


the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding



The PANAMA CANAL —
America's Newest
Trouble Spot



About Our Cover

Colombian freighter, *Ciudad de Bogota*, glides into upper chamber of the Miraflores Locks, Panama Canal. This strategic seaway linking the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans is the subject of a growing controversy between the United States and Panama. For the full story behind the crisis, read the article beginning on page 20.

Gene Hogberg — Plain Truth

IN THIS ISSUE

<i>Personal from the Editor</i>	1
<i>Abortions Now Legal . . . But Is Abortion Murder?</i>	2
<i>By Volcanic Eruption . . . 30,000 Lives Snuffed Out!</i>	8
<i>Advance News</i>	13
<i>The Coming World Oil Crisis</i>	14
<i>Newest Trouble Spot for U.S. — Panama Canal</i>	20
<i>What Happens After Death?</i>	32
<i>What You Can Do</i>	37
<i>You Call That Music?</i>	38
<i>What's All This Business about Tithing?</i>	43
<i>Radio-TV Log</i>	49

Address all communications to *The PLAIN TRUTH* office nearest you.

- *United States*: P. O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91109.
- *Canada*: P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver 1, B.C.
- *México*: Institución Ambassador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D. F.
- *United Kingdom, Europe, India, Africa and the West Indies*: P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., England.
- *South Africa, Mauritius and Malawi*: P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg.
- *Rhodesia*: P. O. Box A94, Avondale, Salisbury.
- *Australia and Southeast Asia*: G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia.
- *New Zealand*: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand.
- *The Philippines*: P. O. Box 1111, Makati, Rizal D-708.

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.

May 1973

VOL. XXXVIII

NO. 5

Circulation: 3,074,518

Published monthly by Ambassador College, 300 West Green Street, Pasadena, California 91105, as a public service in the public interest. Your already-paid subscription is made possible by the contributions of those who, voluntarily, have become co-workers in support of this worldwide work. Ambassador College, as a separate corporation, is associated with the Worldwide Church of God, and a portion of the financial needs of the work is supplied by that Church. The publishers have nothing to sell, and although contributions are gratefully welcomed, no solicitation is ever made to the public for financial support.

EDITOR

HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Executive Editor: Herman L. Hoeh

Managing Editor: Arthur A. Ferdig

Associate Editors: William F. Dankenbring, Jerry J. Gentry, Gene H. Hogberg, Paul W. Kroll, Raymond F. McNair

Contributing Editors: Robert Boraker, Robert L. Kuhn, Cliff C. Marcussen, Ernest L. Martin, Gerhard O. Marx, Patrick A. Parnell, Richard C. Peterson, Richard H. Sedliacik, Charles F. Vinson, Eugene M. Walter, William R. Whikehart

Regional Editors: Bonn: John Karlson; Brussels: Ray Kosanke; Geneva: Colin Wilkins; Johannesburg: Robert Fahey; London: Roderick C. Meredith; Manila: Colin Adair; Mexico City: Enrique Ruiz; Sydney: Dennis Luker; Vancouver: Dean Wilson; Washington, D.C.: Dexter H. Faulkner

Foreign Language Editors: Dutch: Roy McCarthy; French: Dibar K. Apartian; German: Frank Schnee; Spanish: Charles V. Dorothy

Research Staff: Jeff Calkins, Werner Jebens, Paul Knedel, Steve Kopel, Jeff Moss, Dennis Neill, David Price, Rodney Repp, Donald D. Schroeder, Marc Stahl, Keith Stump

Art Department: Monte Wolverton, *Layout*; Ron Lepeska, *Production*

Photography: Don Lorton, *Editor*; *Photographers*: Mike Hendrickson; England: Alan Beardsmore, Ian Henderson; Germany: Alfred Hennig; *Photo Research*: Larry Dalton, *Director*, New York; Bethany Thornton; *Photo Library*: Al Leiter, *Director*; Harold Finch

Copy Editors: Betty Lau, Jim E. Lea

Albert J. Portune, *Business Manager*

C. Wayne Cole, *Director of Publishing*


David Jon Hill, *Circulation Manager*

Regional Circulation Managers: U.K.: Charles F. Hunting; Canada: George Patrickson; Australia and Southeast Asia: Gene R. Hughes; South Africa: Adriaan J. Botha; New Zealand: Graemme Marshall

Published monthly at 300 West Green St., Pasadena, California 91105; St. Albans, England; and North Sydney, Australia, by Ambassador College. French, Dutch and German editions published at St. Albans, England; Spanish edition at Pasadena, California. ©1973 Ambassador College. All rights reserved.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE paid at Pasadena, California, and at additional mailing offices. Entered as SECOND CLASS matter at Manila Post Office on March 16, 1967. Registered in Australia for transmission by post as a book.

Personal from



After Vietnam — The NEW Bastion

I HAVE JUST flown into Tokyo from Bangkok. After departing from Bangkok, we flew over Saigon and South Vietnam. The truce teams are still trying to stop the sputtering of gunfire here and there — in the so-called cease-fire that was supposed to end the Vietnam war.

The new center of this Indo-China war has been Saigon. It may soon shift to Bangkok. After my visit there, I'm convinced that Thailand may now become the new bastion of the free world in stopping the Communists' relentless drive south.


I flew down into that embattled area of

Southeast Asia, just as negotiators were completing the cease-fire agreement work. I wanted to investigate first-hand the probable course events will take, from now. You haven't been hearing much about Thailand — the war news has been coming out of Saigon. Thailand is immediately to the west of the war zone, and I predict you'll be hearing a good deal more about Thailand, its capital, Bangkok, and its Prime Minister, Thanom Kittikachorn.

As the cease-fire agreement was being
(Continued on page 46)



Field Marshal Thanom Kittikachorn,
Prime Minister of Thailand.
Royal Thai Embassy



Abortions Now Legal

... BUT IS ABORTION

The U. S. Supreme Court has ruled that abortions are legal. Many now ask, "Is abortion murder? When does human life start?" The experts do not agree. Heart transplants brought doubts about exactly when death occurs. Can we know when human life starts?

by Herbert W. Armstrong

IT DIDN'T get the BIG headlines. It was overshadowed in the news by the ending of the Vietnam war (so far as direct U. S. participation is concerned) and by the death of a former President. Yet the U. S. Supreme Court ruling handed down January 22 may have even a more important and lasting effect on the future of America and the world.

It was probably the most sweeping and sensational decision of the Nixon Court. It abolished the criminal abortion laws of almost every state, ruling that the decision regarding abortion, prior to the last ten weeks of pregnancy, must be made solely by the woman and her doctor.

Two Opposing Views

The ruling "sets in motion developments which are terrifying to contemplate," said Cardinal Krol, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

But, applauded Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America,

it was "a wise and courageous stroke for the protection of a woman's physical and emotional health."

But is abortion murder? The Supreme Court carefully avoided answering the question of when a human life begins. It said, "We need not resolve the difficult question of when an unborn child actually becomes a human person, with a legal right to live."


The Court's majority (it was a 7 to 2 decision) justified this dodging of the question of legalizing LIFE or DEATH, and "passed the buck" by saying, "When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not

A FORTY-TWO-DAY-OLD EMBRYO, one half inch long, bathed by the fluid in the amniotic sac. Attached is the yolk sac, with the surrounding chorionic placenta. Embryo already looks human, its eyes, ears and nasal organs have started to form, the jaws are well formed and the rudiments of fingers and toes have become evident.

UPI



MURDER?



in a position to speculate as to the answer.”

And dissenting Justice Byron R. White said, “The Court apparently values the convenience of the pregnant mother more than the continued existence and development of the life or potential life which she carries.”

For the past five years, pressures have been accelerating in the Western world to make abortions legal. These pressures have been primarily one-sided and well organized. The protests of the Roman Catholic Church have been far less vociferous. There have been other indignant, emotionally aroused protests, but none sufficiently strong to match the organized demand for legal abortion.

All this is another drop downward on the moral toboggan slide.

The “new morality” is neither new nor moral. It merely appears new since it follows the era of Victorian prudery and medieval Roman Catholic domination of moral standards. The opposite extreme has taken over. Permissiveness has befouled the air. Promiscuous sex has accelerated. Fornication and adultery have gained public toleration, if not complete acceptance.

For 25 years, outright profanity has been accepted on the stage. Finally, in some areas, actual and simulated nude sex performances have been tolerated. Some movies have descended all the way into the X-rated cesspool.

And now the question of whether legal abortion amounts to legal permission to commit murder does not appear to raise many eyebrows or ignite indignant flames of heated protest.

These current trends accompany the alarming increase in crime, in broken homes and divorce, increasing violence, racial strife, riots, arson and sniper killings.

These are the conditions. These are the trends.

But what are the answers to all

these problems of modern society?

The editors of *The PLAIN TRUTH* often say that newspapers, newscasts and news magazines report the news, picture the conditions, and pose the questions, but *The PLAIN TRUTH* gives the answers, reveals the SOLUTIONS.

Also, we have said that when society looks to science and technology for solutions to society’s problems and evils, we find that these questions are outside their field. We look to modern education, but find it generally unconcerned about moral and spiritual standards. The emphasis in education today is on the intellect. Governments have no solutions. Governments may pass laws and sometimes enforce them, but they are neither teachers nor custodians of morals, short of crimes. Religion has failed to make this a better world. Religion is hopelessly divided on doctrines and on what is truth, and many large religious groups have been tacitly adding their assent to the current immoral “new morality.”

Where, for Authoritative Right Answers?

As I said, the newscasts, newspapers and news magazines report the happenings and the evils. Our Philip Wylies and John O’Haras have painted masterful word-pictures of the world’s troubled and sick society. But their brilliant rhetoric stops short of workable solutions.

WHERE, then, for right answers?

There *is* a supreme authority that reveals infallibly *true* answers. It is, unfortunately, a neglected, rejected, misrepresented, maligned, almost totally misunderstood authority.

And *there is no other!* That is the reason this world goes on suffering in confusion, full of evils that should not exist. Those who refuse even to listen to this one supreme authority have only to say in hopelessness, “I don’t know — I’m ignorant.”

The plain truth about life — what it is, *when* it is, *why* it is and *where* it

leads — is very essential knowledge. But the tragedy of human society is that it has been deceived into accepting humanly reasoned fables, postulates and errors in the guise of knowledge, science and truth. And this sick, sick world suffers on!

The one supreme and sure authority is the world’s best seller — the same book so many religious denominations claim as the source of their beliefs. Yet, incredible though it seems, most of their teachings and customs today are diametrically contrary to those of the book they profess to follow! They *could* find the true and right answers to questions, problems and evils if they would read it like it is. But they interpret away the one tenth of it they use, while ignoring utterly the other nine tenths.

Assuredly, as Bruce Barton said, the Bible is “the book that nobody knows” — well, *almost* nobody! We can understand it — if we are willing — and what an eye-opener it is to the one willing to be astonished by what it really does reveal!

And Now — Our Answer

I know well this is a highly controversial question. I can tell you only what this authoritative Source, from the Maker of us all, reveals. One may take it or leave it — and the world has been “leaving it” for entirely too long, to its own hurt! I merely give it to you to accept or reject.

When, then, does a human life start? When does it become a human life, the taking of which is murder?

Is it actually a human life at and from conception? Or does it first become a human life when an embryo becomes a fetus — approximately three months after conception? Or does it become a human life only at birth?

The answer to those questions determines whether abortion is murder.

And who, after all, is the giver of

life? *Who* has given the commandment, "Thou shalt not commit murder" (as it should be properly translated)? The Almighty One who forbids murder under penalty of capital punishment is the *only* One who can tell us *when* terminating a life becomes murder!

WHY Not Understood

If those professing the Christian religion had understood what is the true gospel of Jesus Christ, they would be in no quandary as to whether an abortion is a murder. But, incredible though it sounds, that true gospel was not understood or proclaimed to the whole world for 18½ centuries!

In astonishment one might ask, "But haven't people been preaching Christ to the world all through those 18½ centuries?"

Oh sure! They've been preaching Christ. They've been pleading: "Accept Christ." "Receive Christ!" They've been preaching about Christ — about his person — saying that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ. But they have not been preaching *Christ's gospel!* And that's why those who have listened to them do not understand when a human life begins and whether an abortion is murder.

Jesus himself said this would happen. In the most important, pivotal prophecy in the New Testament, Jesus said: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name [that is, professing to be his ministers], *saying*, I am Christ [saying that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ]; and shall deceive many" (Matthew 24:4-5).

His disciples had asked him *when* the *end* of this world — this age — and his return to earth would occur. He said there would be deceived ministers preaching in his name, preaching Christ, deceiving the MANY. There would be wars, famines, disease epidemics, earthquakes — but these were not the time of the END. He then said, "But he that

shall endure *unto the end*, the same shall be saved. And *this gospel of the kingdom* shall be preached ["published" in Mark 13:10] in all the world for a witness unto all nations; *and then* shall the end come" (verses 13-14).

What Gospel?

What gospel must be proclaimed *worldwide*, just before the END of this age and the second coming of Christ to earth? He said, "This gospel of the kingdom" — the same gospel Jesus brought to mankind from God — the gospel the world rejected. Jesus could not have said the preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom would signal the end of the age if that gospel had been preached these 18½ centuries.

The word "gospel" means "good news." Jesus brought news — and good news — from Almighty God. God sent him to earth — to mankind — with a message — with a news announcement — the most important news ever announced to the world.

But the world rejected it! They crucified Christ because of that message.

Some believed on him — but refused to believe what he said! Read it yourself in the 8th chapter of John: "As he spake these words, many believed on him. Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word [that is, in "my gospel"] then are ye my disciples indeed. . . . I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. . . . But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God [the message God sent him to announce to mankind — his gospel]. . . . and because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not" (John 8:30-45).

Believing on Christ in Vain

Those people "believed on him" — but they did not accept his message from God. They finally did kill

him *because of his gospel* — the gospel of the Kingdom of God!

For 18½ centuries, professing Christians have "believed on Jesus" — have preached Christ to the world — but have NOT proclaimed his gospel — his message — his good news announcement — his truth — to the world.

Because they preached Christ — even worshipped Christ — called themselves Christians — people have been deceived, as Jesus said they would, into believing they preached and heard "the gospel." Jesus said they would be deceived. One who is deceived *does not know* he is deceived. He may be entirely honest and sincere in his belief.

"But," one might exclaim, "people have actually worshipped Christ." Yes, but what did Jesus himself say about that? "Howbeit IN VAIN do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Mark 7:7). Actually WORSHIPPING Christ — but all in vain, because they *substitute doctrines of men* for Christ's truth — for his gospel! Read it in your own Bible! Astonishing! But true!

What Was Jesus' Gospel?

Note the very beginning of Christ's gospel.

It is recorded in the first chapter of Mark, starting in verse 1. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Then beginning in verse 2 it is recorded how John the Baptist prepared the way before Christ. It records that Jesus was baptized and defeated Satan. Then it says: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching *the gospel of the kingdom of God*, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and *the kingdom of God* is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel" (verses 14-15).

Jesus' gospel was the NEWS announcement of the coming world-ruling Kingdom of God!

Not many who have "accepted Christ" have the slightest idea of

what that kingdom is! Yet Jesus said, "Repent, and believe." Believe *what*? Believe the good news of the Kingdom of God!

And what is a kingdom? It is a government. And it is people who administer that government.

Man May Be Born of God

Jesus himself was born to be the King of the coming Kingdom of God. This was foretold in the prophecy of Isaiah 9:6-7. It was announced to the virgin Mary, mother of Jesus, prior to his birth (Luke 1:30-33). On trial for his life before Pilate, Jesus *said* he was born to be a king. But his Kingdom, he said, was not of this world — this society. He explained about the Kingdom of God in parable after parable.

But what about the people who enter into and, under Christ, administer the Kingdom? Jesus struck straight to the heart of that truth in his talk with the Pharisee Nicodemus.

And *that* truth — that part of Jesus' gospel — reveals the answer to our question: Is abortion MURDER and WHEN does human life START?

It was near the beginning of Jesus' earthly ministry that the Pharisee Nicodemus came under the cover of darkness to question Jesus. Nicodemus opened by saying that the Pharisees, as a whole, *knew* Jesus was a teacher sent from God. That's how they "*believed on*" Jesus, even though they refused to believe what he taught. Incidentally, the demons *also* believe — and tremble! (James 2:19.)

Immediately, Jesus got to the central point — the Kingdom of God. He made clear to Nicodemus that he could never enter into God's Kingdom in his present unregenerate state.

Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). He was not speaking of being born a human, physical person, but of being born *again* — being born a spirit being, *composed*

of spirit, not of matter. Unless he is born *of the spirit*, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, Jesus explained clearly. He added, "That which is born of the flesh *is flesh*; and that which is born of the Spirit *is spirit*" (verse 6).

Nicodemus and all humans have been born of the flesh — and are flesh — composed of matter from the ground. But when born of the Spirit — born of God — we shall BE SPIRIT — no longer human, but composed of SPIRIT, even as God is SPIRIT.

This biblical teaching of Jesus totally refutes the popular "Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man" fable. Seven times in the New Testament it is affirmed that until conversion, humans are, spiritually, the children of Satan the devil.

A New Father-Son Relationship

God is that Spirit (John 4:24) of which we may be born. God is the Father. Jesus is his son. A father and son relationship is a family relationship. Jesus is the *firstborn* (by his resurrection) of many brethren (Romans 8:29). To enter into the Kingdom of God, we also must be born of God by a resurrection to immortal, spirit-composed life.

But the crux point is that we may, even now in this human life, be begotten sons of God.

Now understand the exact comparison. Our human begettal, embryo-fetus development, and birth compares exactly to our potential spirit begettal, spiritual growth and development, and final birth as immortal *spirit beings* in God's Kingdom.

All physical life comes from an egg. The human "egg" is called an ovum. It is produced in the mother. A new human life starts when an ovum is fertilized — physical life imparted to it — by a male sperm cell entering the ovum.

How does spirit life start? It starts when the Holy Spirit from God enters — gives spirit life to — impreg-

nates a human person. The Spirit of God — from the very person of God — actually BEGETS and engenders SPIRIT life to mortal humans.

Jesus said, "Repent ye, and *believe* the gospel." The apostle Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). One is to be baptized when he BELIEVES. "Repent and believe" are the two conditions to receiving the gift of God's Spirit.

And "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken [make immortal] your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Romans 8:11).

Human physical conception, gestation, and birth are a beautiful picture of the transcendent human potential — the PURPOSE for which human life was put here on earth by a divine Creator — of God reproducing HIMSELF — of spiritual divine birth into the glorious Kingdom of God!

What wonderful good news the gospel of Jesus Christ is! What indescribable tragedy that deceived men have rejected this good news and have HIDDEN that wonderful, wonderful good news from a deceived world!

But see, now, how it ANSWERS the question of this article!

The Bible reveals that this spiritual divine birth is pictured *by* physical human birth. The Holy Spirit of God entering one who has *really repented and believed* is the spiritual "sperm" from the very spirit body of God, imparting the presence of spiritual, divine and immortal life — though one is not yet immortal until the time of the resurrection.

Repentance, faith, and the presence of God's Holy Spirit in one *changes one into a different kind of person!*

He has not yet been *born* an immortal being, yet divine life from

"It's not a question of whether a human life exists, but a question of whether the mother and her doctor have a right to take that life."

God has been imparted to him, just as the physical life of a human father has been imparted by the sperm cell to the ovum. The truly converted Christian, then, is NOW in the state that compares to the embryo and the fetus in the mother's womb.

