

AUGUST 1978

the
PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

Hitting Close to Home

HUMAN RIGHTS COME FROM GOD
PROBABILITY: WHAT IT SAYS ABOUT EVOLUTION
THE AFFLUENT DIET

the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

Vol. XLIII, No. 7

ISSN 0032-0420

August 1978

ARTICLES

Why Humans Were Put on the Earth	2
Who Will Stop Russia?	4
Hitting Close to Home	8
Probability: What It Says About Evolution	13
Part Three: David—A Man After God's Own Heart	18
Too High a Price? The Affluent Diet	22
Human Rights Come from God	29
Why People Don't Go to Church	31
Is It True That . . . "Every Man Has His Price"?	34
Part Two: The Ministry of the Worldwide Church of God— Reversing Religious Irrelevance	36

FEATURES

Personal from Herbert W. Armstrong	1
Why Not?	27
Letters: Orchids and Onions	45

The Plain Truth is published monthly (except combined June-July and October-November issues) by Ambassador Publishing Company, Pasadena, California 91123. Copyright ©1978 Ambassador College. All rights reserved. Second-class postage paid at Pasadena, CA, and at additional mailing offices.
PRINTED IN ENGLAND
United States: 300 W. Green, Pasadena, California 91123
Canada: P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2M2.
Mexico: Institución Ambassador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D.F.
Colombia: Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.
United Kingdom, Europe: P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., AL2 3TR England
Rhodesia: P. O. Box U.A.30 Union Ave., Salisbury
South Africa: P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa 2000
Ghana: P. O. Box 9617, Kotoka Int. Airport, Accra

Kenya and the rest of East and Central Africa: P. O. Box 47135, Nairobi, Kenya
Mauritius and other Indian Ocean Isles: P. O. Box 888, Port Louis, Mauritius
Nigeria: P. M. B. 1006, Ikeja, Lagos State, Nigeria
Australia, India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia: G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia
New Zealand and Pacific Isles: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand
The Philippines: P. O. Box 2603, Manila 2801
West Indies: P. O. Box 6063, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936
Switzerland: Case Postale 10, 91, rue de la Servette, CH-1211, Geneva 7
Scandinavia: Box 2513 Solli, Oslo 2 Norway

BE SURE TO NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY of any change in your address. Please include your old mailing label and your new address.

**The Plain Truth — SUPPORTED BY
YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS**

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

Founder and Editor-in-Chief:

HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Senior Editors: C. Wayne Cole, Jon Hill, Robert L. Kuhn, Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith

Managing Editor: Brian W. Knowles

Assistant Managing Editor: John R. Schroeder

Associate Editors: Lawson C. Briggs, Robert A. Ginskey, D. Paul Graunke, George Ritter, Richard H. Sedliack

Contributing Editors: David L. Antion, Elbert Atlas, Charles V. Dorothy, Lester L. Grabbe, Robert C. Smith, Les Stocker

Women's Consultant: Carole Ritter

Editorial Staff: Cheryl Graunke, Janet Halvorson, Linda Martens, Dennis Gonzalo, Janet Schroeder, Lesley Van Patten

Copy Editors: Ron Beideck, Peter Moore, Clayton Steep

Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lippross

News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg

News Research Staff: Janet Abbott, Jeff Calkins, Werner Jebens, Donald D. Schroeder, Keith Stump

Art Director: Greg S. Smith

Art Staff: Randall Cole, Ronald Grove, Gene Tikasingh

Photography: Photo Services Director: Warren Watson; Staff: David Armstrong, Charles Buschmann, Ken Evans, Joyce Hedlund, Alfred Hennig

Photo Files: Manager: Alan Lester

Circulation Manager: E. J. Martin; Assistant Circulation Manager: Gordon Muir; Subscriptions: Boyd Leeson; Newsstand Distribution: Mark Armstrong

Business Manager: Raymond L. Wright

Director of Pastoral Administration: C. Wayne Cole

International Editions: Dutch Language: Jesse Korver; French: Dibar K. Apartian; German: Gotthard Behnisch; Great Britain: Peter Butler; Spanish: Kenneth V. Ryland

Offices: Auckland, New Zealand: Robert Morton; Bonn, West Germany: Frank Schnee; St. Albans, England: Frank Brown; Burleigh Heads, Australia: Dean Wilson; Geneva, Switzerland: Bernard Andrist; Johannesburg, South Africa: Roy McCarthy; Manila, Philippines: Colin Adair; Utrecht, The Netherlands: Bram de Bree; Vancouver, B.C., Canada: Leslie McCullough; Oslo, Norway: Stuart Powell; Mexico City, Mexico: Thomas Turk



Personal from...

Emotional Maturity

Do you feel deeply about things or circumstances that are moving or important? Did you ever check your emotional responses to know whether you have attained emotional maturity and stability?

Most people give little or no thought to this matter of their emotions. We humans start life as little babies. We have to grow up. But to fulfill life's real purpose and mission, we must grow up not only physically, but mentally, spiritually, and emotionally. Did you ever stop to realize how many people think primarily only of attaining physical maturity? If it were not for compulsory public school education for children in our Western world, how many would take the initiative to develop their minds? How many, in each hundred, have done so in such nations as China, for example?

But what about spiritual development? The average person the world around automatically accepts the established religion of his parents and his country. Why are most Chinese Buddhists or Confucians? Why do most people of India follow the Hindu religion? Why do most of the Japanese embrace Shintoism or Buddhism? Why do most Arab peoples follow the Moslem religion; most Jews follow Judaism; most Italians, Spaniards, and French—as well as South Americans—embrace Roman Catholicism; a majority of Britons and Americans call themselves Protestant Christians? How many give any real thought to why they believe the religious ideas they hold sacred?

How many of these hundreds of millions of people ever give serious thought to spiritual growth? Yet no person attains true maturity unless he attains spiritual maturity, as well as physical growth.

But fewer still ever give so much as a passing thought to the need for emotional development.

Just what do we mean—emotional maturity? Few know the meaning of the term. Do you? Yet it is one of the real secrets of human happiness.

But, if no one is truly grown up—really mature—until he attains not only physical, mental, and spiritual adulthood, but emotional maturity as well, where will you find it taught?

Do you know any school or college which offers a course in “Emotional Development”? It most certainly is something we need to be taught. Few will ever teach it to themselves.

No one is born with it. It must be learned—developed. We need, continually, to realize that we are born as helpless little babes, knowing nothing at birth. We do not come equipped with instinct, like the dumb animals.

Ever see a little calf born? The mother cow doesn't go to a hospital to have her young delivered by an obstetrical physician, attended by white-capped and gowned nurses. She has no delivery table. No one helps her. The little calf comes into the world by an instinctive, natural process. Almost immediately it struggles to its feet. It finds its legs a little wobbly—but in a few minutes it stands on all four. No one teaches it to walk—and it doesn't have to wait a year to learn. It starts walking at once. No one teaches it where to go—it knows! It has instinct built automatically into its brain. It goes after its dinner. No one tells it or teaches it where the dinner is located. The mother cow simply stands stupidly by, waiting for the calf to find its dinner.

No newborn human knows that much. Yet the human infant has something the dumb animals do not possess—human mind. Humans, however, have to grow up. They have to learn—to be taught.

And one of the basic things every human needs so vitally to learn is the right use of the human emotions. So you see, the human mind has something vital to do with human emotions. Yet most people never give thought to controlling emotions with the mind!

But our emotions need to be understood, taught, trained, and controlled by the mind!

Our minds were given us for a purpose!

Where is the logical and proper place to begin such training? It ought to be taught to one-, three-, and six-year-olds, and in the early primary grades in school. That means this teaching ought first to be taught by parents in the home. But how can parents teach children when they themselves are still emotionally immature? How can elementary schoolteachers

(Continued on page 42)

WHY HUMANS WERE PUT ON THE EARTH

Most people know next to nothing about God. To understand ourselves, why we are, where we are going, and how, we need to know more about our Creator.

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Ask anyone where the real beginning is in the Bible. He would probably reply, "Genesis 1:1." But he would be absolutely wrong! The real beginning of the Bible is NOT Genesis 1:1, but in the New Testament, John 1:1-2: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God."

In the beginning there existed two all-knowing, all-powerful, all-perfect SUPERBEINGS. Each possessed supreme MIND and CREATIVE power. One is called "the Word," the other is called "God." But the Word, it states, was also God—though a separate Personage. Although the one called "God" was supreme in authority, yet He and the Word were in all other respects equal. In mind they were in complete harmony and agreement.

There existed at first only these two Superpersons in space—no matter, no other beings or life forms, no physical universe. Both Superbeings

had always existed. There never was a time when they did not co-exist.

Continuing in verse 3: "All things were made by him [the Word]; and without him was not any thing made that was made." God created all things *by* and *through* the Word. Since these two Beings thought precisely alike in perfect harmony, the Word created all things exactly as directed by God.

God Is Creator

Do you want to know what God is? Above all, *God is Creator!*

These two supernatural SPIRIT BEINGS were both Creators. But, as human beings think, plan and design—even putting their plans on paper before starting to build or construct—so these two Superbeings thought, planned and designed. There was no hurry. They might have thought and planned for many millions (or even billions) of years, as we count time, before starting the actual MAKING OF CREATING.

Whether you believe it or not,

matter was *not* the first thing to be created. God created not only the visible, but *the invisible!*

The Bible says of the Word: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and *invisible*, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or *principalities*, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him" (Col. 1:16).

These two original Persons, being SPIRIT BEINGS themselves, composed of spirit (remember God is spirit—John 4:24), designed and produced a type of spirit being somewhat like themselves—only naturally of far lower degree. These beings, called "angels," are invisible to human eyes. These spirit-composed angels were of three or more levels of power and ability in thought—simple angels; a higher class of angels called seraphs; and the highest, cherubs, of which there were only three—all inferior in mind and power to God. These created beings (angels) were equipped with minds—with the ability to know,

think, reason, form conclusions, make decisions, set CHOICES.

The Supreme Accomplishment

Now as Creator, what was the *most important* creation that God could make? Was it the angels? Was it the heavens and the earth—the whole universe? Or was it man himself?

It was *none* of these things!

The supreme achievement of creation is righteous, holy, perfect CHARACTER. I define it as the ability in a separate entity with mind and free moral agency to CHOOSE the right: one who, seeing the way to both good and evil, *voluntarily chooses* the good, even against strongest temptation and pressures and desires to choose evil, and who *wills*, against strongest opposing pressures, to do good. These created beings—the angels—did *not* have perfect character at creation. *Character cannot be created automatically and instantaneously by fiat.* Character (whether good or evil) must be developed in separate entities possessing thought processes and minds able to think, to know, to reason, to make independent conclusions and choices. And that risks development of evil character. Of course, this righteous, holy and perfect character must of necessity COME FROM the original perfect Beings, yet as a result of the *independent* thinking, reasoning, knowing, and actual choice and desire of the recipients.

