the firstborn of MANY BRETHREN.

In Hebrews 2 we see that Christ, the first human to be born by a resurrection from the dead, has been glorified and now sustains the entire universe. He is our pioneer who has gone on ahead. At his return to earth in power and glory those who have been converted and received God's holy spirit shall be born into the God family by a resurrection. Then the entire universe will be put into subjection UNDER them!

Then, from Romans 8, if we have and are led by the holy spirit of God, we shall be raised to spirit composition and immortality in the God family even as Christ was in A.D. 31 upon his resurrection.

Now once again from verse 19, "For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God" (RSV). This happens at the time of the resurrection, when those who are human actually become — by a resurrection or instantaneous change from mortal flesh to spirit immortality — sons of God.

Now understand please. Why should the whole universe — the creation — be waiting with eager longing for the actual birth and appearing of all these sons of God, to be born into the family of God? The following verses portray a universe filled with planets in decay and futility — yet as if subjected now to this dead state in hope! "Because the creation itself [the universe not now capable of sustaining life] will be set free from its

bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God."

How did all the planets fall into the bondage of decay? Surely God did not so create them!

What could have caused all this "bondage to decay"?

Was this the state in which God created them? Everything we read in God's revealed Word about God's creation shows it to have been a perfect creation. The earth was first created a perfect creation of glorious beauty. Facts regarding that will appear in part four. We shall see that angels inhabited the earth prior to the creation of man. Angels, who were perfect from the creation until iniquity or lawlessness was found in them, caused the whole surface of the earth to turn into a state of decay, confusion and emptiness, as we shall see. Could the whole universe have been created capable of sustaining life? (I do not know now whether physical or spirit life.)

We are not told specifically by revelation in God's Word whether it was or not, but what we are told indicates it, and this throws additional light on why God decided to create man!

Continue this passage in Romans 1:22: "We know that the whole creation [universe] has been groaning in travail together until now." Consider that the creation is compared to a mother about to be delivered of her child. The creation is pictured as groaning in travail in hope (verse 20) awaiting the birth of the children of God. It is as if the creation is the mother and God is the father. Anyway the whole thrust of the passage is that when we (converted humans) are born of God — then having the power and glory of God — we are going to do as God did when this earth had been laid "waste and empty" — Hebrew *tohu* and *bohu* (Gen. 1:2)

— Christ who renewed "the face of the earth" (Psalm 104:30) was renewing what had been destroyed by the rebellion of the sinning angels.

What these wonderful passages imply and indicate goes far beyond the amount specifically revealed.

To grasp the whole of the message of the kingdom of God requires many chapters like this one. It is the all-encompassing subject.

This passage indicates precisely what all astronomers and scientific evidence indicates — the suns are as balls of fire, giving out light and heat; but the planets, except for this earth, are in a state of death, decay and futility — but not forever — waiting until converted humans are BORN the children of God; born into the very divine family of God, forming the kingdom of God.

Jesus' gospel was the kingdom of God. What I am showing you here is that Christ's gospel of the kingdom actually includes all this knowledge here revealed — even the whole universe is to be ruled by us, who, with God the Father and Christ, become the kingdom of God.

God is first of all Creator, but God is also ruler. And he is educator, who reveals knowledge beyond and outside the scope of human nature.

Put all these scriptures together I have used in this installment, and you begin to grasp the incredible human potential. Our potential is to be born into the God family, receiving total power! We are to be given jurisdiction over the entire universe.

What are we going to do then? These scriptures indicate we shall impart life to billions and billions of dead planets, as life has been imparted to this earth. We shall create, as God directs and instructs. We shall rule through all eternity! Revelation 21 and

22 show there will then be no pain, no suffering, no evil, because we shall have learned to choose God's way of good. It will be an eternal life of accomplishment, constantly looking forward in super-joyous anticipation to new progress and accomplishment, and still looking back also on accomplishments with happiness and joy over what shall have been already accomplished.

We shall never grow tired and weary. Always alive — full of joyous energy, vitality, exuberant life and strength and power!

What a potential!

But why? Why? Has God purposed all of this?

There is still much to reveal. With this installment, added to the previous ones, we have only started explaining the true gospel.

Why was it opposed? What is the cause of all human wretchedness and suffering?

What is the origin of evil anyway?

What is the origin and source of human nature, and how shall humans be rid of it? Why was man made mortal, of material substance from the ground? Why does man, who is composed of matter the same as animals, who dies the same death as animals, have a mind thousands of times greater in mental output than animals whose brains are virtually equal to human brain, both quantitatively and qualitatively? What makes the difference? Why is the human mind, while able to invent the computer, fly to the moon and back, helpless in the face of its own problems and relations with others here on earth?

I'll explain all these things.

Science has no answers; religion has failed to tell us; education is in IGNORANCE on these questions. Beginning with part IV, we shall proceed to the exciting answers. □

CALL (1)-800-423-4444*
TOLL FREE



FOR A FREE SUBSCRIPTION

From world affairs to "The Incredible Human Potential" to practical daily living — upcoming issues of *PLAIN TRUTH* will feature a variety of vital topics.

We'll also be explaining the seven laws of success, the keys to a happy home life and how to be an effective parent. Twice monthly you'll receive stimulating, thought-provoking material — fact, opinion, and biblical truth.

Don't miss out, request your free subscription today. There's no obligation.

*California Residents call (213) 577-5225

plain truth

OR WRITE TO:

- **UNITED STATES:** P. O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91123
- **Canada:** Plain Truth, P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver 1, B.C.
- **México:** Institución Embassador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D.F.
- **Colombia:** Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.
- **United Kingdom and Europe:** P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., England
- **South Africa, Mauritius and Malawi:** P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa 2000
- **Rhodesia:** P. O. Box U.A.30, Union Ave., Salisbury
- **Australia and Southeast Asia:** G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia
- **New Zealand and Pacific Isles:** P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand
- **The Philippines:** P. O. Box 1111, Makati, Rizal D-708
- **West Indies:** Plain Truth, P. O. Box 6063, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Be sure to notify us immediately of any change in your address. Please include your old mailing label and your new address. Important! The publisher assumes no responsibility for return of unsolicited art work, photographs, or manuscripts.


III

plain truth
WEEK ENDING MARCH 8, 1975

The War That Won't Go Away

FOOD/POPULATION/WAR

DR. KISSINGER'S GLOOMY VISION



**U.S. Secretary
of State
Henry Kissinger**