The human embryo-fetus is fed by the human mother — protected by her. The Bible calls the Church of God "the mother of us all" (compare Galatians 4:26 with Hebrews 12:22-23). The function of the Church is to "feed the flock" with spiritual food from the Bible and to protect those within it, "for the perfecting of the saints . . . for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect [full-grown, spiritual] man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Ephesians 4:12-13). The begotten Christian must grow spiritually, ready to be born a spirit being *composed of spirit*, just as the embryo-fetus must be fed physical food through the mother and must grow physically, ready to be born a physical being, composed of matter.

When the Unborn Become Children of Parents

The Bible says the Spirit-begotten Christian is already the child or son of God, even while still only an heir — not yet an inheritor — not yet born by the resurrection into a spirit-composed, immortal being.

"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they *are* [now] the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption [sonship], whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit [of

God] 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 suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together" (Romans 8:14-17).

And again: "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. . . . Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (I John 3:1-2).

The Spirit-begotten Christian is now in the spiritual state comparable to the embryo-fetal physical state. We are now, already, the sons of our heavenly Father.

Therefore, the unborn human is, from the moment of conception, the child — the son or daughter — of its parents!

All the human life the father and mother shall ever impart has already been imparted. A new, physical human LIFE has been begotten and is in the gestation stage toward birth. True, it receives physical nourishment through the mother, but that is growth, not the imparting of *life*.

This biblical analogy from the Creator and *giver of life* shows that, though yet unborn, a human life is growing and developing in the uterus of the mother. It is already the child of its parents. From the instant of conception, it is *not* a question of *whether* a human life exists, but a question of whether the mother and her doctor have a right to *take that life*.

Just what *is* a murder? It is the

ending of a human life *prior* to the end of its natural lifetime. The matter of *how much* prior is relative. To deliberately *end* that life one or two months after it started (after conception) is putting an *end* to a human life as much as to do it ten or eleven months after, or 50 years after.

Biblically, in the Old Testament, in the nation Israel, God himself ordered capital punishment by stoning to death or otherwise, for certain capital sins or crimes. This was not considered murder or a violation of the victim's right to live, under the sixth commandment. The victim himself had forfeited his right to live by his own commandment-breaking.

But the sixth commandment of God denies others the right to take an innocent life, and, under divine law, guarantees the innocent the right to continue living.

Unfortunately, though we may print on U. S. currency, "In God We Trust," U. S. lawmakers and judges do not appear to feel obligated to OBEY the God in which they supposedly "trust." But on the day of judgment, they themselves, along with all of us, will ourselves be judged — by the divine laws of God! □

For three eye-opening free booklets on the most important subjects affecting your life, write for *Just What Do You Mean — Born Again?*, *Just What Do You Mean — Kingdom of God?* and *Why Were You Born?* These treat the biblical portion of this article in much more detail. Know the real purpose for which humans were put on this earth. Learn the true values of life. Learn the way to peace, success, happiness, and abundance. You'll wonder why this precious knowledge has been withheld from a mixed-up and deceived humanity all these years. If you want understanding, don't fail to read these booklets — the most important reading of your life.

By Volcanic Eruption...

30,000 LIVES SNUFFED OUT!

Does the catastrophe of 1902 prefigure the supergiant political volcano, about to erupt, that could erase all human life from the earth? You need to know the real meaning of present world events.

by William F. Dankenbring

TODAY WE live in the shadow of a giant political volcano, and that volcano is about to erupt. All human life will be dramatically affected.

Will men take warning in time?

A Warning for This Generation

Seventy-one years ago, people in St. Pierre were going about their business as usual. They — like we — were unaware of what was about to happen. St. Pierre, a thriving seaport of 30,000 inhabitants, was the commercial center of the island of Martinique, rivaling Fort-de-France, the capital, in importance.

St. Pierre was located near Mount Pelée, a volcano named after the an-

cient goddess of fire and volcanos. The early settlers could not have known it, but the volcano was aptly named. It was a quiescent time bomb which threatened the lives of all who lived around it.

Twice during a span of 300 years, Pelée had erupted — once in 1792 and again in 1851. Neither eruption was more than a short rumbling display.

When similar rumblings and showers of ash spewed out of Pelée on May 2, 1902, nobody was frightened or worried. There seemed to be no reason for dire concern because Mount Pelée had been a sleeping volcano for 51 years.

But a series of events were to combine, this time, to spell horror

and disaster for 30,000 people — innocent victims of a cataclysm they never fully believed would happen.


Despite growing signs of peril, no one took action. Thousands died senselessly, for no apparent purpose — other than as a lesson for us today!

What lessons can we — in the age of the hydrogen bomb — learn from their horrible fate? Let the record of the last few days of St. Pierre speak — and see if the generation of the 1970's can learn a lesson from their experience.

The Beginning of the End

On Friday, May 2, 1902, Pelée's activity began.

Fernand Clerc, millionaire and commercial leader of the island,





rose at six o'clock in the morning, flung open his bedroom shutters, and was amazed at the sight before him. Everywhere he could see, the ground and trees were covered by flaky, white volcanic ash.

The next day, the town was covered with more flaky ash. Mount Pelée issued guttural rumblings from deep within. Lava flows poured down the sides of the mountain. One flow blocked a stream on the slopes of the mountain, causing a flood which took several lives. Earth tremors jolted the ground, throwing people to their knees.

At this point, public disquiet increased. The inhabitants of St. Pierre and the local villages knew that such earthquakes often pre-

ceded major volcanic eruptions. But a Martinique political election was coming up soon — and nobody in government wanted a panic among the populace. Panic could cause loss of votes. Public clamor was quelled by official reassurances and proclamations of safety. Government officials had decided it was unwise to evacuate every citizen from St. Pierre. It would create a social upheaval and seriously damage the economy. So the people were encouraged to stay.

Earth tremors continued; more lava flowed down the mountain. Prayers for safety increased.

"Why," one wonders today, looking back on the devastation that occurred in St. Pierre, "why didn't

UNLIKE 30,000 INHABITANTS of St. Pierre, Martinique, who perished in the volcanic eruption of Pelée in 1902, the 5,000 dwellers near the foot of Iceland's Helgafell volcano (above) successfully evacuated. The recent eruption of lava from Helgafell threatened the main harbor of Vestmannaeyjar on Heymaey Island.

James Andanson — Gamma

people take warning? Why didn't they flee for safety?"

A full answer has never been adequately given because it involves a side of human nature of which few people are aware.

Signs and Portents

Sunday, May 4, arrived. The whole sky glowed with fire. Blinding

flames shot through the air, bursting like holiday fireworks. The people marveled at the spectacle, whooping and cheering.

Thoughts of fear or fleeing were allayed. Things really didn't seem so bad. "How could something so majestic be a deadly threat?" people mused.

Meanwhile, a jagged fissure opened in the side of the volcano, violently releasing steam and boiling mud which killed the cattle, horses, and people near the fissure. White-hot steam and mud seared living flesh, causing agonizing deaths. At one estate near the mountain, the earth split, and twenty men and women fell into a yawning crevasse.

The fireworks continued. A huge cloud of ash rose from Mount Pelée and overshadowed the whole city, covering the sky like some vast, dark curtain. A loud, hollow bellow issued from the volcano. People, though fearful, put their faith in the official reassurances, remained calm, and stayed in the city.

And then, havoc.

Monday, May 5, hordes of ants and centipedes swarmed down the mountain into the villages and estates, biting and stinging the people and animals. Meanwhile, the situation in St. Pierre worsened. Poisonous snakes invaded the mulatto quarter and attacked everyone within reach. In thirty minutes, thirty people were dead, many of them children. Dead, too, were horses, dogs, and other animals.

The same day, a giant wall of mud rose almost 100 feet into the air and ponderously moved down the mountain slope, gaining speed as it headed toward the sea. A sugar refinery lay in its path. The massive 120-foot-high wall of mud, weighing millions of tons, smashed into the sugar refinery. Over a hundred fifty workers were buried.

The mud hurtled past the refinery into the sea, driving the sea far offshore. The water, in response, reared higher and higher. Suddenly,

a giant wave was thrown against the shore. A wall of water raced toward St. Pierre.

Seeing the tidal wave coming, panic-stricken onlookers fled the seashore, trampling women and children in the haste to save their own lives. The surging wave crashed down upon the waterfront, lifting boats over the first row of buildings. It rushed up the streets, tearing warehouses and other buildings from their foundations.

Meanwhile, Mount Pelée continued spewing out flame and fire.

The Glowing Cauldron

Tuesday, May 6: As dawn arrived, cinders rained down on St. Pierre and its inhabitants, igniting small fires throughout the city.

A few hundred feet below the summit of Pelée, a pink glow appeared in the rocks. The glowing rocks shot into the sky, arced upward, and fell to the foot of the mountain. A jet of dust, steam, and red-hot lava shot out of a massive hole in the side of Mount Pelée. Enormous pressures built up inside the molten cauldron. Lightning bolts flashed. On the heels of the lightning, a dreadful noise, unlike anything the people of St. Pierre had ever heard, erupted from the turbulent mountain. Incredibly, the people of St. Pierre still refused to leave!

And then Wednesday, May 7, arrived. It was "Ascension Day" and a public celebration and an official banquet were planned in honor of the governor and his wife. Meanwhile, fire roared down the northern slope of Pelée. A weakness in the surface rock allowed lava to rise up through the ground and pour down the slope.

Pelée began its final death cadence. A mighty explosion rent the air and fiery flames shot out of the crater. Thunderous roars like the sound of booming cannons caused people for miles around to put their hands over their ears.

Another tremendous explosion

ejected tons of hot lava from the summit of Pelée. Houses on the edge of St. Pierre caught fire. Nevertheless, people still went about their business, though somewhat uneasy. In the harbor, ships placidly remained at anchor. Celebrations for Ascension Day were cancelled at the last minute, despite the objections of the mayor. People were confused. Even so, there appeared to be an overwhelming sense of ennui about Pelée's activity.

Eerie Quietude

Thursday, May 8, dawned much like any other recent day. Smoke swirled around the crater of Pelée. Occasionally, huge boulders were blasted into the sky.

And then, strangely, Pelée fell silent. An eerie calm hung in the air. The deep-throated rumblings were stilled. The sun came out, bathing St. Pierre with a peaceful warmth.

Then suddenly, the barometer needle began swinging crazily. Pelée developed a rapidly expanding red bulge high on its side. The light of the sun seemed equalled by the glowing red ball. A terrifying noise created panic among St. Pierre's inhabitants.


The great red ball grew larger, detached itself from the mountain, and started rolling down its slope, gaining speed. A monstrous ball of fire, 1,300 feet high, descended upon St. Pierre and set the city ablaze, utterly devastating it. Even ships in the harbor were engulfed in the cataclysm. A number of them disappeared.

A second ball of fire burst out of the hole in Pelée's side. Glowing and swirling, it rolled downward and merged with the first fireball.

St. Pierre was gone. Only devastation remained. The time was 8:02 a.m. Thirty thousand people had perished.

The Problem With People

Why did the people of St. Pierre fail to take warning after they had witnessed several days of fright-



VOLCANIC ASH from Helgafell piles up like blackened snow drifts around a church in Vestmannaeyjar, Iceland.

James Andanson — Gamma

ening events — events which should have reminded them of the danger they were in? Why did 30,000 people remain confident that it would all just pass away?

The answer to this question reveals a basic flaw of human nature. It afflicts most people and could afflict you, unless you are on guard against it.

That flaw is twofold: First, it involves the “herd instinct.” In other words, all people tend to be conformists. Nobody wants to stand out. Nobody wants to be regarded as an alarmist or a heretic.

This feeling of conformity revealed itself in the situation that faced the inhabitants of St. Pierre. Public officials did not take the lead in evacuating the city. Rather, they attempted to reassure people that serious peril was not imminent. And people just went along; nobody wanted to “rock the boat” and be looked upon as a trouble maker. Furthermore, people took confidence in the fact that no one else was doing anything to prepare for the calamity either — nobody else took the danger seriously.

That attitude, on the part of thousands, proved fatal.

Psychologists have analyzed this aspect of human nature. They have

studied many cases where a person was attacked or raped while groups of passersby passively watched.

Psychologist John M. Darley of New York University, a specialist who has studied the problem, found that the more people witnessing a victim in distress, the less likely it was that someone would help. Such bystanders, he said, are anguished individuals in genuine doubt, wanting to do the right thing, but they don’t. Their reactions are shaped by the actions of others — and most often by their own inaction.

What is the explanation for this phenomenon? One fact is that in a group, the individual is subordinated; he no longer acts or reacts entirely as an individual. His responsibility becomes so diffused that he feels no *personal* responsibility or involvement. As Dr. Darley explained, “If a person were to act, he might look like a fool, so he does nothing. So, until somebody acts, nobody acts.”

This is precisely what occurred at Martinique when Mount Pelée was simmering and glowering. Nobody acted because nobody wanted to look like a “fool” — nobody wanted to be a public laughing stock.

Those who don’t act are generally in a state of indecision and conflict.

They refrain from taking action because they don’t want to make fools of themselves; also, the inactivity of those around them lulls them into a sense of false security by creating the illusion that an emergency situation does not really exist.

We all have the same human nature. We must all therefore become aware of our human nature, and the influences upon it. We must learn to resist the “herd instinct” so we can make prompt decisions that may save our lives in a crisis. We must notice the events unfolding before us and then interpret them properly as an emergency, if they indeed constitute one; and we must decide we have a *personal responsibility to act*.

Apathy and Indifference

Closely related to this first flaw in human nature is the fact that most people have been conditioned to be unconcerned and apathetic toward news events. People are generally self-centered; they are especially interested in their own personal problems. Thus, for those living near a rumbling volcano, there is a tendency for the erupting volcano to become “old news” — unimportant and uninteresting. “Oh, smoke and flames belched out of that mountain yesterday, and nothing happened. So why should anything occur today?” people reasoned.

People’s attention is diverted to

those personal things which interest them the most — their own jobs, pleasures, pastimes, financial difficulties, marital matters, or child rearing problems.

An example of this kind of apathy occurred in San Diego, California. A man lived in an apartment next to one which was ransacked by robbers. The robbers bound and gagged the lone male occupant, poured fluid over his body, and set him on fire. When police investigated the crime, they asked the man in the adjoining apartment if he had heard anything unusual. "Sure, I did," he replied nonchalantly. "I heard screams. In fact, they were so loud, I had to turn up the volume on my television set."

When a person is totally preoccupied with the satisfaction of his own senses, he is not apt to take warning of impending natural calamity or dangerous political events. Such people tend to be completely apathetic and couldn't care less. They don't want to be reminded of reality. Completely absorbed with their own physical lives, pleasures, and problems, they will not react to external threats of danger.

We live in the age of the "unshockables." Our present generation is so inured to the threat of nuclear danger and other awesome world perils that we are not as alarmed or concerned as we ought to be. We are like the inhabitants of St. Pierre, who became "accustomed" to the fiery activity of a volcano just four miles away.

Lesson for Now

The catastrophic events which overtook St. Pierre in 1902 should serve as a vivid reminder to the now generation. We also are human. We also tend to have the sheep instinct and tend to react with apathy. We also tend to be self-centered and totally engrossed with our own activities.

Unless we take heed, we could also fall prey to the sudden onslaught of some fearful catastrophe.

Whether or not you believe it, the Bible makes plain that awesome catastrophes, global cataclysms, and tremendous maelstroms lie ahead for the world. The book of Revelation gives an insight into what many of these fearful events will be. The specters of famine, disease epidemics, earthquakes, global wars, and conflict, as well as universal religious deception, are all plainly outlined.

Jesus Christ also spoke of these events 1900 years ago: "The nations and kingdoms of the earth will rise against each other and there will be famines and earthquakes in many places. But all this will be only the beginning of the horrors to come" (Matthew 24:7-8). (All Bible quotations are from *The Living Bible*.)

Jesus continued: "For there will be persecution such as the world has never before seen in all its history, and will never see again. In fact, unless those days are shortened, all mankind will perish. But they will be shortened for the sake of God's chosen people" (verses 21-22).

The book of Mark gives a similar warning: "For those will be days of such horror as have never been since the beginning of God's creation, nor will ever be again. And unless the Lord shortens that time of calamity, not a soul in all the earth will survive" (Mark 13:19-20).

"Yes, these are the events that will signal the end of the age," Jesus continued (verse 30). And then come these sobering words of warning: "Keep a sharp lookout! For you do not know when I will come, at evening, at midnight, early dawn or late daybreak. Don't let me find you sleeping [off guard] . . . This is my message to you and to everyone else" (verses 35-37).

Luke records another emphatic warning for our generation:

"Watch out! . . . don't let me find you living in careless ease, carousing and drinking, and occupied with the problems of this life, like all the rest of the world. *Keep a constant*

watch . . ." (Luke 21:34-36).

Are you alert to world events? Or will you take your place with the vast majority who don't care, who are apathetic, who follow the crowd?

The world events Jesus spoke of are beginning to unfold all around us. The climax is not far off. The warnings are being read and heard via the pages of the magazine you are now reading and via *The World Tomorrow* broadcast and the *Garner Ted Armstrong* program on television. Will you take warning?

Or will you be one of those of whom the apostle Paul wrote: "When people are saying, 'All is well, everything is quiet and peaceful' — then, all of a sudden, disaster will fall upon them as suddenly as a woman's birth pains begin when her child is born. And these people will not be able to get away anywhere — there will be no place to hide" (I Thessalonians 5:3).

This common attitude was foretold over 2500 years ago by Isaiah the prophet. He looked into our day and declared: "For the leaders of my people — the Lord's watchmen, his shepherds — are all *blind to every danger*. They are featherbrained and give no warning when danger comes. . . . And they are as greedy as dogs, never satisfied; they are stupid shepherds who only look after their own interest, each trying to get as much as he can for himself from every possible source.

"'Come,' they say. 'We'll get some wine and have a party; let's all get drunk. This is really living; let it go on and on, and tomorrow will be better yet!'" (Isaiah 56:10-12.)

The inhabitants of St. Pierre did not watch; they were not heedful of the danger which confronted them. They ignored day after day of warning.

Then they were suddenly overwhelmed with one of the most calamitous destructions ever to befall a city in modern times.


Are you willing to take warning? □

advance news

in the wake of today's WORLD EVENTS

• New Nationalism in Australia

In a significant move to the left, voters in Australia turned over the reins of government late last year to the country's Labor Party headed by E. Gough Whitlam, now Australia's 21st prime minister. Thrust out of power after the December 2 general election was the strongly pro-American Liberal-Country Party coalition which had ruled Australia for nearly a quarter century.



Wide World Photo

Australian Prime Minister
Gough Whitlam

the United Nations were reversed, the last Australian servicemen in Vietnam were withdrawn, diplomatic relations with the Nationalist Chinese regime on Taiwan were broken and relations established with Peking, and diplomatic relations were established with East Germany. These were just a few of the changes made in the wave of liberalization that has rolled over the continent. Expect more.

It is obvious that Canberra intends to take a more independent stance in international affairs. Australia's turnabout in foreign policy is not likely to significantly upset the normally tranquil U. S.-Australian relations. Public opinion in Australia remains basically pro-American. Speaking over Radio Australia a few weeks after his election, Mr. Whitlam stressed the traditional, deep, and abiding relationship Australia has had with

Almost immediately after the balloting, the Labor Party began revolutionizing Australia's domestic and foreign policies. In a number of swift decisions, the Australian dollar was revalued upward 7.05 percent, the draft was abolished, draft resisters were freed from jail, past Australian positions in

the United States. In the great essentials, he said, there would be no decisive change under his government. ANZUS, the mutual defense pact linking Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, will remain the "crucial foreign treaty" for Australia. "Indeed," said Mr. Whitlam, "we shall try to make ANZUS live again, more constructive, more fruitful, and more meaningful than it has ever been." The Australian government, furthermore, has no plans at present to reduce its participation in SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. More pessimistic observers, however, see an eventual withdrawal from the organization, at least from its military aspects.