Who Is God?

It is vital, at this point, to know something more of God. So now consider. God is Creator, Designer, Educator, RULER. God has SUPREME MIND! He is perfect, holy and righteous character.

The Eternal God is not only Creator of all that is, but is also RULER over all He creates. He is also Educator. He reveals knowledge basic and vital to know—knowledge otherwise inaccessible to man and some of it even to the angels (see I Peter 1:12). What God creates He *maintains*. What He creates, He creates for a purpose. He intends it to be put to a use—a *right* use that *preserves* and *improves*. This use, maintenance and improvement is controlled by the GOVERNMENT OF GOD!

Just what is God? He is Creator! But He maintains and preserves what He creates. How? By His government—the government of God!

Now the tremendous supremacy of these two great God-beings was exhibited at this point. They had in mind a tremendous objective for the angels—a purpose supreme. This required the creation of a new substance, MATTER, which comprises the whole vast universe.

So now we finally come to Genesis 1:1. The first four words of the Bible are: “In the beginning God . . .” Since in the Bible God reveals Himself as Creator of ALL—the entire universe with its galaxies, its suns, planets and moons—this places God (as we have previously seen from John 1:1-3) in existence *before* all else. The next word tells us what God did: He “created.” God is, first of all, Creator! And what did He create at this time—*after* the creation of the angels? “. . . the heaven[s] and the earth” (Gen. 1:1).

The King James Version renders the word “heaven” in the singular, but the original Hebrew is in the plural—“heavens”—as it should be translated. It is so rendered in the Revised Standard Version, Moffatt, and other modern translations. Genesis 1:1 is speaking of the *original* creation of matter—the entire universe, including our earth. The original Hebrew words imply a perfect creation. God reveals Himself as Creator of perfection, light and beauty. Every reference in the Bible describes the condition of each phase of God’s creation as “very good”—perfect. It is a perfect creation, beautiful to the eye. God is a perfectionist!

Creation Not Finished!

Even though God is perfect—and He is a perfectionist, having created everything perfect—He often does *not* complete His creation all at once. This was true of the angels. The second stage of the angelic creation was the development of character—whether good or evil.

This earth, as only few know, originally was populated by angels. God had a great purpose in mind for them. Great accomplishment was planned for them. God pur-

posed that the angels utilize the raw materials and the many properties built into the matter of the earth to complete its creation—for God is the Author of beauty, harmony, peace, joy, perfection and glory.

This, of course, demanded law and order—harmony—and that all the angels pull together for their grand accomplishment. So the Creator set over them a GOVERNMENT—His government, with His constitution and laws. God’s LAWS were—and are—a way of life; the way of love—outgoing concern for the welfare of others; the way of peace, harmony, helping, serving, sharing.

The government of God is a way of life. It is the way that develops righteous, holy, perfect character. It is the way that produces peace, harmony, happiness, joy, abundance. It is the way of love. It is love to God in implicit *obedience*, adulation, worship, reliance, and faith—knowing that *God Himself is love!*

So God established on earth a throne to administer His government. On it, He placed a super-archangel named Lucifer. This great Lucifer was *originally* a bringer of light and truth. He was perfect as created. Next to God, this super-angel was the most powerful and most mighty being that it was possible for God to create. He was *perfect* in all his ways *until iniquity* (lawlessness) was found in him of his own free choice (Ezek. 28:15).

The First Rebels

This Lucifer led his angels (one-third of all the angels—and it is possible that it was the same third that populated the earth under Lucifer) into sin—transgression of the laws of God’s government. God had wisely chosen to make angels, and later humans, *free moral agents*—with free choice. Otherwise neither angels nor humans could attain God’s holy, perfect, righteous character. God gave the angels minds of their own. And He made them immortal—they never die. They were each individually created. They do not reproduce themselves.

God bestowed upon angels minds possessing *great knowledge*—super-
(Continued on page 41)



Quittard—Gamma (Top); Alan Nagues—Sygma (Middle and Bottom)

When a football team produces a quick succession of goals (or first downs in the American version of the game), it acquires what is called “momentum” and becomes a real threat.

The same is true in the arena of international power politics. The Soviet Union has chalked up some impressive gains recently, mainly in Africa. The geopolitical momentum is clearly on its side.

Worst of all, Moscow is becoming emboldened in its drive for world domination. The Soviets have read America’s post-Vietnam mood well. They realize that public sentiment plus congressional restrictions practically eliminate the possibility of U.S. troops being dispatched overseas to contest Communist aggression.

The men in the Kremlin believe that President Carter’s recent “strong” denunciations of Soviet activities in Africa are mere words that cannot be backed up by ac-

WHO WILL STOP RUSSIA?

Key allies around the world are having doubts as never before about the ability of the United States to protect the free world against the rapidly mounting Soviet challenge. Will Western Europe, Japan and others be forced to defend themselves—even in defiance of America?

by Gene H. Hogberg


tion—the only “language” they pay attention to.

Threat to Europe Mounts

In Europe, meanwhile, the buildup of offensive Soviet forces continues unabated. Monstrous new missiles, some of them on mobile launch pads, are targeted on West European cities. In conventional weaponry the gap between the Warsaw Pact and NATO widens.

The Soviets already have a nearly three-to-one numerical advantage in tanks. Early this year, they mounted an unprecedented propaganda campaign against the proposed neutron bomb, which was specifically designed to penetrate invading Soviet arms with deadly radiation. Many Europeans feel that this propaganda pressure resulted in President Carter’s decision to postpone production of the weapon.

On the high seas, the Soviets are developing an offensive strike-force navy designed in large part to be



Michel Artault—Gamma

able to cut allied shipping lanes in time of war; to isolate America—still the “arsenal of democracy”—from its allies in Europe and Asia. The Soviets are building naval vessels faster than they are training crews to man them. Meanwhile, the U.S. Navy is aging and understrength. Moreover, its ship-building budget for fiscal 1979 was whacked in half!

This is not to say the Soviet Union is invincible—yet. The ease with which a straying unarmed Korean airliner earlier this year was able to unintentionally penetrate the U.S.S.R.’s most heavily defended strategic region—the Kola Peninsula with the port of Murmansk—shows the Soviets have much to improve. But again, the issue is one of *momentum!*

Attacking Weakest Link First

The Soviets realize that the United States and the free nations of Europe are presently too formidable to be challenged directly. Instead, the

Kremlin is concentrating on critical areas of the world supportive of the Western industrial societies—the Middle East, Africa and Asia.

Thanks to a billion-dollar military airlift to Ethiopia—the biggest such exercise since the Berlin airlift in 1948—the Soviets are now planted firmly in the Horn of Africa. They and their Cuban “Afrika Korps” are presently helping the Ethiopians in their renewed drive against Moslem Eritrean rebels which hold Ethiopia’s Red Sea coastal strip.

Control of the contested area would enable the Soviets to have naval bases directly across the Red Sea from Saudi Arabia and an ominous monitoring capacity over the tankers which carry that nation’s precious lifeblood of petroleum to the industries of Western Europe and the United States.

Since the Saudis have been helping finance Somalia’s fight against Ethiopia as well as Eritrea’s struggle for independence, the Arab king-

dom fears possible future punitive action by Ethiopia, with Cuban or Soviet help. Fears of such action helped the Saudis obtain an order for sixty advanced U.S. F-15 jets.

The respected Swiss daily *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* reports that “there are indications that the Angolan and Ethiopian operations are learning experiences for future conflicts in the Third World in which the Soviet Union could further its aims by using seasoned Cuban troops. In one of his speeches wherein he sought to explain to his people why Cuban soldiers should be sent to fight abroad, [Fidel] Castro said that at the moment ‘Africa was the weakest link in the imperialist chain.’ Experts predict that, after they have secured the Horn of Africa, the next Soviet-Cuban moves will be in southern Africa, and possibly eastward into the conservative Arab-Iranian complex of the OPEC cartel.”

As if to gear up for this future front, as many as 1,000 Russian, Cu-

ban, and East German "advisors" have turned the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen—formerly the British protectorate of Aden (located at the tip of the Arabian peninsula)—into the world's leading training base for world terrorists.

Afghanistan in the Fold?

Further to the east, Moscow scored a major success in late April when a pro-Soviet faction overthrew the government in Afghanistan. Details are still sketchy, but nearly all of the new leaders are Communist Party members—and all of them are aligned with Moscow rather than Peking.

The importance of the Afghan coup is geographical. Afghanistan, tucked under the Soviet Union's southern border for 1,000 miles, projects like a wedge between pro-Western Iran on the west and Pakistan to the east and south. Afghanistan has long had a smoldering border dispute with Pakistan over that nation's Baluchistan region. Pakistan is weak, literally only half of its original self with the loss, seven years ago, of East Pakistan, now Bangladesh. If Pakistan itself were to topple, the Soviets could realize a dream dating back to the days of the czars—a warm-water port on the Indian Ocean.

Afghanistan is also strategic for another reason. Reports columnist Ernest Cuneo: "Its acquisition gives striking power to the Russian general staff in three directions. With Afghanistan as a base, the Russian air force is within easy striking distance of Karachi and New Delhi, and even more importantly, of Iranian, Saudi Arabian and Persian Gulf oil fields."

Soviets Eye Mideast Oil

Senator Abraham Ribicoff warned during the Senate debate over the controversial sale of planes to Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia that the Soviet threat to the Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf was of "serious consequence" to the United States and the Western world because half the world's oil reserves are in this area.

He cited CIA estimates that Russian oil production will decrease in 1985 while demand will be higher.

"What the Soviets need and what they want" is control of Middle East oil, he stated.

Ribicoff said the Soviets "know the value of the region they are surrounding." He asked: "Does anyone think they give a damn about Afghanistan or Yemen or Ethiopia?"

"The point is," he said, "that while everyone is drawing attention to the confrontation states at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, we had better watch out for the back door and what the Soviets and Cubans are up to in the Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf."

**"Europeans . . . have
relied on United States
power to hold back
Russia. . . . Now they see
[the U.S.] faltering,
retreating, backing down
at every turn."**

*Herbert W. Armstrong,
Editor, The Plain Truth
in July 1961 issue, p. 4.*

"You can say what you want, whoever controls that oil will control the economic lifeblood of the West. Let the Soviets control that oil . . . and where will the United States be?"

"The Saudis are scared, and I think they ought to be scared because they have what the whole world wants. That is oil, and that is a mighty powerful package."

Setting Africa Aflame

Including the fighting in the Horn region, no less than seven armed conflicts are raging in Africa—and the blood-stained hand of the Soviet Union is immersed in six of them.

Homegrown Marxist "Polisario" guerrillas, supplied with Russian and Czech arms, are fighting for control of the former Spanish Sahara. Morocco and Mauritania have joint claims to the phosphate-rich territory and are battling the Polisario bands. Small numbers of

French troops are assisting their cause.

In landlocked Chad, a civil war has raged for weeks. Several thousand French paratroopers have come to the aid of the Chad government. (Paris has a standing agreement to militarily assist its former African colonies.) Apparently Communists are not involved here, although the rebels are assisted by Libya, the most radical Arab state which cooperates with Moscow in supporting worldwide terrorist movements.

In central Africa, the huge state of Zaire once again came under attack in mid-May. As occurred in "round one" fourteen months ago, invaders struck at southernmost copper-rich Shaba province from their redoubt in Marxist Angola. The invading force was composed of elements of the old Katangese army that once controlled Shaba (then Katanga) province following Zaire's independence in 1960. This revived Marxist liberation army has been nurtured by Cuban and East German advisors in Angola.

French and Belgian paratroopers chased the rebels back to Angolan bases and rescued hundreds of white Europeans who worked for Shaba's rich copper-mining enterprise. However, the rescue operation came one day too late for up to 200 whites who were massacred in what one news source called "the bloodiest slaughter of Europeans in modern African history."

Most of the 2,500 skilled white mining operators and their families who were airlifted to safety have vowed not to return.

Experts now believe that the Soviet and Cuban strategy was a limited one—but with far-reaching consequences. Moreover, it may have succeeded despite the rebel retreat.

Zaire depends upon mineral exports from Shaba—mainly copper and cobalt (half of the world's supply of the latter)—to provide 70 percent of the country's foreign exchange earnings. Zaire is already in very shaky economic condition. Without the mines in full operation—and the skilled European expatriates to run them—Zaire itself could topple, thus accomplishing a major Communist objective. A

Marxist Zaire, smack in the middle of Africa, would be a catastrophe and would put unbearable pressure on three neighboring countries earmarked for future "liberation"—Kenya, the Sudan, and Zambia.

Both the Cubans and the Soviets vehemently denied having engineered the Katanga invasion. But intelligence sources supplied the White House with a clear case of Russian foreknowledge of the assault. According to syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, Soviet agents, just before the invasion, quietly purchased nearly 400 tons of scarce cobalt from European brokers. After the attack the price of cobalt tripled!

Red Arms Pour South

Further to the south, Red arms are pouring into African ports for the expected assault against the new black-and-white interim government of Rhodesia. Up to 350 new Soviet T-54 tanks are reported to have been unloaded recently in Tanzania. Mozambique now has 150 new Soviet tanks and up to 30 MIG-21 fighters. Zambia is now receiving huge quantities of small arms and mortars.

All three front-line states harbor Cuban-run Patriotic Front guerrilla camps. But the guerrillas—many of them teenagers kidnapped or lured away from Rhodesian missionary schools—obviously are not being trained to handle such heavy and sophisticated equipment. Such weapons are also far beyond the capabilities of the small military forces of the host countries.

"These are enormous forces for this part of the world," a British military source told the *London Daily Mail*. "Who is going to drive them, who's going to fly the MIGs if not the Cubans?"

Cuba's "Humanistic" Terror Campaign

In Angola, Marxist dictator Neto wouldn't last the next weekend if it weren't for the over 20,000 Cuban troops plus additional thousands running all branches of government service. Despite this assistance, Angola is in the midst of a horrendous civil war, with the Communist MPLA government fighting against three



Alfred Henning

CORDIALITY PREVAILED between Leonid Brezhnev and Franz Josef Strauss on Soviet leader's state visit to West Germany in May. Brezhnev affirmed Moscow's peaceful intentions toward Bonn. Strauss emphasized that the idea of a reunified Germany was not dead. He afterward said a united Germany would be a "grateful partner" of the Soviets, opening up a "true spring in Europe."

separate more or less pro-West rebel forces, subtly supported to varying degrees by France, West Germany and South Africa. Over 70,000 civilians have died this year in the civil war. Thousands of teenage Angolans from areas recaptured by the Communists are said to have been flown to Cuba as virtual slaves to work on sugar plantations—replacing former workers now fighting in Africa.

Despite the Cuban-unleashed terror campaign, a high U.S. official known for his controversial statements said in a February newspaper interview in South Africa: "I think the Cubans play, and continue to play, a rather positive role in the development of a stable and orderly society...it is possible that their humanism and their lack of racism can be stronger influences on the African continent than their Marxism."

South of Angola, in South West Africa (Namibia), Communist-supported SWAPO guerrilla chieftain Sam Nujoma has rejected a formula for peaceful transition to majority rule as drawn up by five Western nations—the U.S., U.K., Canada,

France and West Germany. South Africa, despite reservations, surprised the U.N. by accepting the proposal.

The response of SWAPO, which fears it can't win in a free and honest election, was to declare that the "armed struggle" must go on.

America Powerless, Afraid of Cuba

Russia and her client states are having a field day, especially in Africa. According to Professor Michael Louw, head of the Institute of Strategic Studies at Pretoria University, the Soviet Union has concluded that most African states are too weak, both economically and politically, to resist military intervention by a superpower. Since the U.S. refuses to contest Soviet intervention, Moscow literally has an open door.

The U.S. offers African states political and economic support on the assumption that Africa will take care of itself and fend off Soviet pressures. This approach, Louw believes, is doomed to failure.

And so is the policy, openly stated
(Continued on page 39)

We're supposed to be a child-centered society that heaps lavish material blessings on its pampered progeny, and allegedly the younger generation has never had it so good. But in many cases our kids are still getting the short end of the stick, and we've got a long way to go before we "turn the heart of the fathers to the children."

HITTING CLOSE TO HOME

by Carole Ritter

You've probably read a great deal lately about violence in the family, especially child abuse in its various and sundry forms. You've seen the shocking pictures and read about the hideous tortures some adults have inflicted on their children. You've been outraged by the unbelievable abuse of power and authority some troubled parents have displayed. Or maybe, like some people, you've been troubled more by the subject's having been brought up in the first place. While it's easy to evoke outrage at the sight of "kiddie" pornography, people like crusader Dr. Judianne Densen-Gerber have found it difficult to get much of a reaction to pictures of maimed, beaten, or dead children.

It's easy to condemn the producers of pedophilic smut, but it's far harder to condemn parents who simply beat their children—to death or otherwise. Our society dictates that children are our property, which we have the right to damage if we so desire. And since nearly everybody "hauls off and hits his kid a good one" now and then, the stories of child beatings and murders strike a bit uncomfortably close to home.

Blair and Rita Justice write in the book *The Abusing Family* that "there is good reason to believe that



people would rather pretend that child abuse is none of their business, and they almost have to be forced to face the fact that it not only exists but is a major public health problem."

Unsparring the Rod

We live in a culture that cherishes such maxims as "spare the rod and spoil the child." But such taken-for-granted sanctions of corporal punishment can easily lead to tragic consequences. Violence in the home today rivals that found on a battlefield or the scene of a riot. A national study of violence in American families found "an astounding range and severity of violence toward children by their parents." Approximately 1.4 million children between the ages of 3 to 17 had been attacked by their parents with a lethal weapon at least once, and as many as 2.2 million children in the same age bracket had been beaten up by these same violent caretakers.

And tragically, these parents probably received the same sort of treatment from their parents. But the root causes of such culturally sanctioned and ingrained patterns of child abuse are extremely complex. This is a problem which presents no easy answers, in spite of the simplistic "lock-the-parents-up-and-put-the-kids-in-foster-homes" solutions most judges, lawyers, and social workers seem to advocate.

Studies show that kids are generally better off with their own parents even in less-than-ideal situations. Temporary foster parents just can't provide what is needed, no matter how motivated they may be. And there is a dearth of good foster homes—an abused child may be taken from his own home and placed in a situation that's only slightly better (or maybe even worse) than the one he left.

Why Parents Do It

But what are the causes of child abuse? Experts offer several theories, all of them incomplete of and by themselves. Here are the main factors they implicate:

1) Lack of a "mothering imprint." In other words, the ability of a parent to nurture and "mother" is absent because the parent herself

was not given this example as a child. Such a woman is usually isolated, has an unsupportive spouse, and expects to get the love and nurturing she missed when she was young from her own child. When it's not forthcoming, the frustration she feels sets the stage for abuse.

2) "Child abusers have negative character traits." This theory—which fails to consider other environmental factors—labels or categorizes abusers as immature, impulsive, self-centered, frustrated, hostile, suspicious, rigid, compulsive, etc. It does not take into account the many people with such negative traits who do not abuse their children.

3) Some abusive parents lack social skills, such as knowledge of child rearing. They don't know what to expect of children at various stages of development, and demand too much. When children don't perform, the parents go overboard on "punishment."

4) Faulty family structure is also blamed for child abuse. Homes where children are illegitimate and/or unwanted; a parent who is involved with a child to the detriment of the relationship with the spouse; or families who use a particular child as a scapegoat for family problems are common examples.

5) Environmental stress also contributes. Families in which the father or mother is out of work; crowded or inadequate housing; lack of education; poverty—these all are factors. But this theory doesn't explain why some poor and environmentally stressed people beat their kids while others don't.

6) Others postulate that frustration and stress due to a great many reasons (a poor marriage, too many children, a difficult child, social isolation, etc.) combine with a person's social level and background to provide the breeding ground for child assault.

7) And finally, a small fraction of child abusers are actually mentally ill, mentally retarded, or brain damaged. But many otherwise "normal" people beat their children, and some mentally ill people don't, so this explains only a few cases.

The Abusing Family System

Blair and Rita Justice see all of these factors as part of an overall pattern or

system. They believe that the problem of child abuse must be attacked by a "systems" approach. In other words, the abusing parent does not stand alone in a vacuum. He or she is part of an abusing family, which in turn is influenced for good or evil by a physical and social environment. This environment includes a series of "cultural scripts" or patterns of behavior that are generally accepted by the society as permissible, such as corporal punishment and the viewing of kids as parental property. In order to deal with the overall problem, society itself will need to be remodeled along healthier lines.

The Justices did find a common pattern in abusing families. In such a marriage, both husband and wife usually received inadequate parenting themselves, and both are looking for someone to "take care of them." They compete with each other for nurturing and attention, with neither one willing to take the giving or parenting or supporting role. They don't really have a mature adult identity of their own, and they try to merge with their spouses to form a sort of common identity. (Understandably such people are drawn to each other, and this is why both partners are always involved in the abusing family system, even though only one may actually beat the children.)