Trade will also keep Australia and the United States together. With the loss of trade preferences in Britain, now that Britain has "joined Europe," Australia will have to look to American markets for partial compensation. Australia will be trying to break down some of the trade restrictions that the United States has erected against her dairy products, meat, and wool.

But Australia's future development appears to be *linked primarily to Japan*. According to one Australian official, "Our trade has changed, with Britain our traditional mainstay moving into Europe, and Japan emerging as our major customer."

Eastern countries, with Japan leading the way, now take more than 40 percent of Australia's exports and are the source of 23 percent of its imports. Australia seems certain to continue as one of Japan's prime sources of raw materials, particularly of iron ore and coal for steel production. And as the Japanese economy grows, Australian trade officials see opportunities for expanding exports of foodstuffs and manufactured goods.

Last year, Australia piled up a trade surplus equal to almost \$2 billion U. S. dollars, due primarily to heavy mineral and industrial exports.

Australia's links with other countries in Asia and the Pacific are growing. In the changing relationships in Asia and the Pacific, the "new" Australia is a nation to watch.

— Keith W. Stump

The Coming

WORLD OIL CRISIS

Middle East oil literally makes the wheels of European and Japanese industry turn. If their vital oil source were choked off, panic reactions could occur, plunging the world toward chaos.

by Paul William Kroll

THERE ARE nine nations which can cause the mighty industrial complexes of Japan, West Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy and the Benelux countries to virtually grind to a halt. Their trump card is OIL.

Unless you are a student of economic geography, you may not even have heard of some of these nations and kingdoms. A quick map check will pinpoint them in a belt stretching across North Africa through the Middle East to the Indian Ocean. The nine are Abu Dhabi, Algeria, Bahrein, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Qatar and Saudi Arabia.

The Oil Consumers

These nine nations supply approximately 80 to 85 percent of Western Europe's oil and 90 to 95 percent of Japan's petroleum needs. The exact figures are not important.

It is their magnitude that is important.

Currently, even the United States imports approximately 25 percent of its oil from abroad, mostly from Canada and Venezuela. It is virtually independent of Middle Eastern oil. Only 3 to 5 percent of the U.S. oil needs are supplied by the Middle East.

Conflicting reports are given regarding the United States' future dependence on Middle East oil. Recently, one concerned U.S. Interior Department official said that American dependence on Middle Eastern oil would rise from its relative insignificance to about one third of its total consumption by 1985.

One Rand Corporation think tank study took a different perspective: "...The degree of [U.S.] dependence [on Middle Eastern oil] can be kept at a very low level relative to consumption if the United States chooses to continue a policy designed to achieve such a result. . . .

"The option open to the U.S. is, our study points out, in *sharp contrast* to the position of the countries of Western Europe and Japan." These countries, with their projected increases in oil consumption, will be almost completely dependent on oil imported from the Middle East and North Africa.

To Import or Not to Import?

A United States Foreign Policy Association assessment of the oil

picture agreed in substance with the Rand study. Both pointed out, however, that Americans would have to pay an economic price for remaining independent of oil imports. One factor: Petroleum can be imported at a lower cost than it can be produced in the United States. Thus, the cost factor will have a large bearing in the final policy adopted.

Some authorities see a potential three-way rivalry — between the United States, Western Europe and Japan — developing for Middle East oil in the following decades. With a worldwide energy crisis taking hold, the rivalry could assume ugly overtones.

And we must not forget the Soviet Union. It will, no doubt, try to establish and maintain a firm foothold in the Middle East.

In mid-1972, for example, Iraq nationalized the Western-owned Iraq Petroleum Company. The Soviet Union hailed the nationalizing as a "great victory for the Arab people." A few hours after expropriation of the oil properties, Moscow met with the Foreign Minister of Iraq. Presumably, the meeting focused on Soviet economic aid and development of Iraq's oil industry.

The Russians themselves are apparently self-sufficient in oil production. In fact, Soviet oil industry Minister Sashin has predicted that the Soviet Union will outstrip present American oil production within three or four years. (State-

ment made on January 22, 1971.) The chief reason for the optimism is the tremendous output of the Siberian oil fields.

But there may be a fly in the oil well for the Soviets. The Soviet economy is still heavily dependent upon the use of coal and other solid fuels, though by 1969, oil and gas accounted for over 55 percent of the total amount of energy used in the Soviet Union. By 1980, the share of oil and gas in the Soviet energy market is expected to be over 75 percent.

In Western economies, there is a correlation between the dynamics of growth in industrial production and oil consumption. Here, the Soviet Union and its satellites lag far behind.


In the COMECON (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) countries of Eastern Europe, the per capita consumption of oil is only about 200 to 300 kilograms annually. Even if the Soviet bloc had consumed 1,400 kilograms of oil per capita in 1970, that would still be 20 percent less than the amount used in Italy. The obvious need to switch to more modern fuels has been discussed in the Soviet Union.

Using More Oil

The point is that the Soviet Union may find it is not totally indepen-

ARAB OIL-DRILLING RIG in Kuwait, the third largest Mideast oil-producing nation with the second largest reserves.

Taconis, Magum




PROVEN WORLD OIL RESERVES

EXCEPT for the United States and the Soviet Union, no major industrial power is a significant oil producer. This is one of the great paradoxes of economic geography. The entire world, including the more developed regions, are dependent on a few vulnerable countries for one of the most strategic items of modern industry: oil. This is one of the most disturbing aspects of the industrial scene.

Estimates of proven oil reserves are very speculative. The estimates given below, regarded as the latest and most reliable by some sources, differ significantly from other figures. The highest figures are three times as large as those given below for both the United States and the world. In any case, with the tremendous current production (over 18 billion barrels or 2.5 billion tons in 1971), it is clear that current rates of production and growth can only be sustained for a few more decades. The figures once again underscore the great importance of the Middle East and North Africa as oil suppliers.

Source: *Oil, The Middle East and the World*, Charles Issawi, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, New York: The Library Press, 1972, p. 8.

Figures in billions of U. S. barrels.
One metric ton equals about 7.3 barrels.



dent of Middle East oil if Kremlin leaders decide to modernize the industrial base, as they apparently want to do.

In fact, it has been reported that Communist Eastern Europe is looking increasingly to the Middle East for gas and oil. A leading Czechoslovakian economic planner, Vlastimil Plechac, recently wrote that Russia had instructed Czechoslovakia to stop relying totally on Soviet oil and to look increasingly to the Middle East.

The Soviet Union's increasingly direct involvement in Middle Eastern oil may indicate that she, too, has *designs on the product* as well as the place. (We must remember that a great deal of the Soviet Union's oil reserves are in such remote locations that development would be costly and difficult.)

The main point, however, is not how dependent the United States will be on Middle East oil, or if some discovery such as the North Sea oil deposits will dramatically affect Western Europe's oil situation or how free from oil import needs the Soviet Union can remain.

We should focus on the irrefutable fact that, for the near future, two of the world's four major industrial giants (Western Europe and Japan) will be almost totally dependent on Middle East oil. A third giant (the United States) will get at least some of its oil from there. A fourth (the U.S.S.R.) will have political interests in the area, regardless of whether or not she needs the oil.

The Middle East will continue as a focal point of international tensions. And the spotlight will intensify. Oil makes it certain.

The Oil Drum of Western Industry

Two thirds to three fourths of the (non-Communist) world's oil reserves are in the Middle East. As oil economist Walter Levy put it, "There is no alternative to Middle East oil." Echoing this assertion was

*Eastern Europe and Communist China included

oil expert Christopher Tugendhat, who is also a British member of Parliament. Nations may not like it; but they will have to use Middle Eastern and North African oil — that is, unless they are willing to shut down their industries.

In the 1960's, 44 percent of the oil discovered was found in the Middle East. Other finds, such as the fields in Alaska or the North Sea, as most experts know, will hardly fill the gap caused by increased consumption. Middle Eastern nations have most of the industrial world literally over a barrel. And if Shell Oil group estimates are right — that world oil consumption in the next 10 years will equal the previous 100 years' consumption — that barrel is going to get painfully large.

Of course, unknown factors could

change the circumstances. Perhaps new sources of power will be developed. Or newly discovered oil fields in Western Europe, Japan, the United States or other parts of the world may drastically alter the oil situation.

But for the next decade or so, such eleventh-hour situations seem unlikely. And as the consumption of oil skyrockets, Middle East petroleum will become ever more important to Japan, Western Europe, the United States and the Soviet Union.

A Barrel of Problems

An event which occurred in 1971 underscored the importance of oil to the world's economy and the fragility of the Middle East political situation.

During January of that year,

painful negotiations were in process in Teheran, Iran, between a score of oil companies and the ten OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) nations.

During a press conference in late January, the Shah of Iran, normally a moderate, urged all ten OPEC members to take concerted action to halt oil exports, should the companies fail to come to reasonable terms.


"If that happens," said an executive of a U.S. oil giant, "there would be complete and utter chaos in Europe and Japan." Fortunately, the oil companies came to terms.

In early 1973, the Shah of Iran announced that his country would not renew its existing agreement with the Western-dominated oil consortium after 1979. Iran, instead,

ESTIMATED OIL CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION BY 1980

ONE OF the most critical paradoxes of economic geography is that oil consumer and producer nations are not one and the same. The figures given below illustrate this central reality of the oil industry. They illustrate that the world's industrial giants, Japan and Western Europe in particular, must rely on other nations for their crucial oil supply. The political implications of this situation are obvious.

The statistical projections are some of the most recent which are available. They are offered only as probable magnitudes and possible trends. Exact forecasts must constantly be revised as new discoveries are made and changes in the world economic scene occur.



would take over its oil industry and run it independently. This may well complicate the Iranian oil picture.

Iran, though Moslem, is the only non-Arab oil giant in the Middle East. It is relatively free from the effects of the Arab-Israeli conflict. But the Arab oil powers are not.

Few people realize how difficult it is for Arab oil ministers to negotiate with the industrial powers. Some would like to use oil as a weapon against Israel. This would mean, in effect, denial of oil to the United States, a financial and military supplier of Israel. The United States, remember, finds itself in the contradictory position of supplying massive aid to Israel and increasingly looking to Arab oil for its fuel needs. But the stormy Middle East situation makes it difficult for all parties to come to agreeable settlements.

By the mid-1980's, many Middle East nations are expected to develop their own expertise to manage, control and market oil through their own national companies.

During this decade, the Arab nations are expected to be earning scores of *billions* — please note, *billions* — of dollars annually from oil earnings. John G. McLean of Continental Oil Company reported that by 1985, the oil producing countries of the Middle East and North Africa could be collecting oil revenues at the annual rate of \$50 billion. In five years, Saudi Arabia's reserves could conceivably rise to somewhere between \$10 and \$12 billion. This is more than the U.S. gold reserves behind the dollar. Clearly, the oil producing nations are emerging as powerful forces in world trade and finance.

What of the Future?

In the light of the growing financial clout of Middle Eastern nations, Japan's and Europe's obvious oil vulnerability, the increasing needs of the United States, and the Soviet Union's maneuverings and possible

needs, will Middle Eastern and North African oil flow unimpeded in the 1970's and 1980's?

We asked that question in an article appearing in the August 1971 issue of *The PLAIN TRUTH* entitled, "Middle East Oil: Black Gold." Since then, the oil situation has not necessarily changed for the better.

Three nations have nationalized their oil. Algeria nationalized her total oil industry in 1971. Libya nationalized the fields of British Petroleum in 1972. Earlier, in 1967, Iraq nationalized the Rumaila oil fields. One authority estimates that within ten years, all the oil properties in the Middle East and North Africa will be nationalized.

However, some oil-rich nations presently want only participatory status. In late 1972, Western oil companies announced a tentative agreement with five Middle Eastern nations (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Qatar, Abu Dhabi) which would give the Arab states a 51 percent interest in oil operations (by about 1982). These 5 nations together account for some 30 percent of all free-world oil production.

Nevertheless, the prospects of overall stability in the Middle East are still in question.

A Rand Corporation study discussed the difficulty in these terms, "In dealing with the threat of blackmail from the Middle East [that, of course, is a Western point of view, and nations in the Middle East would not agree with that assessment of their role], the counter-threat of economic retaliation may not be strong enough to impress Middle Eastern rulers caught in the irrationality of political passion."

We must not forget that in 1956, less than twenty years ago, two Western European nations, Britain and France, invaded Egypt. Not long afterward, American troops landed in Lebanon, and recently, the Soviet Union armed Egypt and sent in thousands of technicians and paramilitary personnel. The point is,

harsh measures of one sort or another are *not* out of the question.

Could Oil Spark World Conflict?

Political events surrounding an oil crisis such as a stoppage could lead to frightening circumstances involving many powerful nations. In order to graphically portray this, consider the following possible scenario of the future:

It is, let us say, November 1982. Winter is coming on, and Europe has increased fuel needs, added to the normal, voracious needs of its industry.

A federation of Middle Eastern and North African nations, called the United Arab Union, has been involved in months of stormy haggling over oil prices. A few oil producing states (not in the union) such as Saudi Arabia and Iran have still not hammered out acceptable terms. With billions of "petroleum dollars" in reserves, these nations are not concerned with hastily signing contracts.

The United Arab Union considers putting the squeeze on the few remaining foreign-owned oil companies and their paying customers, hoping to increase revenues to what it feels is fair. The nations in the federation are Egypt, Libya, Syria, Sudan, Algeria, Yemen and Iraq. Events, however, are soon to get out of hand.

In Syria, guerrillas embark on a program of their own. They blow up the Tapline and other pipelines carrying oil. The Egyptian government, bowing to popular demand, closes its supertanker pipeline from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean. Libya and Algeria, supplying a good share of the oil needs of Germany and France, shut down their wells. Oil flowing to Europe from west of the Suez Canal is effectively halted.

More importantly, the Soviet Union, seeing a resurgent Europe

on its western border and a mighty Chinese-Japanese combine on its eastern flank, decides to take advantage of the out-of-control situation to make a test-of-power move. Its object is to strengthen its position vis-à-vis the growing European influence in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union, openly backing what appears on the surface to be a "united," United Arab Union oil embargo, uses its bases on both sides of the Strait of Hormuz to blockade any oil leaving Iraq, Iran and other sheikdoms.

The Soviet Union then moves troops into Yemen at the "request" of guerrillas in control of part of the country. From its Socotra base in the Indian Ocean, Soviet naval units blockade Saudi Arabia and the east end of the Red Sea. As a result of Soviet actions, no oil can leave the area.

Europe's Panicky Reaction

Europe and Japan are in turmoil. Worried leaders quickly assemble to assess the options open to them.

Industrial leaders pressure their governments to get oil flowing immediately. "Unless it does," they say, "reserves will soon run out, wrecking Europe's industries." The public is up in arms. Soon there will be fuel rationing and higher prices. In time, as fuel runs out, transportation and industry will be terminally affected.

But diplomatic talks are having no effect. The United Nations appears powerless to act politically. The Soviet Union has just vetoed consideration of the oil problem in the Security Council. In the Middle East itself, no one seems capable of taking charge. Public, industrial and economic pressure in Europe and Japan increases to the breaking point.

And then...

Back to 1973. The question of the hour: Where do we go from here? Is

it possible at this critical juncture to avoid a Middle East conflict of immense proportions? The scenario is fictitious. But as in a Rand study, it is based on existing or potential political and economic realities.

The stakes are high. Middle Eastern and North African oil is presently the lifeblood of Europe and Japan. Neither can exist without it. Also, the United States may find itself significantly dependent on oil from this area.

Is Prediction Possible?

Based on the current instability of the oil situation, it is possible that some form of crisis could occur in the Middle East. And it will not be beneficial for the nations concerned. Here are some of the conditions that could help spark a multi-nation conflict over Middle East oil supplies:

(1) Increasing consumption of oil by industrial nations, focusing on greater needs for Middle East oil. This could result in possible competition between Japan, the United States and Western Europe for scarce reserves.

(2) No other significant oil or natural gas discoveries to offset current needs and future increases in usage, resulting in the much discussed "energy crisis."

(3) Continuing Soviet naval expansion and the Kremlin's increasing attempts to control Middle East oil with efforts to lock out the United States, Japan and Europe from Middle East oil sources.

(4) Increasing economic, political and military power of the European Community in the Mediterranean. Thus, the temptation to use force in order to counteract vulnerability.

(5) Shrinkage in the global role of the United States, with an isolationist approach to world problems.

(6) Continuing desire by the Arab states for better economic terms coupled with sometimes justified suspicions regarding the "colonial powers" of Western Europe and

particular animosity toward the United States and British "oil interests."

(7) An impasse in the Arab-Israeli conflict with oil being used by the Arabs as a lever to dislodge Western support of Israel. Any combination of the above points could lead to an international oil crisis with dire consequences for the nations involved. Coupled with other events of an international scope not centering on oil, a time of trauma could ensnare the nations of the world.

Such a thought is not pleasant to entertain, but to shut our eyes to the possibilities, indeed probabilities, will not make the Middle East dilemma vanish. Unless the Middle East hot spot is defused, it will remain a potential crisis area. □

For further reading

The interested reader will find the following volumes of help in understanding the Middle East oil crisis. Besides the books mentioned, there are numerous articles in newspapers, magazines and journals, which can be found by checking the appropriate guide or abstract.

Issawi, Charles, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, *Oil, the Middle East and the World*, New York: The Library Press, 1972.

Lubell, Harold, *Middle East Oil Crisis and Western Europe's Energy Supplies*, Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

Middle East Institute, 26th Annual Conference, "World Energy Demands and the Middle East," Washington, D.C.: Middle East Institute, September 29-30, 1972.

O'Conner, Harvey, *World Crisis in Oil*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1962.

Odell, Peter, *Oil and World Power*, New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970.

Schurr, Sam and Homan, Paul, *Middle Eastern Oil and the Western World*, London: American Elsevier, 1971.

Stocking, George W., *Middle East Oil*, Kingsport, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

Newest Trouble Spot for U.S.-

PANAMA CANAL

Attention is again focusing on the one of the world's most vital seaways. Here is the real meaning of the crisis and the background behind the recent United Nations Security Council meeting in Panama.

by Gene H. Hogberg

AMERICANS ARE waking up to a new international crisis, one that is a lot closer to home than Vietnam.

The major trading nations of the world are also deeply involved in the issue. At stake is their continued access, at reasonable cost, to the strategic Panama Canal — the “funnel for world commerce.”

Zone of Contention

At the heart of the dispute is the Republic of Panama's insistence on establishing its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned and administered Canal Zone. This 558-square-mile strip of territory bisecting the tiny Central American nation has been in U.S. hands since its formation in 1903. Within its boundaries, in a virtual “Little America,” live some 40,000 United States civilian workers and military personnel and their dependents. Their combined task is to operate, maintain and defend the vital Atlantic-to-Pacific waterway which courses through the middle of the 10-mile-wide Zone.

For the United States, the brewing Canal crisis comes at a very poor time. Most Americans, agonized by the twelve-year experience in Vietnam, are in no mood to get embroiled in another international dispute. But for Panamanian nationalists, the moment could not be more opportune.