When two people who don't know how to be whole persons and meet their own needs have a child, the situation is explosive. A mother may expect her baby to provide the missing elements in her life; a father may feel deprived of the attention his wife formerly focused on him.

However, such a situation may not produce child abuse all by itself. The Justices also found that abusing families are usually in the middle of a life crisis brought on by too many changes occurring too fast. The authors feel that the abusive parents' personalities actually bring on a lot of these changes.

For example, since the father is searching for someone to "parent" him, he will have constant trouble acting like an adult—making his own decisions or assuming responsibility for his life. He may get into trouble financially, engage in sexual warfare with his wife, have trouble

with his in-laws, and difficulties relating to his boss and holding down a job. All of these factors contribute to the family's moving often, and this also tends to alienate the family from the rest of the world. With no family or friends to act as stabilizing influences, the situation is even more volatile.

Such messed-up family patterns tend to repeat themselves generation after generation—those who don't know how to parent can't pass the information on to their kids. And the poisonous pattern of family over-dependency—the inability to mature into whole, independent persons who can meet their own needs—is repeated over and over again. It has been demonstrated that violence begets violence. Many violent criminals and assassins were abused as children. Arthur Bremer, would-be assassin of Governor George Wallace, is a dramatic case in point.

Nonviolent Child Rearing

A society that begets violence must be changed. A system that accords no rights to abused children is absolutely criminal. Of course children should "honor their parents." But inherent in that principle is the responsibility of those parents to behave honorably, in a kind and nurturing manner. And though corporal punishment may be necessary under certain circumstances, there are often more effective ways of settling parent-child disputes and training children to behave. If these alternative methods were habitually exhausted before corporal punishment was turned to as a last resort, there would probably be very little need for "the board." Authority in the home should mean loving teaching and guidance, tempered with wisdom, kindness, and a willingness to sacrifice one's comfort and convenience for the sake of those young individuals one took the responsibility of bringing into the world, rather than authoritarian giving of orders followed by stern punishment for the slightest infraction.

Where the emphasis is primarily on mere obedience rather than communication and cooperation, the situation is ripe for violence. In Germany, for example, "a national poll conducted by the Bielefelder

Emnid Institute in Bonn showed that 72 percent of Germans interviewed felt obedience and respect for order to be the most important principles for child rearing. This emphasis on strict obedience to authority is considered by some to be the reason for Germany's having the highest rate of child abuse in Europe" (George M. Anderson, "Child Abuse," *America*, May 28, 1977, p. 481).

Knowledgeable child rearing experts suggest that many if not most family conflicts can be solved through effective communication rather than authoritarian intervention. One highly effective and proven approach is summarized in the book *Parent Effectiveness Training* by Thomas Gordon.

Changing Our Ways

Our entire society must be changed to get at some of the factors contributing to child abuse such as poverty, joblessness, and lack of adequate housing. Family patterns that foster dependency and immaturity must be changed through education and therapy. And societal approval of the unfairness, cruelty and actual violence that pass for "parental prerogatives" has got to go. A society that tacitly approves such abuse is sick to the core and desperately in need of self-awareness, reeducation, and healing.

More than that, individuals themselves must recognize the ugliness of child abuse in their own lives. Out-and-out child beaters who recognize their problem can be helped. There is an organization patterned along the lines of Alcoholics Anonymous designed to meet their needs. Called Parents Anonymous, it was begun in 1970 by a woman in California who had abused her own child and was unable to find help. There are branches all across the United States. At Parents Anonymous meetings, parents are able to discuss their problems in a supportive, understanding, confidential atmosphere with others who have been through the same struggle. Child abusers don't need punishing; they have had enough in their own lives already. What they do need is the help and support such an organization can provide.


But there are other more subtle forms of child abuse that take place in so-called happy, loving homes. Parents who think they couldn't possibly be abusing their children need to ponder the fact that physical violence isn't the only way to cause damage. "Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never hurt me" is a rhyme children use to cover up the fact that words can hurt very deeply. Verbal abuse, or even a lack of nurturing, support, cuddling, and physically expressed affection can be just as damaging as an outright beating.

Kids can be programmed to fail, even to die, by exposure to emotional neglect. A lack of affection, touching and eye contact can be deadly. Emotional uninvolvedness on the part of even one parent can scar a child for life. "Workaholic" fathers who don't interact with their children, mothers who have their own emotional problems and can't give their kids what they need, selfish parents with a "send-'em-off-to boarding-school" attitude—all contribute to stunted growth, not just emotionally but physically.

Everybody needs love. A classic study showed that babies in an orphanage who were given optimum physical care but no love, cuddling, and positive human interaction all invariably lost weight, sickened, and died. This "failure-to-thrive" syndrome is seen in varying degrees in families where love and affection are missing.

By withholding love and affection from our children, we are teaching them to grow up ignoring their hunger for the care and concern of others. We are programming them not to fulfill their basic human needs; to grow up partially twisted and unable to reach their full human potential.

It will take all of us to conquer child abuse, especially in its more subtle forms. It must begin in our homes, right now, before it's too late to program the next generation to love. But if we can build a safe, healthy, fear-free atmosphere into our family lives—if we as parents can really turn our hearts toward our children—we can have a part in building the kind of society in which child abuse no longer exists. □



PROBABILITY: WHAT IT SAYS ABOUT EVOLUTION

Probability is that branch of mathematics which deals with "chance" or uncertain phenomena. The probability of a given event is a number, between zero and one, which measures how likely it is that the event will occur. If an event is impossible, its probability is zero. If an event is an absolute certainty, its probability is one. A probability of one out of two, or 1/2, means that it is just as likely that the event will happen as it is that the event will not happen. Sometimes this situation is described by terms such as "50 percent chance," "50-50 chance," or "even money." The closer the probability is to one, the likelier the event is. For instance, an event whose probability is equal to one out of ten (or 1/10) is more probable than one whose probability is one out of a thousand (or 1/1000). On the other hand, the closer the probability is to zero, the less likely the event is. An event whose probability is 1/1000 is less probable than one whose probability is 1/10. Now to the question at hand. What does probability have to do with evolution? The theory of evolution claims that life, in all of its complexity, originally came into existence by random combinations of dead chemicals, i.e., by chance. And since probability is the mathematics of chance, probability should have a great deal to say about evolution. In the following two articles some of the relationships between evolution and probability are discussed.

A LEFT-HANDED TWIST: AMINO ACIDS IN METEORITES— EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION?

According to modern evolutionary theory, primitive life first appeared on the earth several billion years ago when random combinations of simple molecules such as methane, ammonia and water fortuitously came together to form amino acids. These amino acids in turn presumably united to form exceedingly complex proteins which then combined with nucleic acids that happened to be present to ultimately yield a self-replicating group of molecules: "primitive" life.

For years, many men, especially those religiously oriented, questioned whether such simple molecules could ever—by chance—produce amino acids, which are considerably more complex. Then, in 1953, Dr. Stanley Miller and other scientists demonstrated that if hydrogen, ammonia, methane, and water vapor were placed in a simulated "primitive planetary atmosphere," these simple molecules could indeed produce amino acids! More recently Dr. Sidney Fox of the University of Miami succeeded in synthesizing some nine amino acids by heating ammonia and

(Continued on page 14)

LIFE BY CHANCE?

Where did life come from? Did highly complex molecules form by chance in a primeval chemical soup? Did these molecules combine by chance into highly complex combinations thereby producing "simple" living organisms? Did such "simple" organisms evolve into increasingly more complex living organisms over billions of years by chance mutations and natural selection?

According to the theory of evolution, all living things, all human beings, all that we know of life on earth came into existence through such chance processes.

Just how credible is the theory of evolution? What happens if we apply the laws of chance—probability—to the theory?

In the following, the facts will show the utter improbability of even the "simplest" constituents of life coming into existence by chance, the greater improbability of such constituents actually producing living organisms by chance, and the fundamental inadequacies of the arguments offered by evolutionists to try to make improbable events probable.

First of all, let us consider the probability of a "simple" protein forming by chance.

Proteins are, of course, essential molecules for the existence of life. These molecules *(Continued on page 15)*

Institute of Technology, the total number of protein molecules that has ever existed on earth is about 10^{52} . This is a rather generous estimate, but let us assume it's true. Let us further assume that all these 10^{52} protein molecules are the size of the modest 400-unit protein we have been considering. When we compare 10^{52} to 10^{120} , we reach the conclusion that there is less than one chance in a hundred thousand billion billion billion billion billion billion billion billion that even a single one of all the protein molecules that ever existed on earth would, by chance alone, have only left-handed amino acids! And, of course, even if such a molecule did come into existence, it would not, by any stretch of the imagination, constitute "life."

Another comparison: The number 10^{80} is a generous estimate of the total number of atoms in the entire universe. Let's assume that every atom in the universe represents a separate randomly produced protein of 400 amino acids. Actually, our assumption is ridiculous because each protein molecule would require thousands of atoms to construct, so a universe of 10^{80} atoms could not possibly contain 10^{80} proteins. But even so, the odds are still more than ten thousand billion billion billion billion billion to one against one or more of those chains being solely comprised of left-handed amino acids! And remember, we are not even requiring any particular sequence for the 20 different kinds of amino acids. Our only stipulation is that they be left-handed.

Is the left-handed twist found throughout living things just "another chance accident," as most evolutionists are forced to claim, or is it a result of the forethought and planning of every organism on earth?

The answer should be obvious. The fact that the amino acids in living protein are *all* L-amino acids cannot be explained by evolutionary theory. However, it can be readily explained as the result of the purposeful design of a Supreme Designer!

Chalk one up, a big one, for the Creator! □

—Robert A. Ginskey

BY CHANCE?

(Continued from page 13)

actually consist of chains of chemical compounds called amino acids. A very simple protein would consist of a chain of about 100 amino acids. How likely would it be for such a protein to form by chance?

Suppose we have a "soup" full of amino acids. We want these acids to link up at random to form a protein consisting of 100 amino acids. How many combinations are there?

Suppose there are 20 different types of amino acids available. If we wanted a chain of two acids, there would be 20 possibilities for the first acid and 20 for the second—or a total of $20 \times 20 = 400$ possibilities. Similarly, if we wanted a chain of three acids, there would be $20 \times 20 \times 20 = 8,000$ possibilities.

Therefore, for a protein consisting of a chain of 100 acids, we have

$$\underbrace{20 \times 20 \times \dots \times 20}_{100 \text{ times}} = 20^{100}$$

possibilities. But 20^{100} is approximately equal to 10^{130} —that is, 1 followed by 130 zeros.

Is it reasonable to believe that such a protein could have been formed by chance during the history of the universe?

Scientists have stated that there may be as many as 10^{22} stars in the observable universe. Let's be generous and say 1,000 times as many (10^{25}) stars, just to be on the safe side. Instead of allowing just one planet like earth for each star, we'll give each star ten such planets for a total of 10^{26} "earths" in the universe.

Let's also give each "earth" oceans the same size as our earth's oceans—about 10^{46} molecules. Again, we'll be generous and fill the oceans with a "soup" of amino acids rather than seawater. So we have $10^{26} \times 10^{46} = 10^{72}$ amino acids floating around.

In order to give the evolutionists a sporting chance, we'll let all of these acids link up into chains 100 acids long every second. Since $100 = 10^2$, this would give us $10^{72} \div 10^2 = 10^{70}$ chains per second.

A year has less than 10^8 seconds, but we'll round it off and say we have 10^{70} chains per second times 10^8 seconds per year for a total of 10^{78} chains per year.

Now all we need is an upper bound on the age of the universe. Various estimates have been given, but a safe upper bound is about 100 billion ($= 10^{11}$) years. Therefore, we would have $10^{78} \times 10^{11} = 10^{89}$ chains formed in all our "oceans of amino acid soup," on all our "earths," around all the stars, for all the years the universe has existed!

But we have already seen that there are about 10^{130} possibilities. Therefore, the probability of forming by chance the given protein consisting of 100 amino acids in 10^{89} tries is less than $10^{89}/10^{130} = 1/10^{41}$.

How probable is this? The odds against such an event are beyond astronomical! Even though we have been exceedingly generous, the odds that one small protein could have evolved are infinitesimally small. And the odds against an average-size protein of 500 amino acids evolving are, of course, far greater.

True, an evolutionist (or maybe even a sincere skeptic) can always claim (preposterous as it seems) that it could have happened. Reasoning based on probability alone cannot lead to the conclusion that a protein could not form at random. But it does show the incredible odds against it happening!

Here are some of the evolutionists' counterarguments—and the answers:

- 1) *You can't prove anything by probability.* Some people say you can't prove the world exists; you can't prove cyanide is poison unless you try it; etc. What kind of proof do they want? Do they want proof that things fall down, not up? From back-alley dice games to highly sophisticated research laboratories, the laws of probability have proven themselves to be just as dependable as the law of gravity.

- 2) *Not all chains of amino acids are equally likely to be formed. The ones needed for life are more likely than the others.* This is pure speculation. There is no evidence that such is the case. The idea is based on an

analogy with other rare and completely unrelated chemical reactions (selective autocatalysis).

3) *Even though the probability is immeasurably small, it still is not zero. Therefore, it could have happened.* Do you want to believe in such an improbable event? Is such a belief rational? Would you be willing to bet your life on it? Would you send your child to school on a bus which had one chance in 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 (= 10⁴¹) of arriving safely?

In spite of the counterarguments, the following facts stand.

Fact one: If all the stars in the universe had ten earths, and if all the earths had oceans of “amino-acid soup,” and if all the amino acids linked up in chains 100 acids long every second for the entire history of the universe, even then the chance occurrence of a given very *simple* protein would be inconceivably remote.

But what if a protein did form by chance? Would that be life? Is that all there is to life—a blob of protein? Is a dead dog alive because he has protein? No, protein is just one small piece of an intricately complex puzzle.

Fact two: Natural selection—like a sieve—can only “produce” as output those organisms which already existed as input. Most evolutionists freely admit that an organism (like you and me) is an extremely unlikely collection of molecules (including proteins). However, they claim that natural selection is the fundamental probability sieve which makes unlikely collections of molecules like you and me possible.

But natural selection deals with the survival or extinction of an organism, not with its origin.

Certainly natural selection might explain why an organism survives or dies. But it cannot explain where the organism came from in the first place. Natural selection may explain the *survival* of the fittest, but it cannot explain the *arrival* of the fittest.

In order to see that this is the case, we'll use the evolutionist's analogy of a sieve. Suppose you had a mixture of sand, pebbles, rocks,

etc., and you put it into a sieve. The pebbles, rocks and coarser particles would be trapped by the sieve, while the fine sand would pass through. Would anyone seriously suggest that the sieve had produced the fine sand? Would anyone say that the sieve explained the origin of the fine sand? Ridiculous! The fine sand was there all along—in the mixture.

The same is true of the process of natural selection. Given many forms of life and given certain environmental conditions, the animals and plants which are more suited to the

Reasoning based on
probability alone cannot
prove that a protein
could not form at
random. But it does show
the incredible odds
against it happening!

environment—more fit to survive—will survive. Those which are unfit to survive will die out. But note that natural selection does not explain the origin of the initial mixture of plants and animals.

A classic example of natural selection is the increase in the number of dark moths and the decrease in the number of light moths in parts of Britain after the Industrial Revolution. Did natural selection produce dark moths? Absolutely not. A mixture of dark and light moths existed all along. However, industrialization produced soot and dirt on trees, buildings, etc., so that the dark moths had better camouflage than the light ones—the dark ones were more fit to survive. The sieve of natural selection allowed the dark moths to pass through while the light ones were trapped.

Fact three: Mutations are strictly limited and cannot produce genuinely new forms of life. Evolutionists claim mutations can produce genuinely new forms of life for input in the natural selection “sieve,” but

this has never been demonstrated. True, variation within a given species can—and often does—occur. Witness the fantastic variety of dogs which have “evolved”—largely under man's guidance—over many centuries. Yet a dog is still a dog, and no dog has ever been observed to change into a badger or raccoon.

Scientists, in an attempt to produce “new and improved” species, have irradiated many forms of life with intense radiation designed to “speed up” the mutation process. This they have succeeded in doing—but only in the rarest case has a mutation been considered desirable, and in *no* case has an alteration of species occurred.

For instance, numerous mutations of the *Drosophila* fruit fly have been induced. One remarkable group of flies had four wings instead of two. A beneficial mutation? Hardly. It turned out that the four-winged flies could not fly at all.

You might, as a matter of blind faith, believe that mutations are responsible for changing one species into another, but science has no evidence whatsoever for such a belief.

Let's put it all together. Fact one establishes that every organism is an incredibly unlikely collection of highly improbable molecules. Therefore the odds against any organism coming into existence by pure chance are unbelievably fantastic! Fact two means that natural selection cannot make an organism more probable, since natural selection requires the preexistence of an organism. And fact three leads to the conclusion that mutations cannot account for the arrival of new kinds of organisms.


Are the myriad life forms which exist today the result of the unfathomably improbable, blind-chance occurrence of highly complex molecules, followed by even more blind-chance combinations of these molecules? No. Does natural selection provide the answer? No. Do mutations explain how evolution occurs? No.

The conclusion is inescapable. Life was planned. Life was designed. Life was created! □

—William Stenger


Are you lonely? Tired of wrestling with marital or financial problems? Wish you had somebody to talk to? Maybe we can help. The Worldwide Church of God has a counselor in your area who's willing and able to lend an ear. He can patiently, discreetly and confidentially provide a sounding board when you need it most. He can give you encouragement, answer your questions about the Bible, and let you know when and where the Worldwide Church of God meets near you. (Now *there's* a place you'll find hundreds of friendly people willing to reach out—people just like you who share the hopes and dreams you share—people who could end up being the best friends you've ever had.) So whether you need confidential counseling or would just like to know where you could meet some happy, sharing people, pick up your phone and call now. There's no cost or obligation—we're here to serve you.

**Maybe
We
Can
Help**




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

Or write us at the address nearest you (see inside front cover). *Residents of California, Alaska and Hawaii may dial 213-577-5225 collect.



A MAN AFTER
by Jon Hill
DAVID
PART
3
GOD'S OWN HEART

This article was written in Israel, where I visited many of the sites associated with David's life. Bethlehem, David's birthplace, and the surrounding hills where he tended his father Jesse's sheep. The wilderness where he fled from Saul. The cities of the Philistines where David sought refuge from Saul, yet learned Philistine strategy so he could remove their stranglehold on Israel when he became king. Hebron, where David's forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were buried with their wives, Sarah, Rebecca and Leah—also the city from which David reigned over the tribe of Judah during his first seven years as king. And, of course, Jerusalem, which David made the capital city of Israel 3000 years ago. Jerusalem, where David dreamed of and designed the Temple of God which his son Solomon built. Jerusalem, site of David's sins against God in the tragic episode with Bathsheba and Uriah. The Mount of Olives, where David fled, barefoot and bareheaded, from the rebellion of his own son Absalom. The Temple Mount, where David stayed the plague from God and sacrificed on the site he purchased from Araunah (where the Temple was later to stand). And David's tomb at Jerusalem, where he yet remains, waiting to become king of Israel, forever, in the resurrection.



his gets us ahead of our story, but since one doesn't get a chance to go to Israel every year, I took the opportunity. I hope the experience will enhance the rest of this series.

David had gone through the bewildering—at the time—experience of being anointed by Samuel the prophet. Drawn from the ignoble position of being Jesse's eighth son, tending his father's sheep, David was catapulted into the heart of Saul's court as armor bearer for the king of Israel. This was a most highly trusted position, since, with the king's weapons in hand and the king unarmed, the armor bearer could assassinate him in the privacy of his chambers. Loved, respected, relied upon despite his youth, David soothed Saul with his music and conversation. Saul, fearful of the responsibility he held and more fearful of losing it, suffered fits of temper, migraine headaches, schizo-

phrenic tantrums—and David was his only solace.

Since Israel had entered the promised land, the Philistines had been their relentless enemy. Occupying the coastal cities and plains, rich in commerce, powerful in war, holding a virtual monopoly on every implement of iron from hoe to chariot, they had succeeded in keeping the struggling tribes of Israel at bay. The oppressed Israelites were forced to humbly harvest their meager hill farms. Now the Philistines meant to annex their land and make all Israel their slaves!

Slaves they had been before in Egypt. Were they now to become slaves in their own promised land of freedom?

Not wanting to expend more men and arms than necessary, and according to a common custom of those early ages, the Philistines offered to settle the whole affair in single combat with their chosen champion: Goliath!

"Then Goliath, a Philistine champion from Gath,

came out of the Philistine ranks to face the forces of Israel. He was a giant of a man, measuring over nine feet tall! He wore a bronze helmet, a two-hundred-pound coat of mail, bronze leggings, and carried a bronze javelin several inches thick, tipped with a twenty-five-pound iron spearhead, and his armor bearer walked ahead of him with a huge shield.

"He stood and shouted across to the Israelis, 'Do you need a whole army to settle this? I will represent the Philistines, and you choose someone to represent you, and we will settle this in single combat! If your man is able to kill me, then we will be your slaves. But if I kill him, then you must be our slaves! I defy the armies of Israel! Send me a man who will fight with me!'" (I Sam. 17:4-10, *The Living Bible*.)