In a shrewd political move, the Panamanian government persuaded the 15-member U.N. Security Council to move its March 1973 meeting from New York to Panama City. The Canal dispute took preeminence among a host of hemispheric problems. Predictably, the U.S. presence in the Canal Zone was soundly denounced as perpetuating “colonialism.”

Treaty Deadlock

The Panamanian situation has been simmering on the back burner of the U.S. foreign policy hot stove for over fifteen years. The trouble reached boiling point in January 1964, when anti-American riots broke out in Panama involving a dispute over the display of Panamanian and U. S. flags in the Zone.

Rioting Panamanians also demanded the replacement of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty under which Panama granted the United States exclusive control of the Canal Zone “in perpetuity.”

Since that time, relations between Panama City and Washington have been strained. Negotiations between the two nations broke down in 1967, just when it appeared that both sides were about to approve a new treaty relationship governing the Canal's future status. But legislative resistance in both countries prevented ratification. Willingness on the part of the American negotiators to cede sovereignty over the Zone to Panama sent up a stream of protest in the U. S. House of Representatives. In Panama, the feeling was that the United States had not given in enough in the negotiations.

A long period of stagnation set in.

Highly Emotional Issue

General Omar Torrijos, Panama's strongman since a 1968 revolution, has made it clear in recent months that Panama is more insistent than ever in its demands for jurisdiction

over the Zone. He claims that the Canal issue is "the only religion uniting all Panamanians." (Conversely, American lawmakers and administrators involved in the Canal dispute are divided as to how far — or whether — to give in to Panama's demands.)

Torrijos and his associates in Panama's military junta regime have been dropping hints that unless Washington reconsiders its stand, the Panamanian people may again be obliged to "resort to violence" to make their voices heard.

Panama is also counting heavily on the friendship of people throughout Latin America and on other continents to restore its "national dignity" and eliminate U. S. "colo-

nialism" from what it maintains is its own territory.

Being overlooked by the revolutionaries in their nationalistic zeal, however, are these facts of life.

About 11,000 Panamanians are employed by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government — in increasingly more important positions and at higher wage scales than prevail in the Republic of Panama. Panamanian employees are protected by U. S. minimum wage legislation — \$1.60 an hour minimum. The equivalent in Panama is about \$0.25 an hour. Panama simply cannot afford to pay the higher wages.


Furthermore, approximately one third of tiny Panama's gross na-

tional product is accounted for, directly or indirectly, by the Canal — over \$168,000,000 a year. Should access to the Canal at acceptable rates ever be denied to the world's great trading nations, these revenues would drop and plunge Panama into an economic depression.

Also overlooked is the fact that Panama has been one of the greatest recipients of U. S. foreign aid on a per capita basis. The United States has funneled over \$225,000,000 in all forms of aid into Panama since 1946. Panama's population is only 1½ million.

But these economic facts of life are being submerged in a highly emotional issue fanned by nationalistic passions.

Panama Canal Company



GATUN LOCKS at the Atlantic Ocean entrance to the Panama Canal. Ships entering here are raised 85 feet to the level of Gatun Lake. Locks at the Pacific end, 32 miles distant, complete freshwater "bridge" between the oceans.

Canal More Important Than Ever

The direct and immediate importance of the Canal to the United States — and the world as a whole — is seldom realized. The 50-mile-long waterway, with its magnificent system of locks and dams, is largely ignored or taken for granted today by the American public — the very people whose forefathers labored for over a decade to successfully complete the greatest engineering feat in all of history to that day.

The simple fact, however, is that the Panama Canal, though nearing the end of its sixth decade of near-flawless operation, is more important to the United States today than perhaps at any time in its history. The only possible exception may have been the war years of 1941-45, when nearly 14,000 American and allied combat, troop and merchant ships took advantage of the canal shortcut between the war theaters in Europe and Asia.

It is not an understatement that the United States economy — already in deep trouble in world monetary matters — would be dealt a severe, crippling blow if traffic through the waterway were ever stopped. Nearly 70 percent of the ships transiting the Canal at any time are headed to or coming from ports in the United States. Moreover, the effect of such a blockage on world commerce as a whole would far exceed the impact which resulted from the closure of the Suez Canal in 1967.

An official Panama Canal Company document reports: "Viewed thus from a logistical standpoint, the Panama Canal today is of greater importance than ever before in the welfare and defense of the free world, whose strength, which stems from economic well-being, rests in no small degree on the Panama Canal as an avenue of transportation in peace and in war."

The motto of the Canal Zone Government — "The land divided, the world united" — could not better tell the story of the Panama Canal.

Not Obsolete

Since its opening to commercial traffic on August 15, 1914, half a million ships of all nations have passed through its waters. Remarkably, shipping tolls have never been raised. The average vessel pays about \$6,185 in tolls but saves more than \$50,000 each voyage by eliminating over 7,000 miles and saving 20 days in sailing time between its terminal ports.

It has been claimed by some that the present lock-freshwater-lake canal is obsolete and must be replaced by a new (and very expensive) sea-level canal.

But this assertion is simply not true. The present canal's massive locks — each chamber is 1,000 feet long and 110 feet wide — are still more than sufficient to handle all but perhaps two percent of the world's ocean-going vessels.

The newer, bulk supertankers, of course, cannot squeeze through the locks. But they are specifically designed to avoid transiting Panama or any other canal, thereby avoiding toll costs, which, for their size, are considerable.

The only way the Canal could possibly become out-of-date is through demands being placed upon it by expanding world commerce. Transits each day now average 39, about 12 below what is considered the waterway's normal peak capacity.

Plans long on the drawing board could increase the canal's capacity to handle any expected tonnage increase well into the future. But such plans, which call for an additional system of larger locks, are stymied, pending the outcome of the U.S.-Panama dispute.

Lifeline of Nations

It is a mistake to think that only the United States has great stakes in

the continued unimpeded operation of the Panama Canal. The waterway forms a veritable economic lifeline for many nations which have long benefited from U.S. operation of the Canal, based upon the principles of "entire equality" and "just and equitable tolls" for all.

It is true that about two thirds of the total tonnage passing through the Panama Canal originates in or is destined for U.S. ports. But this statistic does not reflect the whole story. Because the United States represents such a huge market, trade through the Canal means life or death to the economies of several of America's trading partners. For example, approximately one third of the total ocean-going trade of Japan — much of it to or from the States — passes through the Canal.

The situation regarding the west coast nations of South America is even more revealing. Roughly 80 percent of the total imports and exports of three nations — Ecuador, Chile and Peru — passes through the waterway.

A report by the Center for Strategic Studies in Washington summarizes: "It is a mistake too often made to regard the United States as the sole very important beneficiary of present Canal operations. If the relative percentages of total foreign trade as related to Canal use are compared, it will become apparent that the Canal is relatively of greater importance to certain South American countries than it is to the United States."

These states are now in a quandary. They are caught between providing emotional support for "Latin brother" Panama's drive for Canal control — and the practical awareness of what could happen to their economies should the tiny republic, with its long history of political instability, obtain exclusive control of it. (Since 1930, Panama has undergone six unconstitutional changes of government.)

One U. S. official who is generally sympathetic to Panama's cause admits: "There is considerable fear among Canal users in Latin America and worldwide that, without continued U. S. control, the Canal might be operated to produce maximum revenues rather than as a utility serving world trade at reasonable tolls."

Revolutionaries Demand Canal Serve Panama

In October 1968, the Panamanian National Guard staged a military coup. President Arnulfo Arias, who had been inaugurated only eleven

days earlier, was ousted. It was the third time Arias had been elected president — and the third time he had been bounced.


The new junta, headed by Colonel (later General) Omar Torrijos, wasted little time in proclaiming a new "Revolutionary Republic of Panama." The democratically elected National Assembly was abolished, and political parties were banned.

The new government almost immediately took a much more militant stand on the Canal issue. The proposed 1967 treaties with the U. S. were denounced. The new

leaders launched a program intent on exploiting the Canal and its revenue potential to finance what they called their "social revolution."

Reflecting the new inward orientation of the nation, the revolutionary government changed the original Latin motto of the country from "Pro Mundo" meaning "For the World" to "Pro Patria," "For the Fatherland."

The controlled Panamanian press, reflecting official governmental policy, began proclaiming that the narrow Isthmus of Panama — containing the Canal — was the country's "greatest natural resource."



Panama had a right, according to the reasoning, to reap the maximum possible financial benefit from this "resource."

U. S. officials have often stressed that, as a matter of policy, they regard the Canal as an international public utility. As a wealthy country, the United States has not needed to maximize profits from the Canal — although by federal law the Canal must not operate at a loss.

Panama's fundamental outlook regarding the Canal, however, is entirely opposite. Panama protests that by keeping tolls low, the United States has been subsidizing its own and world commerce.

According to one Panamanian source: "Panama doesn't want to be the subsidizing agent for the world's merchant fleet. If the United States wants to be the great white father, fine, but Panama cannot afford to be."

Jorge Illueca, influential foreign policy advisor to the Panamanian government, made his nation's current thinking perfectly clear in a speech at Panama University last December. He told an aroused student body that it must eventually be Panama's decision on "how the Canal will be run, how the fees will be changed, how the benefits will be distributed."

"This means," demanded Illueca, "a Panamanian canal . . . operated by Panamanians, for Panamanians, for the benefit of Panamanians."

Will a Compromise Work?

It is almost certain that when the dust over the current canal crisis settles, some form of compromise highly favorable to Panama will be recommended by American officials anxious to cool inflamed Panamanian passions.

In any new treaty proposal, four factors would most certainly be included:

(1) The recognition of Panama's



THE TOKYO BAY, shown here and on page 21 at left, the largest ship ever to transit the Panama Canal. The giant container-carrier had only two feet to spare on each side within the 110-foot-wide chambers.

Panama Canal Company

sovereignty over both the area of the Zone and the Canal.

(2) The release of all land within the present 10-mile-wide Zone not used directly for the operation of the Canal to Panama, with present U. S. governmental, judicial, and commercial interests in the Zone phased out over a specified period.

(3) Transferring ownership and operation of the Canal itself to a dual Panama-United States administration for a specified number of years, after which the Canal would become Panama's entirely.

(4) A reduction of the formidable U. S. military presence in the Zone with its functions and mobility limited. Remaining U. S. forces would likely be stationed under a "status of forces" treaty with Panama, subject to Panama's good will.

Would such an arrangement work? Would such a one-sided "compromise" satisfy the most radical of Panamanian demands?

The most knowledgeable canal experts in the United States realize the answer can only be "No" to both questions. They stress that continued U. S. operation and defense of the Canal would be impossible should the United States relinquish sovereign control over the Zone itself, with its 5 miles of defensive buffer on either side of the waterway. The January 1964 riots demon-

strated the value of the "fall-back" area of the Zone. While chaos was erupting during the three days of rioting, ships continued to transit the Canal behind the lines of fire as if nothing were happening.

"In my judgment," says U. S. Senator Strom Thurmond, "it is a semantic trick to maintain that the U. S. can keep control of the Canal and the capability to defend it if ever we give up our sovereign rights. . . ."

"It is for this reason," he warns, "that the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is the key issue which must never be compromised."

U. S. Congressman Daniel Flood raised the same issue in the House of Representatives in 1967 when he asked: "If we cannot control the Panama Canal and Canal Zone over which we hold sovereignty in perpetuity under treaty grant . . . how can we hold any canal over which we do not have such authority and ownership? *And what is to prevent our country from being driven altogether from the isthmus?*"

"Final Liberation"

The fact must be faced squarely that once complete sovereignty in the Zone area belongs to Panama, expropriation or nationalization of the waterway itself would only be a matter of time — treaty or no treaty!

The Canal could be taken over as easily as have previously American-owned industries in Chile and Peru.

And what if American military personnel are no longer present because of future treaty limitations? What would prevent a mob, supported by Panama's National Guard, from marching into the Zone to accomplish what Jorge Illueca calls "the final liberation of Panamanian territory"?

None other than Panama's General Torrijos himself has proclaimed: "Without a satisfactory accord, Panama's National Guard will have two alternatives: either to crush the patriotic rebellion of the people or to lead it." And Panama's strongman gave the answer in the next breath: "I am not going to crush it."

Greatest Danger

It is with this background that the most recent and generally unreported developments on the Isthmus assume great significance.

The first is a budding relationship between Panama's revolutionary government and that of communist Cuba.

The two regimes share one common major concern. The Canal Zone to Torrijos is what the big U. S. naval base at Guantanamo is to Cuba's Fidel Castro. But the similarities between the two revolutionary regimes go deeper than the mere presence of U. S. enclaves.

Panama City, in a display similar to Havana, has blossomed with portraits of Torrijos, together with banners spelling out his revolutionary declarations. General Torrijos' handpicked assembly has officially proclaimed him the nation's "Lider Máximo" (Supreme Leader), a title long ago assumed by Castro.

Moreover, technical and cultural missions have traveled regularly between Cuba and Panama, despite the absence of formal diplomatic recognition.

And in November 1971, at the close of Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin's official call on Castro, a joint Soviet-Cuban statement referred to the Panamanian revolution in uncommonly warm tones.

Suitcases of Propaganda

It is no secret that Communist influence is strong and is getting stronger within Panama, although the nation's revolutionary government is primarily a home-grown nationalistic product.

The Communist influence is particularly formidable among the nation's high school and university students.

This point was well impressed upon my memory during a flight I made to Panama in August 1968, shortly before the military coup. En route to Panama from Los Angeles, our plane made a scheduled stop in Guatemala. Transferring to the plane at this point were a group of 17 Panamanian teen-agers. Once aloft, I asked the gentleman seated next to me — a wealthy Panamanian cattle breeder — if he had any idea from where the young people were returning home.

After overhearing several of their conversations, he said they were all honor-roll high school upperclassmen returning from an international Communist youth conference held in Sofia, Bulgaria.

My curiosity was aroused. After the plane landed at Panama's Tocumen Airport, I purposely lingered at the customs counter. Student after student opened bulging suitcases filled to capacity with Communist books, pamphlets and phonograph albums, all in Spanish.

A major thrust of the "World Youth Conference," I later learned, was to spread the ideals of Marxist-Leninism among the present generation of Latin Americans.

Soviet "Chokepoints"

What if the nationalistic revolution in Panama gets out of hand and

the "revolutionary republic" slips into the hands of outright Communist control, as in Cuba — subject to much closer Soviet direction?

Most Americans do not realize that it has long been the aim of Soviet military strategists to wrest from, or pick up by default, the strategic "sea gates" of world commerce from Great Britain and the United States.

The increased might of the Soviet navy in the Indian Ocean is in direct response to Great Britain's virtual abandonment of the line of empire from Gibraltar, through the Mediterranean, Suez, the Red Sea, past Aden and on to Singapore. Ships flying the "hammer and sickle" are moving into the vacuum.

The Soviets are making steady inroads in Latin America as well. Says an American military attaché stationed in a primary Latin American country: "It doesn't take too much sophistication to see how things are going. The Russians now have submarines in Cuba, and they're roaming the Caribbean around the Canal. The port at Cienfuegos [Cuba], if it is not already a submarine port, could easily become one.

"Then you look at the Straits of Magellan, which would be the only way around South America if the Canal were closed. The Russians are helping Chile's Marxist government build a port in the south of Chile that could be transformed into a submarine base within 24 hours..."

There is one very interesting aspect of Soviet foreign policy. Its planners do not refer to these narrow passageways of commerce as "sea gates" or "seaways" which open up trade to the world. In Soviet terminology, such passages are "chokepoints" to be wrested from the Western powers and denied to their continued use.

Time is short and is running out

for exclusive United States control of its most priceless territorial acquisition. As a last-ditch effort to save the Canal, defenders of the Panama Canal are calling upon Congress to admit the Canal Zone to the Union as the 51st state. Supporters of the move realize that they will have a tough time pushing through such legislation. Their opponents feel that enactment of such a bill would be extremely offensive to Latin Americans in general, not to mention an outrage to Panama.

It now remains to ask the most fundamental question of all. Could

there be a deeper reason why the United States is on the verge of losing one of its prime birthright assets?

A Deeper Reason?

Is there a reason why fellow Anglo-Saxon power Britain has already lost Suez, Aden and a host of other strategic sea gates around the world? As a consequence, Britain's sun has so declined that she has sought refuge inside Europe's Common Market.

Could it be that the United States — afflicted with mounting internal

decay and moral corruption — is unwittingly relinquishing its right to and stewardship of the Panama Canal, which it acquired by a series of historical miracles?

Our free book, *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy*, makes it clear how and why the English-speaking powers came to possess the pivotal land and sea areas of the globe. It also details what is likely to happen to the entire English-speaking world from now on — unless some rather dramatic changes are made in the course of national and individual lives. □

Panama-U.S. Relations

THE HIGH COST OF COMPROMISE

ALMOST FROM the day in December 1903 that the fledgling Republic of Panama granted by treaty to the United States perpetual and exclusive authority over the Canal Zone, that authority has been contested.

The generous terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were extremely advantageous to the United States, to be sure. For a lump sum of \$10,000,000 and an annual payment of \$250,000 (since raised to \$430,000 and subsequently \$1,930,000) Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity the use, occupation and control" of the Zone and authorized it to exercise "all the rights, power and authority within the zone . . . which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

In implementing the treaty, the United States proceeded to acquire

outright ownership of all land and other property in the Canal Zone by purchase from the individual owners. The rights exercised by the United States in the Canal Zone are derived, therefore, from a grant by the government of Panama and purchases from the individual property owners.

Panama benefited greatly from the arrangement as well. Its newly won independence from Colombia was guaranteed by the United States. The \$10,000,000 flowed into its barren treasury instead of Colombia's. And most important for the future, the Canal and its operations were to provide the single greatest source of revenue for the Republic, as well as providing a major source of employment for Panamanian labor.

U. S. Becomes "Whipping Boy"

Over the years, however, Panamanian politicians grew adept at blaming nearly all of Panama's domestic woes upon U. S. presence on

the Isthmus. The hated Zone — a piece of prosperous "Little America" with its neat suburban-style homes for canal employees and their families — became the focal point of Panamanian frustrations. Not helping the matter was the fact that many "Zonians" rarely ventured out of their comfortable enclave, some never bothering to learn Spanish.

Officials in Washington, in an attempt to bend over backward, have gradually given in to one demand after another by Panama for a revision or replacement of the 1903 treaty. As a result of years of compromise, the United States — unrecognized by most of its citizens — has already gone a long way down the road to total surrender of its most expensive territorial acquisition (The U. S., it should be noted, has spent nearly \$6,500,000,000 in federal funds for the purchase, construction, maintenance and defense of the Canal. About \$5 billion of the funds are still unrecovered!)

Relatively minor modifications of the 1903 treaty were made in subsequent treaties concluded in 1936 and 1955 within the framework of "Good Neighbor" relations. Although the basic issue of U. S. sovereignty within the Zone was not compromised, the United States was beginning to show signs of losing its control, piecemeal. In return for U. S. concessions, Panama solemnly promised to "strengthen the bonds of friendship and cooperation" with the United States.

That professed friendship didn't last long. In a bold move called "Operation Sovereignty," Panama University students in May 1958 invaded the Zone and planted 72 Panamanian flags in various spots. U. S. authorities ignored the incidents as "youthful pranks" and made no arrests. Other riots and flag-waving demonstrations naturally followed over the next two years.