Outmaneuvered, outfoxed, outgunned and outweighed, Saul and Israel were dismayed and frightened, uncertain, perplexed as to what to do in this situation.

For forty days they remained paralyzed, not knowing what to do. Morning and evening Goliath repeated his challenge. Philistine patience wore thin. Israel was desperate. Two armies were poised on the brink of total war, the outcome of which seemed inevitably in favor of the Philistines.

Knowing the outcome, we might be tempted to brush over the incident we all learned in Sunday school. But let's go to the battlefield. Do you know how much a man weighs who is able to fight in well over two hundred pounds of armor? The rule of thumb in the days of knights was that their shining armor was to be one-fifth of their body weight—and those men fought on horseback! That means Goliath weighed somewhere between 1000 to 1200 pounds! That's like a good-sized horse! In addition, he had weapons which were unavailable to most Israelis. Since he moved freely back and forth to offer his twice-daily challenge, he was obviously mobile in his awesome attire.

Now King Saul was no half-pint himself. Well over seven feet tall, he was formidable also. Since he was "head and shoulders above" all others in Israel, he was the only obvious champion for Israel. But he was king! He didn't want to take up the challenge; he knew of no one else to suggest—and no one volunteered!

Saul advertised for a champion. He offered a huge reward to anyone who could kill Goliath. He offered his own daughter to be wed to the victor (which promised a political plum and future influence, since he would be the king's son-in-law). He promised tax-exempt status to the victor's entire family. But still no takers!

Forty days of frantic effort to meet Goliath's challenge had the entire Israeli camp in an uproar. The costs of maintaining an army in the field were mounting—but were more welcome than the cost of defeat. The psychological pressure was overwhelming as the Philistine danger became imminent. Saul was at his wits' end.

Into this scene came little David, a teenage boy. Dismissed from court when the army took to the field, David had gone back to tend his father's sheep. News traveled slowly in those days without TV reporters at the

front, and David was not aware of the dilemma confronting Israel until he arrived from home with food for his soldier-brothers. The more he learned of the situation, and especially when he personally heard Goliath's challenge, the more he became incensed.

He saw things in a different light than those who had been wrestling first-hand with the problem for over a month. He didn't primarily see a giant in massive armor backed by an invincible army. He saw an insult to God! His first reaction was faith! His second was fight!

Goliath weighed somewhere between 1000 to 1200 pounds! That's like a good-sized horse! And he had weapons unavailable to most Israelis.

In youthful vigor he burst in on Saul and said, "Don't worry about a thing. I'll take care of this Philistine!"

"Don't be ridiculous!" Saul roared in exasperation. Imagine, the king and the entire Israeli army had not been willing to face this Philistine challenge, and now some pink-cheeked, harp-plucking baby-sitter for sheep from back in the sticks offers his services! "How can a kid like you fight with a man like him? You are only a boy and he has been in the army since he was a boy!"

But David argued back.

"Look, boy or no boy, I've killed lions and bears with nothing but a club and my bare hands! Besides, that's got nothing to do with it. God is really the one who helped me slay the wild animals that preyed on my father's sheep, and God is the one who will help me kill this beast of a Philistine who dares defy the armies of the living God!"

Why Not?



aced with spunk, reason and faith, what could Saul say? The Philistines were probably going to attack at any time regardless, and then they would all have to fight.

Saul was certainly not going to honor Goliath's terms of national slavery for Israel if he won, anyway. Time was running out. No one else had volunteered. Why not use David?

"All right, David, go ahead—and, uh, may the Lord be with you."

No use taking any chances though. Saul's own armor and weapons were rigged on David. Now he really did look ridiculous—he couldn't even move! Besides, he might have faith, but he was no fool! He had never trained with weapons or worn armor. He would have to fight Goliath with familiar weapons: a sling... and faith!

That sling, by the way, was not the type you may be familiar with. It was not a notched, Y-shaped piece of wood with a rubber band. David's sling was a precise

and deadly weapon in the hands of an expert. It was constructed with two long (30 inches or so) straps of leather with a pocket in which to hold a rock at their ends. The centrifugal force generated by whirling the stone at arm's length built up the power of impact of a modern bullet! It had a greater range than even Goliath with his spear. And to add caution, thought and care to his faith, David chose five round, smooth stones (not just one) to use as his ammunition. Smooth to improve his aim and reduce friction. Five because David never heard of the six-gun and because five was all he figured he'd have time to use. For good measure, he took along his shepherd's staff.

God helps those who help themselves—at least a little bit!

Giant Insult

Goliath had been waging psychological war on Israel for forty days—forty successful days. His morale and that of all the Philistines was high. The cowards of Israel were the laughingstock of the whole camp. Now at last it seemed there was going to be someone to take up Goliath's challenge. Decked out in all his armored glory, the half-ton monster went eagerly to face his hapless opponent.

What a shock it must have been when he saw *what* it was that proposed to fight him—him, Goliath, champion of Gath and all the Philistines! It must have unnerved him just a little! What good would it do his reputation to kill this imp? What great victory song could the women of Gath sing about his crushing of a gnat? Could this be serious? Were the Israelis playing some joke? He certainly couldn't refuse to fight, since he had offered the challenge to anyone eighty times in a row for forty days. Now it was the Jolly Gath Giant—ho, ho, ho—who couldn't figure out what to do! But all his comrades were watching, and he had to do something! This was insulting!

"Am I a dog," Goliath roared at a hundred and forty decibels, "that you send out a pink-faced punk to fight me with a stick?" The shepherd's staff was David's only visible weapon—a sling can be concealed in the hand. Then Goliath roundly cursed David with a string of Philistine epithets in the name of every god he could

Playing games with God, His will, and His people can be not only dangerous, but humiliating as well!

recall and shouted that he was going to make bird food out of this toy soldier!

There! At least that ought to take the edge off the humiliation and make for an interesting anecdote back in the bars of Gath!

The only trouble was at this point Goliath had made the most classic and basic of military blunders: he un-

derestimated his enemy! He made the same mistake all Israel made before him: he discounted God. He couldn't see God. The only weapon he could see was a club—and that was in the hands of a boy! Blind with rage, Goliath charged this shrimp, contemptuously leaving behind his defensive shield (which could have warded off David's rocks until Goliath could close with him). After all, what giant needs a shield against a boy with a stick!

Victory From the Jaws of Defeat



ommitted, David ran toward his enemy, fixing a stone in his sling as he ran. Stopping suddenly when in range, David whirled his concealed weapon. The last words the giant of Gath was heard to say were: "Here I come, bird feed!" The stone found its mark in Goliath's unprotected forehead and dropped him like a stunned ox! Since David had no sword of his own, he rushed forward and, grasping the Philistine's own weapon from his senseless fingers, killed him with his own sword and then whacked off his head!

The unbelievable had happened! Stunned, shocked, and in turn frightened, the Philistine army turned in flight. Israel gave a great shout and followed in pursuit. A bloodbath ensued. Goliath and thousands of his fellow Philistines became that day the bird feed they were so sure he would make out of David.

What an upset victory. Nobody believed it until they recounted it in one another's ears a hundred times.

David quietly took Goliath's head (a burden he could hardly carry unaided) and had his armor sent to his own tent. David knew the outcome all along—but everyone else was beside himself with joy!

Spontaneous victory songs sprang up to celebrate the event. One was particularly odious to Saul. Its refrain went: "Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands!"

Knowing what he had offered to the slayer of Goliath, Saul's first question to his chief of staff, Abner, was, "What kind of family does this David come from?" His promise of great monetary reward, tax exemption for the family and marriage to his own daughter weighed heavily on his mind. He knew Samuel's prophecy that God had already rejected him as king, that another had been selected—and he viewed everyone with suspicion.

From that time forward, Saul kept a jealous watch on David. When the evil spirit from God tormented him, he called David as before to soothe him. But, while David played, Saul flung his spear at him to kill him! Watchful and nimble, David dodged and fled. Finally Saul banned him from his presence and demoted him in rank. But in the public eye this only increased the popularity of David, the giant killer!

David's success had spelled dire failure in the court of Saul!

Since his offer of reward was public, Saul was faced with having to deliver it. He was reluctant to become a relative of David's, even through marriage. He puzzled

on how to keep his promise in the public eye without having to actually perform it.

David was modest even when the daughter of Saul was offered. "Who am I to become the king's son-in-law? My family is nothing in Israel!"

So, when the time came for the wedding, Merab, Saul's daughter, was married to another.

All was seemingly settled, but complications set in. Saul's daughter Michal had been smitten with love for David!

Saul was delighted to hear about it. He now saw how to rid himself of David once and for all. He appeared to be all for the marriage, encouraging the match. "Don't worry about the dowry, David, my son," soothed Saul. "You have done enough for me and for Israel to deserve her hand—all I ask for dowry is the foreskins of one hundred Philistines!" There—that ought to solve the problem. David might be able to slay one giant, but not a hundred Philistines! Surely he would die seeking his dowry for Saul's daughter's hand. He would fall in battle. Saul would be magnanimous in mourning a great and courageous fallen hero, would provide a big state funeral, would shed crocodile tears—all the while hiding his joy inside!

But unpredictable David jubilantly returned from a Philistine raid with *two hundred* Philistine foreskins. Saul's plot failed. David's popularity soared. Saul gained a new son.

Drat! Back to square one!

Could it be that David, later recognizing Saul's clever plot to remove him by death in battle, refined and used the same plot successfully against Uriah when he had his own problems to face in the Bathsheba crisis?

Royal Games

Now a member of the royal household, David became more famous and popular than anyone in Israel. He was a constant threat to Saul, a thorn in his side, an ache in his mind, a fear in his bones. Not being as clever as his young antagonist, Saul resorted to direct means of ridding himself of his menace.

Jonathan, Saul's own son, had become fast friends with David. Michal, Saul's own daughter, was David's wife. Saul was in a pickle! While feigning love and praise for David in their presence and his, Saul boiled with frustration and hate within.

With the Philistines attacking again, and David successful in every foray against them, Saul's spirits sank to a new low. Tormented and despondent, he called on David and, while he played and sang for him, attempted once again to pin him to the wall with his spear. Foiled again! The spear was still quivering in the wall, and David was gone!

Saul had David's house surrounded and sent his troops to arrest him. Curses—foiled again! Michal saved David from her father's thugs. She let him out the back window and put an idol in his bed. Saul's men slew an already dead god instead of David!

Confronted with her demented father's rage, Michal

lied: "I had to, father—he threatened to kill me if I didn't help him!"

God's Game

F

leeing to Samuel to seek advice on how to act in this dread circumstance, David hid in Naioth. When his whereabouts were reported to Saul, a contingent of soldiers was sent to arrest him.

But a strange thing happened on the way to Naioth. The soldiers met Samuel and the other prophets with him prophesying. God's Spirit fell on them all—and the soldiers forgot their mission and joined in the prophesying—no doubt saying things uncomplimentary about their king, Saul.

Another squad of soldiers was sent. Ditto.

A third group was dispatched. Same song, third verse; could be better, but it turned out worse!

Saul, in an absolute lather by now, went after David

What good would it do his reputation to kill this imp? What great victory song could the women of Gath sing about his crushing of a gnat?

himself. But the same fate befell him. Saul the king tore off all his clothes (signifying his being stripped of all authority) and lay naked all night prophesying right along with his three units of soldiers-cum-prophets and Samuel's men!

Everybody was incredulous! Saul himself saying bad things about himself, good things about David, foretelling his own doom, praising God! The story was told with glee throughout the land and so famous was it that a saying remains today: "Is Saul also among the prophets?"

Playing games with God, His will, and His people can be not only dangerous, but humiliating as well!

Coming in the next installment: exile, guerrilla war, atrocities! □

(To Be Continued)

MOSES AND JESUS— What Did They Have in Common?

To find out, write for the booklet *A Tale of Two Prophets* by Senior Editor Jon Hill. Send your request to our office nearest you (see inside front cover for addresses), or phone us direct or collect. The number is (800) 423-4444. Residents of California, Alaska and Hawaii may dial (213) 577-5225 collect.



A
TALE
OF
TWO
PROPHETS

— TOO HIGH A PRICE? —

Most of us think of eating as one of the few pleasures of life that isn't immoral or illegal. And so, as the richest nation in the world, we indulge... and indulge... and indulge. In affluent America, we annually consume nearly a ton of food and drink per man, woman and child. We spend over 200 billion dollars each year to satisfy our growing appetite. But the price we pay for our affluent diets may be even higher—much higher—than we realize.

The fact is, some 70 million Americans are overweight. Millions now suffer from a whole


the Affluent Diet


host of modern diseases—diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, cancer. And sometimes we wonder—are we really the best-fed nation on earth? Or simply the most overfed?

According to a recent survey, 88 percent of Americans want to know more about proper nutrition. Only 14 percent really believe our diets are adequate. Actually, there's mounting evidence that many of our modern diseases, including the leading causes of death, can be directly linked to what health authorities call the affluent diet.


Interestingly enough, the af-

by Robert A. Ginskey





“If we just ate sugar from natural foods, we wouldn’t get more than 5 or 6 percent of our calories from sugar. But it’s very easy to get sugar from refined foods.”



fluent diet thrives only where incomes range far above subsistence levels—hence the term “affluent diet.” People with an affluent diet consume large amounts of animal proteins and fats in the form of fried foods, meats, and dairy products; they substitute highly refined flour and sugar for bulky carbohydrates like whole grains, potatoes, fruits, and vegetables; and, increasingly, they choose commercially processed and fabricated “junk foods” over fresh, unprocessed products. Never before in all history have millions of people maintained such a diet.

“The affluent diet is something that is characteristic of every part of the world that has the Western standard of living,” states Dr. Kenneth Carpenter, professor of experimental nutrition at the University of California, Berkeley. “In Australia, New Zealand, Western Europe, United States, Canada and an increasing number of other countries, people are eating a lot of refined foods, a lot of meat, sugar, and salt. In many ways this seems like a good diet. We see children growing up typically quite healthy. They don’t have many infections. They get to be 21, tall, and in excellent

condition. The problems only seem to come in middle age.”

True, by the traditional measures of good nutrition, the affluent diet should be a healthy one. Protein supplies are generous, energy intake is adequate (though sometimes excessive), and key vitamin and mineral requirements are usually met. Viewed against the backdrop of humanity’s long history of nutrient-deficiency diseases such as scurvy and pellagra, and of widespread present-day undernutrition, the affluent diet looks healthy indeed.

But nutritional appearances can deceive, and nutritionists and doctors are now saying we may have to take a new approach to what constitutes “good nutrition.”

Empty Calories

Dr. George Briggs, professor of nutrition at the University of California, Berkeley, is deeply concerned that Americans are eating too many calories and too many nutritionally worthless foods. “If we look at the average American diet,” Briggs told *The Plain Truth*, “we find that about 45 percent of our calories come from fats. Now about 17 percent of our calories come from isolated fats—fats that are added back to

foods, as in the frying of doughnuts and the making of candies and pastries. Another 17 percent of our calories are in the form of sugar, so we’re actually getting some 34 percent of our calories from foods with virtually no vitamins or minerals. Then we get another 16 percent from heavily milled refined white flour, which is lacking in a number of valuable nutrients that are removed during processing. So we have to ask the question: How can we get all the necessary vitamins and minerals if 50 percent of the calories we consume are derived from fat, sugar and processed foods from which the vitamins and minerals are removed?” Indeed, it may come as a shock to most people that fats often account for 45 to 50 percent of the calories in a North American’s diet. In many Western countries, the national average is over 40 percent. In contrast, fats comprise less than a fourth of the food energy consumed in most poor countries.

But high fat is not the only characteristic of the affluent diet. It’s also low in whole grains. Moreover, most of the fiber, or roughage, in the outer layers of grain has also been removed—since in rich nations wheat is usually milled into refined white flour.

Actually, the milling process throws away about 70 to 80 percent of most of the vital nutrients in wheat. “It is possible that diets which have heavy reliance on refined flour could be associated with certain kinds of nutritional deficiencies,” warns Dr. Fredric Hill, professor of nutrition and associate dean for research at the University of California, Davis campus. “In the milling process there is a substantial loss of vitamin and mineral values, only part of which are restored by the enrichment processes that are now used by the food industry under federal and state laws.”

How Sweet It Is

Starch intake has also dropped precipitously in the affluent diet, only to be replaced by refined sugar. In fact, global per-capita sugar consumption has grown by half just since 1950, and the average person in the world now consumes 44 pounds of sugar a year. Americans, Australians, and Israelis down over

a hundred pounds of sugar per person every year, while Western Europeans average about 90 pounds.

The problem is, it's so easy in our modern processed society to ingest large amounts of sugar. The five ounces of sugar now consumed by the average person per day in Westernized societies can be easily consumed in the concentrated form found in candy bars and other sweet confections. But taking that same five ounces of sugar in the form of a 2½-lb. sugar beet, or the equivalent amount of raw fruit, such as some 20 average apples, is far more difficult.

"It's much more difficult to get sugar from natural foods because you have to eat so much," says Dr. Briggs. "If we just ate sugar from natural foods, we wouldn't get more than five or six percent of our calories from sugar. But it's very easy to get sugar from refined foods. It comes in the form of candy, doughnuts, cakes, frostings—all these good-tasting things. Many people eat sugar-coated breakfast cereals which may be more than 50 percent sugar."

Perhaps the most important point, however, is this: As our af-

fluent diet has spread, so have a wide variety of once rare diseases such as heart disease, diabetes, hypertension, and cancer—the so-called diseases of civilization.

The Fat Society

One major problem resulting from the affluent diet is an overweight, fat society. Obesity is more than a social problem; it's a source of great concern to health authorities because obese people run a higher risk of premature death than do those of normal weight. For example, men who are 10 percent overweight have a one-third greater chance of dying prematurely from ailments such as coronary heart disease, high blood pressure and diabetes than do those of average weight. Men more than 20 percent overweight are one and a half times as likely to die prematurely.

"Obesity is probably the biggest nutritional hazard or risk that we know," states Hill. "Not only is obesity a condition that most people would prefer not to have, but there is a close relationship between being overweight and various degenerative diseases, including diabetes, high blood pressure, and the com-

plex of changes that are involved in cardiovascular disease."

The Way to a Man's Heart Is Through His Stomach

Heart disease was once a rare affliction even among the aged, but it's now the leading killer of the old and the middle-aged in many countries. And it sometimes takes the lives of the young as well.


All cardiovascular diseases together, including coronary and other heart diseases, strokes, and arterial diseases, account for about one-half of all deaths in the industrialized countries. Coronary heart disease, which involves the coronary arteries through which the heart supplies itself with blood, often culminates in a "heart attack" when the blood supply is cut off. This disease accounts for one in every three deaths in the United States, claiming annually some 700,000 lives.

In North America and Europe, 10 percent of all coronary deaths strike those under the age of 55, and over half involve people under 75. Most of these probably could be prevented—and certainly could be postponed—by changes in diet and life-style.

The rush to the affluent diet has also been correlated with atherosclerosis. Atherosclerosis, the partial blockage of arteries with tissue growth and fatty deposits, can lead to coronary heart disease when the coronary arteries are affected. Since these arteries supply blood directly to the heart, a heart attack will result if they become sufficiently clogged. Any population suffering from a high incidence of atherosclerosis will almost certainly have high coronary heart disease rates as well.

The amount of fatty deposits in the arteries seems to be affected by the consumption of saturated fats and cholesterol. Considerable evidence indicates that a diet high in unsaturated fats lowers the cholesterol output of the body, while high intake of saturated fats, such as those in meat and dairy products, apparently stimulates the body to produce more cholesterol. High consumption of meat, eggs, and other cholesterol-rich foods can raise cholesterol levels in the bloodstream by about 10 percent.

Indeed, a well-known study conducted in Framingham, Massachu-



"We would never feed the average American diet to farm animals. No farmer would give his pigs or his poultry a good diet and then dilute it down with sugar and fat at the levels we're doing in our diet."

setts showed very clearly that the initial level of cholesterol in the blood of a large number of people living in the town correlated extremely well with their subsequent development of heart disease and their death from coronary heart disease.

Briggs, however, argues that some people can be very healthy even with a diet rich in cholesterol. "Should we decrease the cholesterol content of our diet? The answer to that depends a lot on your particular inheritance and whether or not you have a heart disease risk factor in yourself or in your family. The experience with the Seventh-Day Adventists and Mormons in this country has shown that we can eat cholesterol-containing foods and still be very, very healthy."

The controversy over cholesterol in the diet has not been completely resolved, but most authorities agree that elevated blood levels of cholesterol are closely linked with heart disease.

Diabetes: A Modern Killer

Diabetes is yet another disease that seems to be connected to our modern diets.

As the affluent diet has spread, the incidence of diabetes has risen throughout the world. In poor countries, diabetes appears to be mainly an urban disease; in rich countries, it affects urban and rural residents alike.