The turning point in U. S.-Panamanian relations came in 1960. By executive order from Washington, Panamanian flags were ordered to fly alongside the Stars and Stripes at designated locations in the Zone. This was done, it was officially explained, to demonstrate "visual evidence" of Panama's "titular sovereignty" in the Canal Zone. But it was actually done to pacify Panamanian public opinion, which was becoming increasingly anti-American.

American legal experts explained that "titular" sovereignty meant "residual" sovereignty — that the Canal would revert to Panama whenever the U. S. should choose to leave. But to Panamanian nationalists, the term, along with the authorized flying of their flag, amounted to the first official admission by the United States of Panama's full sovereignty over the Zone territory.

The offensive had shifted to Panama.

The "Flagpole War"

The "two flag" issue erupted into violence on January 9, 1964. Ameri-

can students at Balboa High School in the Zone, in defiance of a government order, flew the American flag on the lone flagpole outside the school. The flag had been earlier withdrawn, because the school was not one of the officially sanctioned locations in the Zone where both flags were required to fly together.

In retaliation, a group of Panamanian students marched into the Zone from Panama City and tried instead to raise their flag in front of the school. In the ensuing scuffle, the Panamanian flag was torn. The Panamanian students then fled from the Zone, destroying property on the way.

Large crowds formed at the border of the Zone and serious rioting broke out. Fires erupted in American-owned businesses in Panama City. Panama's *Guardia Nacional* made no attempt to maintain order. Instead, they were ordered confined to their barracks.

By the time order was restored on January 12, four U. S. soldiers and 22 Panamanians had been killed. During the melee, the U. S. troops confined to the Zone were not allowed to fire until they had sustained several casualties.

Panama charged the United States with "aggression" and severed diplomatic relations on January 10. Three months later, however, the two nations agreed to restore diplomatic relations and to "seek elimination of the causes of conflict."

Secret Treaties Leak Out

What happened over the next three years has been described by the more conservative leaders in the United States as "appeasement" and a "sellout to mob rule."

From 1964 until 1967, American and Panamanian negotiators labored in secrecy over three new treaties to replace the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla pact. The silence was broken briefly when an American newspaper reporter obtained ad-

vance texts of the treaties — on the streets of Panama City, where they were being openly peddled! (In Washington, the texts were still classified.) When details of the treaties became known, a major controversy erupted in Congress, especially in the House of Representatives.

Briefly stated, these proposed treaties provided for, first, the ceding to Panama of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and making that country a joint partner with the United States in Canal management; second, sharing the defense of the Canal with Panama; and third, authorizing the United States to construct a new sea-level Canal in Panama. Under terms of the treaties, Panama would ultimately be given *without cost*, not only the existing canal, but also any new canal in Panama that the United States might construct to replace it.

Congressional critics of the new treaties claimed U. S. negotiators were committed to a policy of "surrender in advance" and that the treaties would only result, later on, in "greater extortions and our complete abandonment of the Canal enterprise."

Defenders of the new pacts, however, said the time was long overdue for the U. S. to "meet certain reasonable Panamanian aspirations," with the objective of contributing to a "more enduring relationship between Panama and the United States."

In their arguments, they attempted to prove that American sovereignty could be compromised or "shared" with Panama without sacrificing the ability of the United States to operate and defend the Canal. A State Department viewpoint was that "adjustments" were necessary in order for the United States to "justify itself in world forums."

Partly as a result of the aroused congressional opposition, the new canal treaties were neither signed

nor ratified by either country. The Panamanian legislators also turned them down — but for the opposite reason. The treaties didn't go far enough, they claimed, in meeting their nation's aroused demands.

U. S. Weakness at Fault

Perhaps the most intense rebuff of the negotiators' work came from Harold Lord Varney, president of the Committee on Pan American Policy and editor of *Pan American Headlines*. His remarks were read into the Congressional Record of September 18, 1967:

"The appalling truth is that absolutely no necessity exists for the abject and unprecedented surrender that we are making on the Isthmus. No foreign force is compelling us to give up the rights which the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 assured us in perpetuity . . .

"By some occult reasoning [presidential advisors believe] that we will win the world's admiration if we run out on the Panama Canal we built and the Canal Zone over which we are assured sovereignty by every feature of international law.

"No supposition could be more preposterous. There can be no surer way for the United States to win the contempt of the world, and particularly of Latin America . . .

"At nearly every juncture the Panamanians have won increasing gains not because they are strong, or right, but because of the weaknesses and euphoria of the last three Washington Administrations. If the United States had at any point taken a firm and convincing stand on its rights under the 1903 Treaty, Panamanian demands would have withered and turned to reason. Unfortunately . . . Panama has won the jackpot virtually by default."

Here the issue stands in 1973. Tiny Panama is on the political offensive again. And this time its leaders are trying to win world support for their nation's "revolution of sovereignty." □

Stranger Than Fiction—

The Canal America Didn't Want to Build

PERHAPS NO story of fiction is as exciting as the 400-year history of man's dreams, schemes, failures and ultimate success in building a canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

Was there an unseen hand of history which reserved victory and national honor for the United States at the time of its ascendancy to become the greatest single power on earth?

Charles V of Spain was the first monarch to grasp the significance of a canal joining the Atlantic and Pacific. He initiated the first investigations in 1523, and in 1534 ordered the Governor of Panama to make a formal survey of the route following the Chagres and Grande Rivers, the general course which the actual Panama Canal takes today.

From that date until May 4, 1904, when the United States undertook construction, the principal maritime nations of the world gave earnest consideration to the project, which was urged by geographers and navigators.

American interest in the Isthmus was stirred during the nation's infancy. This interest was greatly heightened by the completion in 1855 of the U. S. financed Panama Railroad, which followed the present Canal alignment. The railroad, in turn, had been spurred by the discovery of gold in California in 1849 and the need to sail from coast to coast as quickly as possible.

The French Begin

The first tangible efforts to build a canal came on January 10, 1880. On that date, an ambitious project was formally inaugurated by Count Ferdinand de Lesseps for the privately financed French Canal Company. De Lesseps was the national hero of France. He had already successfully promoted the construction of the Suez Canal which opened in 1869.

Riding the crest of his popularity, De Lesseps declared that "Panama will be easier to build, easier to finish and easier to maintain than Suez." The Count somehow assumed that chopping down Panama's continental divide and hacking through its disease-infested, tropical jungles to provide a sea-level passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific would prove no more difficult than slicing through the sands of Suez.

Despite the valiant effort of the French engineering corps, poor initial planning, shaky financing and raging tropical diseases combined to doom the mammoth undertaking to failure after ten years of toil. The project engulfed the lives of 20,000 laborers who perished in the swamps of the "pesthole of the Americas."

A new French Canal Company was formed in 1894, but it performed only enough work to retain the company's franchise so that it could be sold to another builder.

All during the French project, Americans looked on with a mixture of suspicion and open hostility. It was only because the French effort was privately financed and was not a government-funded project that Washington did not impose the Monroe Doctrine. Besides, American interest in a canal route had been centered on a route across Nicaragua, not Panama. Even as the French blasted and dug across Panama, an American company was actively engaged in constructing a Nicaraguan Canal.

Colombia Balks

After much debate in the U. S. Congress with the "Nicaraguan faction," the U. S. Isthmian Canal Commission, in 1902, recommended purchase of the rights and property of the new French Canal Company for \$40,000,000. Negotiations then began with Colombia, sovereign over the Isthmus of Panama, for treaty rights to construct and operate the canal.

Secretary of State John Hay and his Colombian counterpart Tomás Herrán labored long hours over a new treaty and finally produced one in early 1903.

According to its terms, the United States was to be granted "use and control" of (not obtain sovereign rights to, as was later granted by Panama) a strip of land six miles wide (not ten) for a period of 100 years, renewable at U. S. option (not "in perpetuity"). The treaty specifically stipulated that sovereignty over the Zone would remain in Colombia's hands.

Despite objections, especially over the sovereignty clause, the U. S. Senate ratified the treaty. The Colombian senate, however, balked. The chief obstacle was money. Colombia demanded \$25,000,000 cash, plus \$600,000 a year compensation for revenues to be lost from the railroad franchise, customs and taxes. The United States held out for \$10,000,000 plus \$250,000 a year

compensation for the railroad only.¹

Days and months passed with no action by the Colombian senate. Prominent residents in Panama grew exasperated with their government in far-off Bogotá. They felt their hopes and fortunes would soon be lost. They were well aware that the 1902 Spooner Act specifically authorized the U. S. President to pursue the Nicaraguan route if Colombia would not agree to U. S. terms for Panama.

The Panamanians chose to secede from Colombia.

Panama Acts on Its Own

The history of this stormy period of Isthmian affairs has been the subject of much debate and controversy. The Panamanian revolution succeeded in no small part — due to intervention by the United States. President Theodore Roosevelt, acting in full legal accordance with the Treaty of 1846 to guarantee freedom of transit across the Isthmus, prevented Colombian troops from traveling by rail from Colon to Panama City to suppress the uprising.

It is evident, however, that the U. S. government did not plot or initially encourage the Panamanian revolt — even though knowledge of the impending overthrow was well known in higher circles of power in Washington for some time.

But there is no doubt President Theodore Roosevelt took full and forceful advantage of a situation which had been created by others totally outside his control. In his biography, Roosevelt wrote: "I did not lift my fingers to incite the revolutionaries. I simply ceased to stamp out the different revolutionary fuses that were already burning." On an-

¹A very important fact is that the \$250,000 annual compensation was later accepted by Panama. It was increased to \$430,000 in 1934 after the U. S. devalued the gold dollar. In 1955, the State Department gratuitously added to this amount the sum of \$1.5 million out of its own budget, for "good relations" (which never resulted), making a total annual payment of \$1,930,000. But neither the original \$250,000 nor the increased annuity can be construed as "rent" or "lease" since the U. S. government owns all the property within the Zone.

other occasion he asserted: "Be it remembered that unless I had acted exactly as I did act there would now be no Panama Canal." In his view, the Colombian government was obstructing the progress of civilization.

Panama's revolutionary leader, Dr. Manuel Amador Guerrero, cleared the United States of any complicity. On his first trip to the United States after the revolution, he said:

"Of course, we expected that the United States would not let the Colombian troops attack us, because of the effect that war there would have in the way of blocking traffic across the Isthmus, but we had no understanding with the Government here, *nor are the people of the United States at all responsible for the revolution. It was our own act.*"

Man of Destiny

The pivotal figure in the entire Panamanian episode, however, was neither a Panamanian nor an American. He was a Frenchman, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, who, as a young man of 26, was De Lesseps' last chief engineer. Bunau-Varilla had "consecrated his life" to the Panama Canal. He spoke of it with an almost religious fervor.

Bunau-Varilla's pride suffered a near fatal blow when the French project collapsed. He therefore feverishly set about to vindicate the "glory of France" and the honor of the discredited De Lesseps. To his way of thinking, if the idea of the Panama Canal was abandoned and a Nicaraguan route chosen instead, the world would always believe that France had been wrong.

Bunau-Varilla failed in his efforts to inspire the French people to resume the work. He then tried to interest the Russian government.

"He got as far as the czar's Minister of Finance, and for a while there seemed to be a good chance that the Panama Canal would be Russian, which might have led to a rather bi-



CUTTING THROUGH the Continental Divide on the Panamanian Isthmus in 1913. Landslides were a constant problem throughout Panama Canal construction. More than 200 million cubic yards of earth were excavated, one quarter of it slide material.

Panama Canal Company

zarre situation half a century later. But the French government fell at the crucial moment, and the plan fell with it" (*Panama, 400 Years of Dreams and Reality*, by David Howarth).

After that, Bunau-Varilla was forced to conclude that there was only one country which could conceivably finish his dream canal. The French failure showed that the job was too big for private industry. It needed a government's resources. But the government of Colombia was weak and nearly bankrupt, and no European government would have dared stir up the Monroe Doctrine. The U. S. government was left as the only alternative.

Financed Revolution Out of His Own Pocket

Bunau-Varilla worked tirelessly behind the scenes cultivating friends in American politics and industry. He continually kept alive the faltering glimmer of hope for the Panama route. His big stroke of success came when he met the leader of Panama's

still secret revolutionary group, Dr. Manuel Amador Guerrero, in New York City in the summer of 1903.

The revolutionaries were short of money. They needed \$100,000 to pay the back wages of Colombian troops stationed in Panama — troops which had professed sympathy for the revolution.

Bunau-Varilla made a deal. He offered to secure the entire amount through a branch of his own bank in New York. In return, the Panamanian revolutionaries agreed to appoint him Minister Plenipotentiary — with full power to conduct canal treaty negotiations with Washington after the revolution succeeded.

Some members of the revolutionary clique group felt uneasy about a non-Panamanian representing them in so delicate a matter. But needing the money, they consented.

Independence for Panama came, virtually without a shot, on November 3, 1903. With his diplomatic credentials in hand, Bunau-Varilla

worked fast. He took the months-old Hay-Herrán Treaty and added many points advantageous to the United States to satisfy the U. S. Senate and, especially, to overcome objections from the Nicaraguan faction.

Secretary of State John Hay could hardly believe the generous terms offered in the new treaty. One senator, who had supported Nicaragua, described the treaty as "more liberal in its concessions to us and giving us more than anybody in this Chamber ever dreamed of having." He added: "We have never had a concession so extraordinary in its character as this. In fact, it sounds very much as if we wrote it ourselves." (Many of Bunau-Varilla's additions, in fact, had been originally proposed as amendments to the Hay-Herrán Treaty by Senator John T. Morgan.)

On February 25, 1904, Bunau-Varilla and Hay exchanged ratifications of the treaty. The next day, Bunau-Varilla resigned his short-lived ministry, his life work accom-

plished. He later wrote: "I had fulfilled my mission, the mission I had taken on myself; I had safeguarded the work of the French genius; I had avenged its honour; I had served France."²

Thus, once again, France figured prominently in a key acquisition of U. S. territory. Almost exactly 100 years earlier, Napoleon had sold the vast Louisiana Territory to the United States. It was America's largest acquisition ever — and the least expensive for its size. And now, a century later, came the Canal Zone — smallest and most expensive of America's strategic acquisitions.

President Roosevelt considered the acquisition of the Canal Zone by grant from Panama as the most important event of his administration. He himself ranked it with the Louisiana Purchase.

Was it just "good fortune" that the United States, against its will for the most part, came to possess one of the most strategic and coveted areas of world geography? Or is there a God who has been working out a plan here on earth?

Of this God it is written: "He created every race of man of one stock. . . . He fixed the epochs of their history and the limits of their territory" (Acts 17:26, *The New English Bible*).

One More Miracle

The exploits of the thousands of laborers sweating under the Panamanian sun from 1904 to 1914, the medical and sanitary breakthroughs in this fever-infested part of the world — this part of Canal history is well documented in the history books.

But not nearly as well known to the public is the fact that the success of the entire project hinged on a fateful decision taken in 1906.

The French, in their unsuccessful effort, had tried two methods of ca-

nal construction. They started with a sea-level project and realistically advanced to a high-level, lake-and-lock system before their enterprise failed.

But American engineers reopened the "battle of the levels." The controversy was not resolved until President Roosevelt's Secretary of War William Taft sided with the minority report of six engineers (out of a distinguished panel of 15 international engineers). They warned that the lock-lake system was the only safe and practical way to construct the interoceanic canal and to control the rampaging flood waters of the Chagres River. The nine majority engineers had favored a sea-level project.

The tremendous rock and mud slides encountered in cutting through the continental divide later proved to all concerned that the lock-lake route, with its 85-foot, above-sea-level elevation, was difficult enough to construct. It is very likely that an attempt to construct a sea-level canal with the techniques and equipment available at that time would have proved to be an impossible task.

"When the American people come to celebrate the opening of the present canal" wrote an on-the-spot observer in 1914, "they owe a hymn of thanksgiving to that happy fate that led them — yes, *led them against their will* — to build a lock canal at Panama. To have pursued the course the majority . . . wanted the United States to pursue *would have involved us in one of the most calamitous undertakings in all history.*" (*Battling With the Panama Slides*, William Joseph Showalter, *National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1914.)

One is struck, too, by the fact that, compared to the French effort, nearly everything went right — all through the project for ten difficult years! It should be plain that it wasn't only American ingenuity that accomplished the task.

The American people should

have sung a hymn of thanksgiving, not to "happy fate," but to their God in heaven for their fantastic national success. But few seemed to realize what was really happening — that the Almighty was conferring upon them another major portion of their birthright inheritance!

Coincidence — Or Design?

The entire Panama experience was no mere coincidence. There is a reason why both the United States and Great Britain rose to such prominent positions of power in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. There is a reason why both English-speaking powers — often against their own political plans and designs — acquired strategic pieces of real estate around the world — Gibraltar, Suez, Aden, Singapore, Panama. As has often been said, the British acquired an empire in a "fit of absence of mind."

The newspaper *London Spectator* recognized the peculiar "Manifest Destiny" occurring to both the British and American peoples, when in its issue of December 10, 1898, it urged the United States to seize the opportunity afforded it in Panama:

"When one-half of the Anglo-Saxon race holds the waterway between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, what could be more appropriate than that the other half should hold that between the Atlantic and the Pacific? . . . It is not for us to delay but to hasten that auspicious hour."

Most important for us today, however, is to understand why many of these "sea gates" and other pieces of strategic real estate have slipped — and are slipping — from the grasp of Britain and the United States. There is a reason for this, too!

Write for our free book, *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy*. It gives the broad historic and prophetic sweep you need to understand the major news events of today's fast-paced world. □

² *Panama*, Bunau-Varilla, p. 428. For another thoroughly documented work on the history of the Panama Canal, see *Cadiz to Cathay*, by Captain Miles P. DuVal, Jr.

What Happens After DEATH?

*Is there a Hereafter? Or is death
the end of it all?*

by William R. Whikehart

I HAD JUST stepped out of a small plane when I saw two of my friends drive into the airport parking lot. I hadn't seen either for some time. So I walked over to greet them.

"Hi," one said as he got out of the car. "What's this I hear about you being in a plane wreck several weeks ago?"

"Oh yeah, it was exactly two weeks ago today," I explained. "Mr. Midkiff and I were taking off in his plane when the engine suddenly quit. We had no choice but to crash land in a rolling field at the end of the runway."

"Well, he replied, "at least neither one of you was seriously hurt. By the way, remember the plane I began learning how to fly in last year? We were wondering if you would check one of us out in it so we could do a little flying today. What do you say?"

"Well, uh . . ." I started thinking. That plane had been sitting on the ground for months. Any number of things could be wrong with it. It needed a thorough checking over.

I finally said, "I don't think you or anyone else should fly that plane until a mechanic checks it over thoroughly. It's not safe to fly." But they decided to go ahead anyway.

The next day, I received a phone

call at home. My two friends had flown that plane — and had crashed! One was dead. The other was in critical condition. I was really shaken up.

Death Is a Fact of Life

Chances are, you yourself have had a similar experience. You have known people who have died. Perhaps you have had a close brush with death yourself. Death is indeed a fact of life. It is around us everywhere — in newspaper headlines, on radio, and television.

Every day around this plague-ridden, war-wracked world, tens of thousands of people die. Some 50 to 60 million die each year from sickness, disease, accidents, old age — you name it.

The record of history is, in one sense, nothing but the obituary of mankind. Except perhaps for those in the last chapter, all the people you've read about in history books are now dead.

Death isn't a pleasant subject to discuss at the dinner table or with friends on the way to work. But it is a question that lingers, that nags in the back of people's minds.

We have all lost close friends, relatives, or a brother or sister. What happened to them at death? Will you ever see them again? More

important, did you ever seriously consider what will happen to YOU when you die?

Isn't it time you quit wondering? Isn't it time you found out what death is? The answers are available. Helping you find them is the purpose of this article.

A Puzzle Since the Dawn of History

Speculation about the hereafter has been rife throughout history. In most early cultures, the afterlife, it was believed, consisted of a series of rewards and punishments for conduct here on earth. The followers of an ancient Persian religion accepted the notion of a spiritual bridge to be crossed at death — broad for the righteous, but narrow for the wicked, who would fall into hell.

From ancient India came the idea that souls "transmigrated" upward or downward in successive reincarnations, depending on attitudes and conduct in the previous life. In ancient Egypt, there was a preoccupation with the idea of reuniting body and soul after death. To effectuate this, the body was carefully preserved by mummification, while the soul was thought to haunt a special chamber near the tomb.

Plato considered immortality an intricate part of man's nature. Au-

gustine also regarded men's souls as being essentially eternal.

But not everyone accepted the concept of man's intrinsic immortality. The Epicureans and Stoics believed that there was no hereafter. The Sadducees of Jesus' day likewise rejected the idea, taught by the Pharisees, that the dead would be resurrected from their graves at some future date.


However, after traditional Christianity became established in the Western world, the concept of a resurrection proliferated, as evidenced by the custom in ancient Sweden of burying a looking glass with an unmarried woman so that she could fix her hair on the day of the resurrection, or the ancient Irish practice of removing the nails from the coffin lid just before lowering it into the grave so that the dead would have no trouble getting out on the day of judgment.

Many of today's secular thinkers are generally skeptical of an afterlife. But the view currently held by most of the world's religions is that man is some kind of immortal soul in a material body, and that this soul will be punished or rewarded after the man dies.

And Now, Immortality Through Technology?

The prospect of living forever has intrigued man through the centuries. But only in recent years has man actually attempted by technological means to achieve immortality. This new technology is called the science of cryogenics.

Associations have been formed for people who believe that if their bodies are quick-frozen when they die, perhaps sometime in the future — 50 years, 100 years, 1,000 years, who knows? — science may eventually discover a cure for whatever it was that killed them. They would then be thawed out, revived, and administered the cure, and thus be granted renewed physical life (and eternal life if science could some-



Do You Believe in an Afterlife?

PLAIN TRUTH staff correspondents recently posed this question to a number of typical men and women on the street. The following cross section of their responses reflects the thinking of many people on the subject today.

Mike Hendrickson — Plain Truth



N. RULE: "I haven't given it that much thought, but I don't believe in re-incarnation or hell. But I do believe in heaven because I believe in a loving God."



A. HENRIKSEN: "Yes, there is — I believe that your soul goes to a spiritual reward in heaven."

how learn to control the aging process).

Currently, few have taken this notion of man-made immortality very seriously. But it does demonstrate the depth of man's desire to live forever.

The Ultimate Source of Understanding

Since death is such a commonplace occurrence and is so inevitable, you would think it's one topic science and philosophy would so thoroughly understand that no one would have a doubt about what it is.

But where is the great work of philosophy or literature which proves the existence of an afterlife — and what it is like? Where is the science text which details what happens to humans after they die?

Death is one subject about which human beings should be educated. Yet, it is the one area in which most of us seem to know little or nothing.

We could know. But our society has rejected the one source which could tell us. That source is the book upon which Christianity is supposedly based — the Bible.

Have you ever looked into this most neglected book to find out what it really says about death? It may not say what you think it does!

Conscious in Death?

For the first time in history, people who were pronounced dead have been medically revived. They have reported exactly what "death" is like. Said one South African heart transplant patient: "I was dead, absolutely lifeless for 70 minutes. I have visited the great beyond, and I can assure you that there is nothing there — emptiness, just zero."

According to God's Word, the dead are exactly that — dead! They have no consciousness or thought processes.

The Old Testament writer Job wrote: "So man lieth down [dies], and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep" (Job 14:12). They are figuratively asleep and will remain so, as long as the present scheme of things continues.

Now notice Ecclesiastes 3:19: "For that which befallerth the sons

of men befallerth beasts; even one thing befallerth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other. . . . so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast. . . ." As a dog dies, so dies a man. As a cow or ox dies, so die human beings. That's what your Bible says.

When a man dies, "that very day *his thoughts perish*" (Psalm 146:4), and "*the dead know not any thing*" (Ecclesiastes 9:5).


This may not be what you have been taught or heard. But these are the plain statements of Scripture.

Even David, a man after God's own heart (Acts 13:22), "is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day," said the apostle Peter (Acts 2:29). David has not gone to heaven (Acts 2:34). He is in his grave, unconscious, just like every other human being who has ever died, except Jesus Christ.

The scriptures are plain! Death means death — not life in some other form or place.

Dead — But Not Forever!

Yet the Bible also teaches that the dead will not remain in their graves




D. QUINT: "I believe my inner being will be transmitted to different planes of existence as I approach perfection."



MRS. C. ESPANA: "Of course there's an afterlife. It's in heaven — otherwise what's the sense in living."



D. ZIMMER: "I believe in a spiritual afterlife, that you have a soul and that the soul goes to a hereafter. But as to where the hereafter is, I'm not sure . . ."



B. SHEPHERD: "I don't think there is any 'life after death' because you don't really die — your body dies, but your soul lives on."

forever. Rather, the Word of God talks of a raising back to life, a re-creation, a resurrecting of human beings.

Large sections, even whole chapters of books such as Ezekiel, picture a resurrection from the dead, not only of individuals, but also of entire nations.

Jesus Christ, the central figure of the Bible, said: "I am the resurrection, and the life" (John 11:25). He spoke of a resurrection of the just and the unjust.

Indeed, the resurrection of the dead was the focal point of the message of the New Testament church. The hope of the Christian and his basis for belief in Jesus Christ revolves around the fact of the resurrection from the dead. I Corinthians 15:17 describes the Christian faith: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." Actually, the entirety of Christian belief stands or falls on the truth of the resurrection.

The apostle Paul firmly believed in a resurrection from the dead. Once he found himself caught in the middle of an absolutely tumultuous

controversy between the religious organizations of that day because of his belief in the resurrection (Acts 23:6-10). In other historical accounts of the Bible are examples of the resurrection of human beings to physical life. The most famous occurred when Jesus resurrected Lazarus in the sight of many Jews. The entire plan of God is, in fact, centered around the fact that every man, woman, and child who has ever lived will ultimately be raised from the dead.

The First Resurrection

The Bible speaks not only of a resurrection, but also of resurrections. Notice Revelation 20:5, last part: "... This is the *first* resurrection."

The Bible reveals that the "first resurrection" is to occur at Christ's second coming. Note Paul's description of the event: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first" (I Thessalonians 4:16). Paul said to the Corinthians: "We shall

not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible [immortal] . . ." (I Corinthians 15:51-52).

But what about those who died, never having an opportunity to be converted — those millions who never had a chance to learn and know God's truth? What about the hundreds of millions alive today in Asia and Africa and on other continents who have never even heard the name of Christ — the only name whereby men can be saved (Acts 4:12) — much less done what he says?

Will these multitudes fry, sizzle and blister in an ever-burning hell, writhing and screaming in a seething, burning pool of lava, leaping from one hot brick to another, shrieking out their agony for all eternity, just because they were guilty of being born into the wrong place or time?

Is there such an everlasting hell? (If you want the answer, write for our free article *Is There a Real Hell*

Fire? It will really surprise you.)

The Second Resurrection

Christ faced the question about what will happen to the multitudes who have lived and died in spiritual ignorance. And he answered it! He spoke of a resurrection to life — the first resurrection — *and* of a resurrection to “judgment” (John 5:29). (This verse is incorrectly rendered in the King James Version. The word “damnation” in the KJV is properly translated “judgment” in modern versions.) The resurrection to judgment, of which Jesus spoke, is a second resurrection. It occurs a thousand years after the first resurrection. That is why we read in Revelation 20:5: “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished” This part of verse five should have been translated as a parenthetical thought. It should have been placed within parentheses because the preceding verses and the last half of verse 5 are about the first resurrection.

The apostle John, writing about what he saw in this second resurrection — the resurrection to judgment — says, “And I saw a great white throne And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God” (verses 11-12).

Here, the rest of the dead — those billions who never had a previous opportunity for salvation — are pictured as having come back to physical life in a second resurrection.

Try to picture this colossal event in your mind: multiple millions, even billions of people, a veritable sea of human beings who never had the opportunity to understand God and his Word before; the men and women, small and great, of ancient Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome; peasants and nobility of the Middle Ages; the millions who have been taught atheism in China, the Soviet Union, and elsewhere; those who have died from sickness or were killed in warfare through the cen-

turies; *your* friends and relatives who have died — all suddenly brought back to life in a resurrection to “judgment”!

But how will they be judged?

Notice again in Revelation 20, verse 12: “. . . and the books were opened” What books? The Greek word for “books” in this case is *biblia*, which is the root word for “Bible.” “The books” here mean the books of the Bible, by which we are all to be judged!

Continuing: “. . . and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” Their names are in the book of life — picturing salvation being made available to them. They will be able to compare the results of Christ’s 1,000-year reign on the earth (verse 5) with the world of sin they previously lived in. The overwhelming majority will certainly choose life and begin to live God’s way of joy and abundance. (If you want your eyes opened to this truth you probably never understood before, write for our free article, “Is This the Only Day of Salvation?”)

During this period of judgment, the “book of life” is still open. Here are people who have their names put into the book of life — who can qualify for eternal life. This period of judgment will not be a sentencing for deeds done solely in past ignorance. These billions will, instead, be given the wonderful opportunity to hear, accept, and live a life free from the burdens of a sinful society such as we now have.

“But,” you may ask, “what about the wicked — those who refuse to obey God, those who have already had their chance to do God’s will, but have spurned his mercy? What will happen to them?”

The Third Resurrection

The Bible reveals that they, too, will be resurrected — in yet a third resurrection. Turn to Revelation

20:13-14: “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell [*hades* in Greek, meaning “grave”] delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.”

Notice that there is no book of life here. Their names have already been blotted out! What a tragic fate — and all could have avoided it!

They will be cast into what is called the “lake of fire.” They will be burned up. They will suffer the “second death” — the death from which there will be no resurrection. The lake of fire will be the absolute end of the wicked. They will have no more life, no more existence — forever!

God doesn’t look forward to imposing such a fate on anyone. He is “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance” (II Peter 3:9). But for the rebellious, God has no other choice. Disobedience produces unhappiness, and God will not allow humans to be unhappy for all eternity. He will, therefore, mercifully destroy the wicked.

But for the righteous, undoubtedly the great majority of human beings, God offers “pleasures for evermore” (Psalm 16:11). “He will wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be *no more death*, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain. All of that has gone forever” (Revelation 21:4, *The Living Bible*).

God reveals there is a life after death — a beautiful, joyous, abundant life in splendor and glory for all eternity — but only for those who obey him!

Will that include you? □

If you would like to know more about what happens after a person dies — whether Christian or non-Christian — write for our free booklet *After Death . . . Then What?*

what you can do...

TIMELY Tips and Helpful Suggestions for YOU and YOUR FAMILY

● **WARNING: X-rays Are a Health Risk!**

X-rays and X-ray equipment have expanded knowledge in both medicine and industry. But what many people have failed to realize is that along with the benefits are risks.

Every X-ray, no matter how small, may be genetically harmful to some degree. The effects are cumulative. They do not wear off. Known X-ray health risks include leukemia, cancer of the central nervous system, bone tumors, thyroid cancer, lung carcinoma, eye cataracts, sterility, and damage to unborn children (mongoloidism, cancers, and physical and mental deformities).

This is what you should do to minimize the harmful effects of X-rays: Don't take X-rays lightly! Don't insist on an X-ray when a competent professional doesn't feel one is necessary. Keep track of the dates and kinds of X-rays you and your family have had in the past. Physicians or dentists may be able to consult these rather than make new ones. Don't have a full set of dental X-rays of your mouth made once a year. This is unnecessary and risky. If an X-ray is required, have it done by a radiologist if possible. Radiologists are specially trained in the use of X-ray equipment and radiation protection. They are more aware of X-ray health risks.

● **If the Accelerator Sticks . . .**

Put yourself in this position: While driving down the road in heavy traffic, the accelerator sticks! What do you do?

Whatever you do — don't panic! One young woman in just such a situation did. In her panic, she put the car in reverse. The car spun wildly out of control and slammed into a nearby house. Happily, the house was empty. Fortunately too, the young woman was not critically injured.

If it happens to you, stay calm. Begin braking, but don't slam on the brakes. At the same time, if your car has an automatic transmission, put it in neutral. If the

car has a standard transmission, depress the clutch. Safely brake to a stop — to the side of the road, if possible, and then shut off the ignition. Some people advise shutting off the ignition before switching to neutral or depressing the clutch to prevent the car's engine from over-revving, but this could be dangerous in a car with power steering and/or power brakes.

Most likely, the accelerator linkage needs lubrication, but whatever the cause for the sticking, be sure the accelerator assembly is immediately examined. Have the accelerator assembly oiled the next time your car is being greased, to prevent the problem of an accelerator sticking in the first place.


● **Food Supplements Can Be Potential Dangers**

Michael and Stephen, 15-month-old twins, got hold of their babysitter's bottle of iron tablets. Before the babysitter realized what was happening, the youngsters had gulped down a number of the pills. Although the twins were rushed to the hospital within 30 minutes, little Michael died. Stephen only barely survived. The cause of death on Michael's death certificate was labeled Ferric Toxemia due to an overdose of iron tablets. Michael's autopsy revealed that every vital organ in his body had been damaged.

Though iron tablets and iron-fortified vitamins can be especially dangerous, fat soluble vitamins can also be toxic by themselves if overdoses are taken. "Concentrated preparations of any of the fat-soluble vitamins should be used with caution and only under direction of a physician," warn Drs. Bogert, Briggs, and Calloway in their book, *Nutrition and Physical Fitness*, p. 311.

Vitamin and mineral supplements ought to be kept out of reach of children. For more vital information about health and nutrition, write for our free articles, "Why Aren't Your Children More Healthy?" and *The Seven Laws of Radiant Health*. See the inside front cover for the address of *The PLAIN TRUTH* office nearest you.

— Patrick A. Parnell



You Call *That*

Why do musical tastes differ so widely? And why, with today's variety in music, do so many enjoy only one kind? Read what music is to others. Then take another look at what it is to you.

by Eugene M. Walter

AS OUR plane left Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia for Hong Kong, my eye fell on the in-flight music console. I plugged in the earphones and was pleasantly surprised to hear the familiar sounds of American popular music. The program listed Peggy Lee, Percy Faith with his orchestra and chorus, the Lettermen, and a dozen or more other popular selections. After traveling in Asia for nearly a month without hearing any European or American music, it was like meeting old friends.

Delighted, I turned the channel selector and... another surprise! There was the Beethoven *Lenore* Overture being played by the Berlin Philharmonic.

Again I turned the dial; this time the sounds were excitingly strange and different. For this channel, the printed program listed Chinese popular music known as "Mandarin Popular." Though this music was alien to my ears, the well-dressed Chinese gentleman across the aisle was obviously feeling right at home with his listening, thoroughly enjoying every minute of it.

Another switch of the channel brought the exotic sounds of Japan. Beside me, a Japanese businessman was listening to the music on this channel while he worked on some business papers.

Looking around, my attention was drawn to a young Oriental leaning back in his seat, eyes closed, with a rapturous look on his face, tapping his foot and fingers. To what was he listening? The Malaysian music known as "Malay Kronchong" on channel five? I was unable to contain my curiosity and got up to peek at his channel number. No, he was listening to channel eight — featuring modern American jazz by Stan Kenton, Wes Montgomery, Clark Terry and other jazzmen!

As I settled back into my seat, I began to muse about what music is, what it means to different people and why. I began to think about the ways we all, at times, limit our own enjoyment of one of man's greatest sources of pleasure — good music.

What Music Is to Different People

Most everyone enjoys some kind of music. But by no means do we all enjoy the same kind. Music is many things to many people.

The most widespread system of music in the world today is that of Western culture. It is divided not only into the broad categories of "classical" and "popular," but also into many types and subtypes.

There are the many varieties of rock and popular music. There is

Music?

what is now called "currently popular teen-age music." There is jazz, film and theater music, country-western, folk and soul. There are classical symphonies, sonatas, operas, oratorios and an array of other forms of traditional, secular and sacred music. There is electronic music, serial music and music of the avant-garde of whatever description. And new forms and styles, often created by freely borrowing from and integrating other forms of music, appear so rapidly that it is hard to keep up with them all. But now look at the variety of music outside the Western system.

To the Australian aboriginal, music may be a tribal chant about the latest hunt, accompanied by a two-note drone on a hollow eucalyptus branch.

In Indonesia, music may mean the sound of the venerated, traditional gong-chime orchestra, the *gamelon*. It comprises metal and wooden chimes, each playing different variations of the same melody pattern simultaneously, and is punctuated rhythmically by gongs and drums.

Classical music in India may mean a three-piece ensemble featuring a plucked, stringed instrument called the *sitar*, which elaborates the melody, a pair of small drums called the *tabla*, which gives rhythmic organization, and a drone instrument which supplies a continuing point of reference.

To some African tribes, music consists of various drums playing an intricate rhythmic web.

Opera among the Chinese includes elaborate costumes, painted faces, stylized movements and often

legendary or patriotic themes. There are some 300 different varieties, such as the highly developed Peking variety, with its well-known use of the high, nasal, falsetto voice.

These brief examples give an idea of the tremendously wide variety of music that exists in the world today. But great though the variety of music is in a broad cultural sense, it is even greater in a personal and individual sense.

Your Unique Response to Music

No two people are exactly alike. And in few areas is this more apparent than in the way we perceive and respond to music. Even those with similar backgrounds and experiences will sometimes have remarkably differing musical tastes.

Music that is a rapturous delight to one person may be boring to the next. In fact, it is not at all uncommon for one person to enjoy a particular kind of music that others would not even call music! And somewhere on earth there is probably someone doing something which only he would label as music.

Your response to music is as individual as your fingerprints. Nobody else could duplicate it exactly, even if they tried. This response is both a matter of your heredity and your environment.

Some people seem to be virtually "turned on" to music at birth. Others may become sensitive and cultured individuals with respect to literature, paintings, etc., yet somehow lack excitement for music. They don't necessarily dislike it; it just doesn't do that much for them.

But while we all grow up with different musical talents, in another

way, we were all born exactly the same. At birth, each of us knew absolutely nothing. Everything you know today, you acquired since you were born — including your attitude toward music and your musical tastes.

Many of our attitudes were largely formed before we were old enough to become conscious of them. One of the most important keys to our response to music later in life involves whether our early childhood experiences with music have been pleasant or unpleasant.

Many a well-meaning parent has caused a child to dislike music by making childhood music lessons an unpleasant experience. And many an unqualified music teacher, lacking perception and understanding, has caused young students to learn to hate music so deeply that it becomes extremely difficult to change their attitudes toward it later in life. On the other hand, many children have learned to love music because of pleasant childhood experiences.

As an illustration, take the recently published account of two sixth grade classes in the same school. It was found that in one class, 86 percent of the students said they disliked music; in the other class, all the students said they liked music. Both classes consisted of the same cross-section of students from the same neighborhood. The only variable was the teacher.

Youngsters are very quick to pick up the example of their parents, their teachers and the society around them. In many primitive societies, music is such a part and parcel of everyday life that everyone just naturally enjoys it. Yet in our

advanced Western culture, various elements of society often seem to do everything they can to cause students to dislike certain types of music, and then attempts are made to help young people with special educational courses that sometimes only compound the existing problem.

Our environment, with its many facets, is a most important factor in the way we each respond to music. Further, these individual responses will vary, depending on how we feel physically on a particular day, our mental outlook or mood, the occasion, how the music was performed and dozens of other factors. A piece that is enjoyed in one setting may be totally unenjoyable in another. And a piece we dislike today may be one of our favorites five years from now.

Each of us, in our own unique



Dan J. McCoy

way, responds personally and individually to music. But we do respond! For music affects us far more than we generally realize.

The Power of Music

One of the most universal characteristics of music is its ability to create the atmosphere of something

special. It does this by the sheer virtue of its presence.

That is why it enhances everything from movies to military marches and from protest songs to religious worship.

The presence of music tends to make people sit up and take notice. People will not all react to a given selection to the same degree, and they may even react in opposite directions. But the mere presence of music creates an out-of-the-ordinary situation — and sometimes, a very special and extraordinary situation.

Psychologist Abraham Maslow researched what he called the “peak experiences” in human lives. Of hundreds of cases studied, there were many different experiences which people singled out as their life’s highlight. “Peak experiences” involving music ranked second in the list — surpassed only by sex.

This should not be all that surprising, for “music is made of a stuff which is in and of itself the most powerful stimulant known among the perceptual processes. . . . Music operates on our emotional faculty with greater intensiveness and rapidity than the product of any other act” (Max Schoen, *The Psychology of Music*, p. 39).

Music can temporarily change the pulse rate and blood pressure. It can increase the secretions of the adrenals and other energy-producing and pain-fighting glands. It can affect the outpouring of gastric juice, thereby having a bearing on digestion. It can reduce or delay muscular fatigue and also increase muscular strength.

In *The Doctor Prescribes Music*, Podolsky explains why. Because the roots of the auditory nerves — the nerves of the ear — are “more widely distributed and have more extensive connections than those of any other nerves in the body. . . there is scarcely a function of the human body which may not be affected by musical tones” (p. 18).

Music is powerful! And its power

can be for evil as well as for good. Music can inspire or depress, uplift or degrade, ennoble or debase.

But the many diverse kinds of music around the world have more in common than just their ability to create moods or a special atmosphere. They also have in common certain basic building blocks.

The Building Blocks of Music

Music can be briefly defined as organized sound. Some, however, will object and say that both organization and sound are not common to all music.

For example, modern chance or aleatory music boasts of its lack of formal organization. In fact, in some circles, music is now defined as “whatever the listener will tolerate”! And at least one composer has written a piece called “Silence” in which no sounds are made. But such far-out exceptions need not concern us here.

Since music is organized sound, to what degree must sounds be organized in order to qualify as music? Is clicking one’s heels in rhythmic patterns while walking down the sidewalk music? And what about those cultures which do not make a rigid distinction between speech and song? Though interesting, such questions are obviously academic! It is sufficient to say that music is organized sound. But organized in what manner?

One way is its overall structure or form. Music must start somewhere and end somewhere. Once it begins, it will establish a tendency to progress in a certain way. Music is never completely static, but is always moving forward. As it moves, it will begin to create shape and form. It will have patterns or formulas or other special signals that will be recognized by all those who understand the particular kind of music being performed. This structural framework can have the simplicity of a pup tent or the complexity of a gigantic skyscraper.

Other basic building blocks of music are rhythm, melody, tone color (the characteristic sound of a particular instrument or voice) and harmony. All of these components are usually present to some degree in Western music. In fact, it is the varying manner and degree in which these basic building blocks are used — coupled with other factors such as variations in loudness and tempo, choice of mode or scale, how the separate strands of sound are woven together into a musical fabric, degree of freedom allowed in interpretation or improvisation, and choice of words (if any) — that largely account for the differences between the various kinds of music.

How these basic building blocks are used within a particular kind of music determines the specific style of a given composer or school of composition. An outstanding feature of rock, for example, is the unprecedented emphasis it gives to the rhythmic beat. This overemphasis of the rhythmic element and consequent reduction of emphasis on other musical elements can have a devastating, hypnotic effect on listeners. Excessive loudness of some rock has even damaged ears permanently. Any music which leaves the listener with less control over his mental or physical powers is damaging. Good music heightens the positive emotions and uplifts the spirit. It does not dull the senses or degrade the emotions.

Eastern, African or other non-Western types of music, too, emphasize the basic building blocks of music in various ways. In these types of music, it is quite common for certain building blocks not to be used at all, except perhaps incidentally. The music of some African cultures, for example, consists primarily of highly complex rhythmic patterns without any real attention given to melody, harmony or tone color.

By way of contrast, the traditional classical music of the Western world has placed great emphasis on har-



mony (indeed, over-emphasis at times) and tone color — both of which are concerned with bigness, fullness and richness of sound. Its rhythms, however, have remained simple by comparison, its melodies are not greatly embellished and ornamented and improvisation is rare.

And look at the classical music of India, with its long and proud tradition. This music has great rhythmic and melodic complexity and sophistication, and uses challenging techniques of improvisation. Yet it is not concerned with tone quality and harmony in the Western sense.

A number of Oriental cultures have music in which several different instruments simultaneously play variations in pitch, time and ornamentations of the same basic melody. To Western ears, this sounds like cacophony, since the Western ideal is to make all instruments in an ensemble sound in unified and harmonious blend. The ideal for these Oriental cultures, however, is to hear and enjoy the individual identity and separateness of the sound of each instrument. This separateness is not only appreciated, but is also actually required, and in some genres, it is prescribed in great detail.

In some Asian music, great value is placed on long-held, single tones which are ornamented by subtle variations in pitch, vibrato and tone color, according to strict traditional rules. To Western ears, this static quality is not immediately appealing.

But it is important to remember that this matter of unfamiliarity with new combinations of sound works both ways. A recent article I read told of a United Nations diplomat from Asia who decided that he needed to become familiar with Western music. So he went to a concert in New York. Afterward, his American friend asked how he enjoyed it. He replied that he didn't enjoy the last four numbers very much, but that he rather liked the first one and would enjoy hearing it



ELDERLY MUSICIAN dressed in overalls strums guitar in southeastern United States (far left). Boy of Abouri tribe learns to play tom toms in Yaou village, Ivory Coast (top). Indian musician with a sitar (center). Hunza musician in the foothills of the Himalayas in northern India plays the bagpipes.

Top, Bernheim — Woodfin Camp & Associates
Center, John Laundis — Black Star
Bottom, Bonington — Woodfin Camp & Associates

again. His American friend was puzzled, as there were only four numbers on the program. Further inquiry revealed that the "number" that the diplomat had enjoyed was the warming up of the orchestra just before the program began! The sounds of the instruments tuning up were apparently closer to the music the diplomat was used to hearing than anything else on the program.

Music is truly many things to many people! But what is music to you? Have you thought about that?

Enlarging Your Musical Outlook

A wider variety of music is available today than ever before, and a growing number of people are learning to enjoy greater variety in their musical diet. Many are beginning to realize that they like the music they do primarily because this is the music to which they have been most exposed. Further, this exposure was probably not of their planning or choosing, but came about rather haphazardly. They are discovering that enlarging their musical tastes isn't all that difficult. In fact, it can be fun! All it takes is a little curiosity and effort.

But despite this progress, it is nevertheless a fact that most people still are inclined to consistently listen to and enjoy only one kind of music. This is unfortunate for several reasons.

First, such a person often tends to be less tolerant than he should be of others and the music they enjoy. He will have difficulty placing himself in the other person's shoes. It is as if he expects everyone else in the world to have his musical tastes — limited though they may be. Now what would he think if the other person, whose music he dislikes, expected the same of him? Well, speaking of thinking, that's just the problem. Most people don't think when it comes to music; they just react emotionally.

Second, people who like only one

kind of music are depriving themselves of the greater interest and enjoyment that exposure to a wider variety of music would bring. They are in a musical rut and may not even know it. It is somewhat like shopping at a gigantic supermarket or department store and never investigating the many available choices, but always choosing exactly the same few items. You can be rather sure this limiting approach carries over to other areas of their life.

There is appropriate music for every occasion: formal music for formal occasions, semiformal music for semiformal occasions, and informal music for informal occasions. Those who enjoy only the more formal types of music are missing the special pleasures of the more informal types. And vice versa.

Each of these major categories contains much good music. But there are also mountains of slag and low-quality musical ore that must be sifted through to find the nuggets of quality. The person who is stuck with one kind of music is handicapped in trying to search out quality because he lacks a basis for comparison. He will tend to think that the music he likes has quality, while the music he is not familiar with lacks quality. This, however, may not be the case. Yet until such a person has contact with other music, he will never know.

A third difficulty encountered by those who rigidly stick to one kind of music is that they will not be as quality conscious as they should be.

But just what is quality in music? That, of course, is a big question. A future PLAIN TRUTH article will give guidelines for evaluating quality in music by pointing out the strong and weak points of the various kinds of music. This will help you learn how to separate the wheat from the chaff. There is, however, one broad and most important principle which anyone can begin to apply immediately.

All you have to do to begin to determine whether or not a particular kind of music has right quality is to honestly and sincerely ask yourself: *Is this music truly helping me become a better person?* If it is, all other questions about its quality are quite secondary. If it isn't, you ought to take stock and decide to make some changes.

So the next time you listen to music you enjoy, stop and ask yourself, "Is this music helping me become a more sensitive, refined and enlightened individual? Or is it helping to keep me in a mental and emotional rut that robs me of personal growth and development?"

And the next time you hear music that you have already decided is not for you, hold on just long enough to ask yourself, "Why don't I like this music? Do I know? Do I have a valid reason — or is it that I don't understand it? Would appreciation of this kind of music round out my life and help me become a better-balanced individual? Or would it merely foster attitudes and a way of life that would pull me down?"

Do the same thing the next time you hear music that is entirely strange or unfamiliar to you. Don't frantically plug your ears and run. Listen attentively and then ask yourself these same basic questions.

This question-asking approach will help anyone begin to be — or continue to be — quality conscious. As for getting started with broadening your tastes, deliberately try to select a type of music you do not normally listen to the next time you turn on the radio or buy a record or cassette. If you do, you will probably hear your regular kind of music in a little different way when you return to it.

Don't be afraid to figuratively "stretch your ears" — and your outlook. Learn to enjoy a variety of music. But always make sure you do so with a continuing quest for character and quality. □

What's all this business about TITHING?

Is tithing only an ancient financial custom irrelevant to the modern world? Or is it a practical financial law that pays off today?

by William F. Dankenbring

MOST PEOPLE today have never heard of "tithing." Few churches practice it. In our "now generation," the subject of tithing seems remote — like a ghostly specter out of the old religious woodwork of theological orthodoxy.

And no wonder. The word "tithe" itself is an old English word. It simply means "tenth." A tithe is a tenth of one's income.

But does tithing have anything to do with one's income today? Should we be concerned about it?

What You Can't Ignore

We all face the reality of financial worries, whether we be rich or poor. It is time we asked whether there has been a missing dimension in the handling of our financial affairs. Is there something really practical about tithing which applies to everybody today — regardless of background, beliefs, or status in life? Let's understand.

A Historic Custom

Many ancients realized there was something important about tithing. It was a custom practiced by many ancient nations. Assyrians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, and Greeks all practiced a form of tithing. That is, the rulers and religious leaders of those nations required, or themselves paid, a tenth of their produce or spoils of war to their particular "god."

However, the earliest record of tithing is found in the pages of the Bible. About four thousand years ago, an ancient patriarch discovered that his nephew had been captured by an invading army. This patriarch gathered his men, armed them, and pursued the invaders, overtaking and defeating them. He rescued his nephew as well as several other persons. In addition, all the goods stolen by the Assyrians were recovered.

Then, thankful to Almighty God for granting him success, he gave to

the priest of the most high God "tithes of all" (Genesis 14:18-20). This patriarch was Abraham, and his nephew was Lot. Abraham was the grandfather of Jacob, who was the father of twelve sons who became the ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel mentioned throughout the Bible.

Abraham was an exceedingly prosperous man, mightily blessed of God. One of the reasons why he became so wealthy and prosperous was the fact that he knew God, obeyed him, and kept his commandments (Genesis 26:5). And Abraham tithed — that is, he returned to God one tenth of all the produce and income that God provided for him.

Many years later, Abraham's grandson, Jacob, also determined to obey God's laws and serve him. Jacob told God: "... of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee" (Genesis 28:22). And Jacob, the book of Genesis relates, also became a prosperous

man, blessed by the God of heaven and earth!

The Principle of Tithing

Jacob and his family later migrated to Egypt to find food for their numerous flocks and herds during a time of prolonged drought. In Egypt, they multiplied into a large nation within a few generations. But they had, meanwhile, become slaves to the Egyptians. According to the biblical narrative, God called a man named Moses to lead his people out of Egypt.

After punishing the Egyptians with frightening plagues, God convinced Pharaoh to let the Israelites leave Egypt. After the Israelites came to the wilderness of the Sinai peninsula, God began teaching them more about his laws and ways. One of those laws was the principle of tithing.

God promised to bless them greatly if they obeyed him, and he reminded them: "And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's: *it is holy unto the Lord.*" Then God added: "And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord" (Leviticus 27:30, 32).

The tithing principle, God told ancient Israel, was one of his laws (verse 34). If they expected to be financially prospered and blessed, they were required to obey this financial commandment, a divinely instituted law of God.

Tithing was not an ancient custom that evolved among the nations of old. It was originally a God-ordained principle which has been obeyed by the servants of God down through history.

What relevance does this fact have for you? We shall see!

An Ancient Revival

During the centuries that the twelve tribes of Israel remained in the Middle East, the principle of tithing began to be neglected and

ignored, along with other laws of God. Israel fell into idolatry, Baal worship, and forsook the commandments of God. As a result, the northern ten tribes of Israel were carried away into captivity by Assyrian invaders (II Kings 17).

Despite what had happened to Israel, the northern kingdom, the people of Judah were also tempted to sink into the depravity of the pagan nations around them and to worship Baal. As the situation deteriorated, a king who had good judgment and was righteous in God's sight came to the throne. He attempted to stem the tide and turn the people back to their God. His name was Hezekiah.

During the reign of Hezekiah, a vast reform was instituted. Pagan idols and carved images of alien gods were broken in pieces (II Chronicles 31:1).

Interestingly, one principle Hezekiah reinstated was tithing. "And as soon as the commandment came abroad, the children of Israel brought in abundance the firstfruits of corn, wine, and oil, and honey, and of all the increase of the field; and *the tithe of all things brought they in abundantly.* And concerning the children of Israel and Judah, that dwelt in the cities of Judah, they also brought in the tithe of oxen and sheep, and the tithe of holy things which were consecrated unto the Lord their God, and laid them by heaps" (verses 5-6).

As long as the people of Judah obeyed God's laws and paid their tithes to him, they were blessed; but when they forsook God's laws and neglected to tithe faithfully, they were punished — adversity and calamity came upon them!

But you may wonder, what does all this have to do with those of us living in the 20th century?

Tithing Abolished?

Is tithing relevant to our modern generation? There is controversy among theologians as to whether tithing is valid or applicable today.

Some argue that Jesus abolished the need of the ritualistic law of Moses and the tithing law as well. Yet Christ's abolition of the need of the rituals, which were added to the law in the time of Moses, could in no way abolish a principle or law which preceded Moses' time by hundreds of years!

Let's understand this point.

Notice the words of Jesus himself about what he came to do and not to do: "Think not," he told his disciples, "that I am come to destroy the law [the law which preceded the rituals of Moses' time] or the prophets: I am *not* come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matthew 5:17).

Jesus himself said he came not to destroy — that is, to annul or rescind — the law, but to *fulfill* it — that is, to fill to the full, as you would fill up a bottle with water. In other words, Jesus came to *keep the law*, setting us an example that we should follow in his steps (I Peter 2:21).

Did Jesus also intend the tithing law to remain in effect? Yes! Notice the warning to the Pharisees of his time, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 5:18-19).

Many would probably look upon the tithing law as the "least" of God's commandments. But Jesus knew the hearts of men; and he gave clear warnings about those who would discount any of the commandments of God!

So that no one would be mistaken on that point, Jesus Christ specifically mentioned tithing as a principle which people ought to perform faithfully.

Jesus was well aware of the hypocrisy of the establishment. He told his hearers, "Woe unto you,

scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: These ought ye to have done, *and not to leave the other undone*" (Matthew 23:23).

Jesus did not condemn them for paying tithes. He approved of their doing so. But they should not have neglected judgment, mercy and faith!

Some might argue that Jesus was only talking to the Jews of his day. They might deny that his words apply to all Christians or to all people living in our time.

Is there direct biblical evidence that tithing is still a valid financial law governing all the world?

The Tithing Question

The apostle Paul, who was sent by Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, faced the tithing question squarely. He carried the good news of God's coming Kingdom throughout the Mediterranean world. He traveled to Cyprus, Asia Minor (modern day Turkey), Greece, Italy, Spain, and other lands.

Somehow, Paul's journeys had to be financed. A great deal of money was needed to carry out the commission Jesus Christ gave his church.

Paul knew he had authority to collect tithes from the converts in the areas where he preached. He told the Christians at Corinth, a depraved city of ancient Greece, "Who serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard without eating any of its fruit? Who tends a flock without getting some of the milk?"

He continued: "If we have sown spiritual good among you, is it too much if we reap your material benefits? . . . Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service get their food from the temple, and those who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings? *In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel*

should get their living by the gospel" (I Corinthians 9:7, 11-14, RSV).

Paul plainly compared the ministers of Christ with the priests and Levites of the Old Testament who received tithes and served in the affairs of the temple.

Just as the priests and Levites were paid for their services from the tithes and offerings of ancient Israel, the New Testament ministry of Jesus Christ is to receive tithes of the people to carry on the work of the ministry.

This truth is made plain in the New Testament book of Hebrews. In chapter 7, Paul briefly discussed the history of the tithing principle. He explained how Abraham tithed to Melchizedek, priest of the most high God (verses 1-6), and that Levi, the father of the Levites of the Old Testament, figuratively "payed tithes in Abraham" to Melchizedek (verses 9-10).

However, Christ came, replacing the Levitical priesthood and reinstating the Melchizedek priesthood (verses 11, 15-17, 21-28). Paul continued, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law [that is, a change in the tithing law]" (Hebrews 7:12). Paul explains it to mean that since Christ has come, the Levitical priesthood is no longer the instrument through which God does his work. The Levites were not chosen to publish and preach the good news of the kingdom of God. Hence they were no longer to receive the tithes of God's people. Rather, Christ and his New Testament ministers should receive the tithe so that the work of the living God may be accomplished! Thus the tithing law has never been abolished! It is still in effect today. The financial principle of tithing, like all of God's righteous law, is "holy, just, and good" (Romans 7:12). It is a spiritual principle regulating man's financial relationship with the Creator God (Romans 7:14). And that which is spiritual is eternal (II Corinthians 4:18).

Tithing, then, is a New Testament command!

The Purpose of Tithing

But what is the purpose for this financial law of God? What does it accomplish?

Tithing is not merely a "little" commandment of God, a trivial matter of no significance. It is, rather, an important test commandment!

Jesus said, "For where your treasure [and that includes your money or pocketbook] is, there will your heart be also" (Matthew 6:21). If a person's heart is truly wrapped up in the things of God and sincerely desires God's work to be accomplished above all else in life, then he will have a financial part in God's work. Tithing is a test of whether or not a man's or woman's heart is really in the work of the living God.

Tithing is also a test of faith. It requires a certain amount of faith in order to obey this financial law, even when to all outward appearances, one's income seemingly won't stretch far enough to cover all expenses and debts. Under such circumstances, tithing becomes a real test of an individual's faith and willingness to obey God, despite outward conditions.

But for those who pass that test, tithing is a wonderful, spiritual opportunity and a key to receiving bountiful blessings from God!

God says to all peoples, Christian and non-Christian alike, "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? *In tithes and offerings*. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation" (Malachi 3:8-9).

Because God's people (including all those today who descend from the ancient nation called the House of Israel, the ten so-called "lost" tribes) have failed to pay him his tenth of their income, they are under a curse. Notice that this message of Malachi applies directly to the

modern world — a world living in the time of the end, the “day of his [Christ’s] coming” (Malachi 3:2).

God continues: “Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and *prove me now herewith* [that is, prove me in regard to this matter of tithing], if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there *shall not be room enough to receive it*” (Malachi 3:10).

Here is God’s test — his challenge to you. God says to prove him. Put his promise to the test and see if he won’t bless you in unexpected ways and pour out blessings on you for

your faithfulness. Some of God’s blessings will be tangible, easily discernible; others will be intangible, spiritual, but just as real.

Do you have the courage to obey God? Do you have the strength of character to take him at his word, to accept his challenge, and put him to the test? Can you believe God?

“And I will rebuke the devourer [agricultural pests, such as locust plagues, etc.] for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground,” says God. Continuing, “neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field . . . and all nations shall call you

blessed: for ye shall be a delightful land, saith the Lord of hosts” (Malachi 3:11-12).

Tithing is a spiritual, financial law that produces dividends, that provides unexpected benefits when you may be thrown out of work. It is guaranteed by the direct promise of the Almighty.

Tithing pays — physically and spiritually. Millions suffer needless financial worries and other problems because they are in ignorance of this spiritual law of God.

God is waiting to fulfill his promises in your life. Will you let him? □

Personal from



(Continued from page 1)

completed, in great confusion, there were many doubts about it being the end of the war. Even weeks before the cease-fire agreement, I continued saying, week after week, the Communists will never stop pushing on. If it is not by open, organized *shooting* war, then it will be by infiltration, propaganda, sabotage, or guerrilla warfare. Prime Minister Lee of Singapore called it an *intermission*. Actually, I’ve said the armistice ending World War I was merely a recess — and that’s precisely what the word “armistice” means. In 1939, Adolf Hitler decided the recess was over — and we had World War II. Now we are in another recess before the final nuclear World War III. Oh, it won’t be the end of the EARTH’S existence — or of human life upon it — but it assuredly *could* — *unless* there exists that all-powerful *unseen* hand from SOMEPLACE, to stop it. There will be a peaceful and happy WORLD TOMORROW, but meanwhile, we’re having our wars in Vietnam, Korea,

the Middle East, and religious war in Northern Ireland, besides some 40 other wars and skirmishes since the end of World War II. VIOLENCE is everywhere. Do you expect me to tell you we’re going to have beautiful PEACE in Vietnam, in such a world? I only wish I could!

Let me give you a quick summary of the condition in Vietnam *as of* cease-fire day. The agreement between Washington and Hanoi did NOT require the Communist North Vietnamese to withdraw their troops that were already in South Vietnam. There has been a question as to whether the South Vietnamese government of President Thieu could survive politically in an election since so many of those Communists are in the villages of South Vietnam and can control village votes.

What Now Lies Ahead?

Here’s what I find over here in the Far East:

The heads of governments in this part of the world — from Tokyo to Canberra in Australia — are all looking at the uncertain political future of the post-war Far East — and I only HOPE it is “post-war.” There has been scurrying to form new plans — new alliances — during this past week, and *it has centered primarily in Bangkok.*

Here in Tokyo, Prime Minister Tanaka, with whom I have had two personal meetings, talked of “a new age” — of a “turning point” — and of a “new chapter” in Far Eastern affairs.

Important meetings have been taking place in Bangkok, where I have been for the past few days. Singapore’s Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew and his aides flew into Bangkok to discuss plans for Asia’s future with Thailand’s Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn. Australia’s Prime Minister Whitlam is flying to Jakarta to discuss a bilateral defense agreement with President Suharto of Indonesia. I had a personal meeting of about an hour with President Suharto some six months ago. He is very much concerned with combatting Communism from *within his* country.

Last Wednesday morning, in Bangkok, the newspapers announced that Henry Kissinger, President Nixon’s personal envoy and Assistant National Security Affairs adviser, would be arriving at Bangkok airport in the second of the presidential jets — *Air Force II* — on Thursday night with a contingent of 14 U. S. government officials. He was scheduled to have a meeting at 7:30 Friday morning with Thailand’s Prime Minister Kittikachorn,

prior to his visit to Hanoi and Peking, trying to wind up this Vietnam war. Three U. S. ambassadors from that area also came there to confer with Mr. Kissinger.

But I had an important personal meeting (by invitation) with Prime Minister Kittikachorn less than 24 hours before Mr. Kissinger's meeting with him, and I consider this meeting, for that reason and at this critical time, of great import. Because, after this meeting with Thailand's Prime Minister — and being already acquainted with His Majesty Bhumibol Adulyadej, Thailand's king, I feel that I can tell you that the main bastion of defending the free world against Communist inroads in Southeast Asia is due to shift from Saigon to Bangkok.

Accompanied by Mr. Stanley R. Rader, our Ambassador College Chief Counsel and Mr. Osamu Gotoh, chairman of our Department of Asian Studies, we were met at the entrance to the official residence of the Prime Minister by his aide, an army colonel, and were ushered into an antechamber. In a minute or two, the smiling but serious Prime Minister greeted us in his living room. We were introduced to his son-in-law, who was trained and educated in the United States.

Immediately, we began to discuss the problems of this crisis moment in Southeast Asia. First, I asked him his opinion about whether President Thieu would survive in South Vietnam in the wake of the cease-fire. He had recently had a talk with an emissary and confidant of President Thieu, and told me that he has concluded that President Thieu may now very likely survive a political test at the polls. The South Vietnamese government is now stronger and more stable than at any time during the war. However, as I said, the Communists were NOT required by the cease-fire agreement between the United States and Hanoi to remove their troops from the northern portions of South Vietnam — and

the Communists control many small villages here and there throughout South Vietnam. And, of course, they can vote. Their propaganda will continue, and perhaps sabotage and even guerrilla warfare.

The Senior Leader in Southeast Asia

But the Prime Minister of Thailand reminded us that he is the *senior leader* in Southeast Asia. He has been in office longer than any other head of state in the entire area. And he has relentlessly and vigorously opposed Communist inroads. He served as Prime Minister for the first time in 1958 and has been Prime Minister continuously since 1963. And he has been singularly SUCCESSFUL in resisting Communist advances.

Just as President Suharto of Indonesia told me *his* problem in holding off Communist inroads was primarily that of combatting *internal* subversion, so it has been in Thailand. To grasp the strategic significance of this, you'll have to remember that Thailand, formerly called Siam, is bordered on the northeast by Laos — into which North Vietnamese troops had infiltrated — during the war. Vietnam is just beyond, so that at one point, Thailand is only about 65 or 70 miles from North Vietnam. Yet the North Vietnamese have not attempted to invade Thailand.

Prime Minister Kittikachorn pointed out that other leaders in the area — Prime Minister Lee of Singapore, President Suharto of Indonesia, and President Marcos of the Philippines — have all adopted his long-tested and successful approach of vigilant and inspired national efforts and education to oppose Communist inroads. He admitted the infiltration of Communists (civilian — not military) in the northeastern area of Thailand — where they are only some 65 miles from North Vietnam, but he said the situation there was under control.

We turned, then, to a discussion of domestic problems within Thailand. Education and birth control are two MAJOR problems. Thailand is rated as 80% literate, but that still leaves close to one in five — mostly in outlying and mountain areas — who can neither read nor write. I explained to the Prime Minister about our own Ambassador College cooperative participation in the program of His Majesty the King in bringing education to the mountain tribes, and he expressed his appreciation on behalf of the people of the country.

He said the birthrate in Bangkok is in excess of 3% per annum, and in the outlying areas, over 7% — much too high — and creating great pressures.

Black September Commandos in Bangkok

Incidentally, in talking with the Prime Minister, I received some interesting details regarding a world-news headline at the year's end. You may remember reading of some "Black September" Arab commandos taking Israeli Embassy employees in Bangkok hostage. A number of Arab governments voiced open opposition to this political act of the Black September group. Both His Majesty, King Bhumibol, and Prime Minister Kittikachorn were personally involved.

It was on December 28, 1972, and it was a national holiday in Thailand for the investiture of His Majesty's son as Crown Prince. It was a most important day for the royal family and for the government. Israeli Ambassador Amir did not go to the embassy on that day, but six of the embassy staff did. Four members of the "Black September" movement, with machine guns, entered the Israeli Embassy, taking all staff employees as hostages. They demanded the release of 36 Arabs held in prison in Israel.

The Israeli Ambassador immedi-

ately received an answer from Jerusalem: "NO RELEASE of prisoners. Absolutely NO NEGOTIATION with guerrillas." There was absolutely nothing, from that moment, that the Israeli Ambassador could do for the hostages.

At that point, the Thai government took over. They did not want a mass slaughter on their hands on the day that meant so much to the King. I was told by friends close to the King, including a princess, that the King himself played a leading part in devising the strategy, and Prime Minister Kittikachorn saw that the plan was carried out.

They knew, since the Israeli government at Jerusalem refused to give in, or even negotiate, that the Arab guerrillas realized that if they did not kill the two women and four men hostages, the guerrillas themselves would certainly be killed. The Thai government promised them safe passage to any Arab country if they would free the hostages. The Arabs, knowing how most of the Black September commandos at Munich were never allowed to escape alive, feared they would be shot instead of given safe passage. To reassure the Black Septemberists, the Thai government offered *Thai* hostages, in exchange for the Israeli hostages. The Thai government offered the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Egyptian Ambassador to Thailand. The Arab guerrillas agreed. A Thai aircraft flew the guerrillas and hostages safely to Cairo.

True, this maneuver allowed the commandos to get away, but it prevented any bloodshed from marring the day of the investiture of the Crown Prince. For 19 tense hours, the Deputy Prime Minister of Thailand remained with the Israeli Ambassador during this emergency. This Prime Minister himself spent 15 hours with the Ambassador, and the King made several personal in-

quiries about the progress of the negotiations.

The Coming Shift of Power

Following withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam, look for the United States to shift headquarters for all U. S. air operations to some point in Thailand.

Let me give you the reasons why I think it inevitable that Thailand will *now* become the free world's new bastion against further Communist invasion in Southeast Asia.

Thailand has a stable government that has been in office longer than any of the others. If the Communists were able to take over South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia politically, or by military force, they still would be stopped cold at Thailand's border — as long as the Thais could hold them off.

At this point in time, it is probable there will be no further fighting by major conventional military units in Vietnam — for the present, that is. Actually, the war *will not stop*. The Communist thrust to the south in that area will continue, but it will now shift from organized conventional military war to POLITICAL war — which is propaganda — accompanied by sporadic guerrilla fighting here and there, and occasional terrorism.

North Vietnam is not in position to mount another major military offensive against South Vietnam, unless the U.S.S.R. would load them up, as they did in 1971 — and guarantee North Vietnam sufficient financial and military backing to keep going. There's every evidence that Moscow is not inclined to do that for the present. China probably is not in *position* to do it now. Besides, there is still rivalry between the U.S.S.R. and Communist China.

The administration in Washington is not going to want to reduce its forces in Southeast Asia right now, further than getting the soldiers out of South Vietnam. To do that would weaken Mr. Nixon's and Henry

Kissinger's hands in carrying the cease-fire negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion. So, I think you'll see the main bulk of U. S. power in Southeast Asia *shifted* into Thailand.

Thailand not only has a tried and competent leader in Prime Minister Kittikachorn, but the country is also held together by its King, who is actually revered by his people. He is very popular, especially in the outlying regions and mountain areas, because he has done so much for his people, and is so deeply concerned for their welfare. He has very definitely revealed that to me, in the hours of visits I have had with him personally. As an example, on my arrival in Bangkok on this visit, I was escorted to the hotel by one of its young lady representatives, in a car supplied by the hotel. I mentioned the CONCERN I knew the King had for his people, and she said, almost fervently, "I would lay down my life for him." And her eyes filled with tears so that she could not talk further for some minutes.

Yes, the fighting will now shift to political propaganda warfare, primarily, in Vietnam. President Thieu probably will win if there is an election. The South Vietnamese government will remain — for the present. The United States forces in the Southeast Asian sector will shift to Thailand, which will now become the new bastion of defense against Communist aggression in that part of the world.

For the PRESENT — that is! But the war is not over. War is not over in the Middle East. Violence is increasing WORLDWIDE. And it WILL increase, until that "unseen Strong Hand from Someplace" does intervene and usher in the *peaceful* world tomorrow — when nations really will, finally, beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and men shall learn war NO MORE. *Then*, for the first time since MAN was placed on this earth, we shall have WORLD PEACE — *permanently!* □

Garner Ted Armstrong

— heard daily worldwide. A thought-provoking broadcast bringing you the real meaning of today's world news — with advance news of the WORLD TOMORROW!

Below is a partial listing of stations. For a complete list write to the Editor.

U. S. TV STATIONS

East

NEW YORK — Channel 9, WOR-TV, 8 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10 p.m. Sun.
BUFFALO, N. Y. — Channel 2, WGR-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:30 p.m. Sun.
ELMIRA, N. Y. Channel 36, WENY-TV, 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 6:30 p.m. Sat.
WASHINGTON, D. C. — Channel 7, WMAL-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

Central

McCOOK, NEB. — Channel 8, KOMC, 6:15 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sun.
GARDEN CITY, KAN. — Channel 11, KGLD, 6:15 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sun.
GREAT BEND, KAN. — Channel 2, KCKT, 6:15 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sun.
WICHITA, KAN. — Channel 3, KARD-TV, 6:15 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sun.
CHICAGO, ILL. — Channel 32, WFLD-TV, 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
AKRON, OH. — Channel 23, WAKR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 1:00 p.m. Sat.

South

LITTLE ROCK, ARK. — Channel 7, KATV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
PORTSMOUTH, VA. — Channel 10, WAVY-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
JOHNSON CITY, TENN. — Channel 11, WJHL-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
NASHVILLE, TENN. — Channel 5, WLAC-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
AUSTIN, TEX. — Channel 7, KTBC-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:00 a.m. Sun.
FORT WORTH-DALLAS — Channel 11, KTVT, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
HOUSTON, TEX. — Channel 39, KHTV-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SAN ANTONIO, TEX. — Channel 5, KENS-TV, 6:25 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
NEW ORLEANS — Channel 6, WDSU-TV, 5:45 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 3:30 p.m. Sat.
SHREVEPORT, LA — Channel 12, KSLA-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA. — Channel 44, WTOG-TV, 1:00 p.m. Mon.-Sun.
ORLANDO, FLA. — Channel 2, WESH-TV, 6:25 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

Mountain States

DENVER, COLO. — Channel 4, KOA-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:30 a.m. Sat.

West Coast

SPOKANE, WASH. — Channel 6, KHQ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
TACOMA, WASH. — Channel 11, KTNT-TV, 9 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
PORTLAND, ORE. — Channel 12, KPTV-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
LOS ANGELES — Channel 5, KTLA, 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
SAN DIEGO, CALIF. — Channel 10, KGTV-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
STOCKTON, CALIF. — Channel 13, KOVR, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
HONOLULU — Channel 4, KHVH-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

U. S. RADIO STATIONS

East


WHAM — Rochester, N. Y. — 1180 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
WWVA — Wheeling, W. Va. — 1170 kc., 98.7 FM, 5 a.m. and 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m., 8:30 & 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WRVA — Richmond, Va. — 1140 kc., 10 p.m. daily.
WPTF — Raleigh, N. C. — 680 kc., 1:15 & 11:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WRCP — Philadelphia — 1540 kc., 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.

Central

WCKY — Cincinnati — 1530 kc., 5:05 a.m. daily, 1:05 a.m. Tues.-Sun., 12:05 a.m. Sun.
WISN — Milwaukee, Wis. — 1130 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9 a.m. & 9:30 p.m. Sun., 97.3 FM, 11 p.m. daily.
KXEL — Waterloo — 1540 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun., 105.7 FM, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
KXEN — St. Louis — 1010 kc., 7:15 a.m. & 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. & 4 p.m. Sun.
WWWE — Cleveland — 1100 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:00 p.m. Sun.
KSTP — St. Paul, Minn. — 1500 kc., 9:30 p.m. daily.

South

WLAC — Nashville — 1510 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 a.m. & 7:00 p.m. Sun.



KRLD — Dallas — 1080 kc., 5 a.m. & 11 p.m. daily, (92.5 FM 5 a.m. daily).
KTRH — Houston — 740 kc., 7:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
WOAI — San Antonio — 1200 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:05 p.m. Sun.
WWL — New Orleans — 870 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
KAAY — Little Rock — 1090 kc., 5:15 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WHAS — Louisville, Ky. — 840 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8:00 p.m. Sun.
WGUN — Atlanta — 1010 kc., 11 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4 p.m. Sun.
WINQ — Tampa — 1010 kc., 12:15 p.m. daily.
KCTA — Corpus Christi, Tex. — 1030 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 4:30 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.

Mountain States

KOA — Denver — 850 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily (or after ball game).
KSL — Salt Lake City — 1160 kc., 5:06 a.m., 11 p.m. daily.
KOB — Albuquerque, N. M. — 770 kc., 11:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.

West Coast

KIRO — Seattle — 710 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
KRAK — Sacramento — 1140 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
KGBS — Los Angeles — 1020 kc., 97.0 FM, 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KFRE — Fresno — 940 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.

CANADA

CFCN — Calgary, Alta. — 1060 kc., 9 p.m. Sun.-Fri., 8:30 p.m. Sat.
CKOY — Ottawa, Ont. — 1310 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
CFBC — St. John, N. B. — 930 kc., 98.9 FM, 8:30 p.m. daily.
CKCY — Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. — 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

In This Issue

The PLAIN TRUTH
P. O. Box 111
Pasadena, California 91109

Printed in U.S.A.

★ ABORTIONS NOW LEGAL . . . BUT IS ABORTION MURDER?

The U. S. Supreme Court has ruled that abortions are legal. Many now ask, "Is abortion murder? When does human life start?" The experts do not agree. See page 2.

★ BY VOLCANIC ERUPTION . . . 30,000 LIVES SNUFFED OUT!

Does this natural catastrophe of 1902 prefigure the supergiant political volcano about to erupt that could erase all human life from the earth? You need to know the real meaning of present world events. See page 8.

★ THE COMING WORLD OIL CRISIS

See page 14.

★ NEWEST TROUBLE SPOT FOR U.S. — PANAMA CANAL

See page 20.

★ WHAT HAPPENS AFTER DEATH?

Is there a hereafter? Or is death the end of it all? See page 32.

★ YOU CALL THAT MUSIC?

Why do musical tastes differ so widely? And why, with today's variety in music, do so many enjoy only one kind? See page 38.

690920-1620-0 4 P053
MR-MRS WAYNE L HUGHES
2225 ALBANS
HOUSTON TX 77005