In the United States in 1900, diabetes was the twenty-seventh most common cause of death. By the mid-1970s, it moved up to fifth place. In fact, the number of reported cases in the United States jumped 50 percent in the eight-year period from 1965 to 1973. Diabetes is a major cause of blindness. And if the heart diseases, circulatory problems, kidney disorders and other potentially fatal complications of diabetes are added to its annual direct death toll, diabetes emerges as the third most important killer, trailing only cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Significantly, epidemiological studies tend to show that diabetes occurs with greater frequency in populations where there's a high intake of sugar. A study of Yemenite Jews in Israel was a classic example. This study found that people who moved

into Israel from Yemen didn't change their eating habits for about the first twenty years that they lived in the new country. Then they began to adopt the eating patterns of the Israelis, which included a much greater intake of sugar. As a result, they became more obese and suffered a higher incidence of diabetes.

Of course, cause and effect relationships are often very difficult to establish, and many authorities hesitate to say that dietary sugar causes diabetes. But they agree that obesity and diabetes are closely linked. Eighty percent of patients who become diabetic are obese at the time the diabetes is discovered.

Diet, Hypertension and Cancer

Hypertension, or high blood pressure, is also a cause for concern as one of the most common illnesses in the world today.

Hypertension can shorten its victims' lives. A 35-year-old American man with blood pressure 14 percent above normal for his age has lost about nine years off his life expectancy. A 45-year-old man whose blood pressure is 17 percent or more above normal runs twice the risk of a heart attack and four times the risk of a stroke than a man with blood pressure slightly lower than normal.

Research has firmly established a link between high salt consumption and high blood pressure in test animals. And the evidence strongly suggests that high salt intake contributes significantly to hypertension in humans as well.

Yet the average person in an industrial country consumes at least ten times more salt than the body actually requires.

Even cancer seems to be linked with our affluent pattern of eating. Of course, people who think about a link between diet and cancer often consider only chemical food additives. Synthetic additives do pose real enough problems, but research over the last quarter century points to dietary factors that may influence cancer rates far more.

Without question a high-fat diet contributes to the development of several important types of cancer, including those of the colon, rectum, breast, and prostate gland. Current evidence relates diet to as much as

50 percent of all cancers in women and one-third of all cancers in men. Since about one in every four people in the industrial countries develops cancer, and one in five people dies from it, the toll of diet-related cancers looms large indeed.

So what's the answer? Are we doomed to reap the devastating harvest of degenerative diseases that are being linked to modern dietary habits?

What You Can Do

An 85-page report recently released by the U.S. Senate's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs provides some valuable recommendations we should all seriously consider.

The report recommends that Americans reduce their consumption of fats from about 40 percent to 30 percent of total calorie intake (decrease their intake of saturated fats particularly), and increase their consumption of complex carbohydrates (fresh fruits, vegetables, whole grains) while reducing the amount of sugar in the diet and the reliance on highly refined foods.

To accomplish these goals, the committee suggests the following changes in food selection and preparation:

- 1) Increase consumption of fruits, vegetables, whole grains and legumes.
- 2) Decrease consumption of meat and increase consumption of poultry and fish.
- 3) Decrease consumption of foods high in fat and partially substitute polyunsaturated fat for saturated fat.
- 4) Substitute nonfat milk for whole milk.
- 5) Decrease consumption of butterfat, eggs, and other high-cholesterol sources.
- 6) Decrease consumption of sugar and foods high in sugar content.
- 7) Decrease consumption of salt and foods high in salt content.

Senator George McGovern, chairman of the committee, states in the introduction to the report: "The simple fact is that our diets have changed radically within the last 50 years, with great and often very

(Continued on page 41)

WHY NOT COMMUNICATE WITH YOUR KIDS?

Child psychology books tell us that a child of 18 months to two years old has one favorite word: "No!" Come here: "No!" Shut the door: "No!" Eat your cereal: "No!"

The first real communication frustrates the parents—not to mention the child.

Why is "No!" the favorite word? Probably because that is the most often heard word the child is familiar with, because the parents have been using it most frequently for the preceding 18 months! In order to protect the child as he begins to crawl, and later walk, it is necessary to tell him "No!" Don't put everything on the floor into your mouth. Don't get near the fireplace. Don't touch the porcelain birds on the coffee table. All the no-no's are well established. The yes, that's fine, good boy, good girl statements we make are rare if not missing totally.

So the child figures "No!" must be the way to communicate. Parents give up too soon because of this first negative conversation—which may not seem to be a conversation at all. TV takes over as the educator, mother, father, baby-sitter. The child learns many wrong things through this medium. After it is too late, we try to control the viewing. That only anchors the negative approach. But how can you reason with a child? He won't understand.

Despite the fact that the child's next favorite word seems to be "Why?" we fail to recognize an effort at meaningful communication. We substitute lies and myths for true answers. The stork. Santa Claus. The bogeyman. Meanwhile sex, violence and cartoons on TV have communicated inaccuracies and total confusion regarding the real world. Our child learns—but mostly the wrong things, answers, solutions.

We give up. Maybe school will help straighten him out—after all, teachers are supposed to teach, aren't they? But by now it's probably too late. The child knows he has not received meaningful answers from his parents; he's coy and shy in even discussing (advanced communication) his real questions because he's been told he won't understand even if he's told; or to wait till he's older; or we don't have time now (and probably never will); or don't disturb me, I'm busy; can't you do anything right?; etc.

Now the communication offered by TV contributes to the sum total of ignorance of all the kids put together, and they share their fogged knowledge with each other—don't trust anyone over ten! They've learned you can't really talk about the things you want to with your parents, the teachers, any adults—they just put you off, don't give right answers, don't understand.

Bad goes to worse and we end up saying we just don't understand why the child doesn't like school, get better grades, why he runs with the "wrong crowd," gets into trouble, smokes pot, gets pregnant, runs away, seems to hate us.

Children are a bother. We have forgotten what Jesus said: "Let the children come to me, for the Kingdom of God belongs to such as they. Don't send them away! I tell you as seriously as I know how that anyone who refuses to come to God as a little child will never be allowed into his Kingdom" (Mark 10:14-15, *The Living Bible*).

We hope God, our Father, will listen to us when we seek His help, guidance, answers. Seek and you shall find. Knock and it shall be opened to you. Ask and you shall receive. All those are positive responses from God. He doesn't tell us to wait till we are perfect so we will understand. He forgives our imperfections and patiently listens, and through His Word offers real answers to our problems.

There's a saying: "Talk is cheap." But it's not true. Talk is very expensive. It takes time, concern, care, thought, love. Kids know more than you think. Don't underestimate them. If they don't understand your first answer, phrase it in different words; if they don't understand your second answer, phrase it in different words; and on, and on, and on. Soon you will be communicating. Give them the benefit of the doubt and they will do the same for you. Give them your time and they will give you theirs when it really counts. Trust them and they will return the trust. Give them real answers and they will always come to you with their questions—and all their questions are important, because the answers are going to form the basis of their lives.

Try it. Why not communicate with your kids? □

Two words keep popping up in almost everything you read about world politics these days: human rights. Considering the way the phrase is casually tossed off in the media's interminable political analyses, reports and harangues, we would assume there was a settled definition of human rights. And since we all know what human rights are, we then all know when a right is being violated.

But no. Journalists, commentators, and Jimmy Carter all use the words "human rights" as a magical incantation designed to elicit an emotional response, but they never get around to specifically defining human rights or explaining from whence these rights are derived. Human rights, in today's news, rate a better press than mom, God, and apple pie, but the fact remains that "mom," "God," and "apple pie" are even less glittering generalities than "human rights."

Freedom Is Slavery

Unless there is real substance to the words "human rights," then even the most brutal dictatorships can claim to uphold them and be correct. When language has no meaning, you can bet that the first petty Hitler who comes along will just ooze concern for the protection of your "human rights" while he deprives you of everything

you ever earned and sends you off to his labor camps, telling you that in doing so he is protecting your "human right" to be free from unemployment!

The world already too much resembles George Orwell's nightmare vision of 1984, where Big Brother regulated the lives of everyone. But in addition to the dangers of totalitarianism, Orwell also warned of the corruption of language which inevitably accompanies it. The rulers of the 1984-state will tell you that they are protecting your basic human right—to be their slaves. Orwell summed it up when he described the slogan of a Big Brother society: "Freedom is Slavery. War is Peace. Ignorance is Strength."

It calls to mind the words of the Old Testament prophet: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil" (Isa. 5:20). Indeed, Isaiah's point is essentially the same as Orwell's: Language must have consistent and specific meaning or all manner of evil will be called good. The reluctance of world leaders to say precisely what they mean by "human rights" is a serious matter.

One current example well illustrates this point. Since late autumn 1977, a human rights conference has been going on in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Western delegates have dutifully recited any number of human

rights violations, mainly centering on repression of dissidents, by the Communists. And, in true Orwellian fashion, the Communist delegates have countercharged the West with human rights violations such as "capitalist exploitation" (this simply means working for someone other than the government) and "social inequality" (which may merely mean that you like roller derbies while someone else prefers the opera). Thus, given today's haphazard application of the phrase "human rights violations," there has never been a greater need to pinpoint the definition and origin of human rights.

U.N. Declaration

The primary human rights document used today in world politics is the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a list, drawn up by Anglo-American lawyers after World War II, which enumerates a series of rights as they might be enforced in, say, a court of law. The U.N. Declaration consists of 30 articles divided into four parts. Articles 1 and 2 are general articles stating that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" and that everyone has equal rights as specified by the rest of the Declaration.

Articles 3 through 21 enumerate various civil and political rights.

HUMAN RIGHTS COME FROM GOD

What are human rights? Where do they come from? World leaders are confused because they ignore the only real source which gives the answers.

These are protection from what government can do to you: You have the right to life, liberty, and security of person; freedom from slavery and servitude; freedom from torture; the right to own property; freedom of religion; etc. The common denominator of these rights is that they exist independent of the existence of any government.

Articles 22 to 27 cover economic and social rights. These define benefits the government should provide for you. They include the right to social security, the right to work, the right to a standard of living adequate for health and well-being, as well as the right to a compulsory public education. These rights require the existence of government and deal with its duty to provide its citizens with material benefits.

Finally, the rest of the Declaration states that everyone has the right to an "international order" in which he can enjoy his other rights.

There are two very serious flaws in the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. The first is that the economic and social rights of one man may necessitate the deprivation of the political and civil rights of another. For example, if you have the right to own property, does another man have the right to have the government take some of that property away so that he can have a "standard of living adequate for health and well-being"? Or take perhaps a more glaring example: If you believe in rearing your children to respect God, what happens to your, and their, freedom of conscience and religion if the government compels them to go to a school where they are taught an evolutionary world view while God is never mentioned in the classroom except in profanity? And to make matters worse, what if the government takes some of your property in order to finance teaching your children what your conscience abhors? (Indeed, it was Thomas Jefferson who said that to compel a man to pay for the promulgation of beliefs which he opposed was tyranny.)

But the other flaw is even more serious: The U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, as the noted writer Carl F. Henry has pointed out, is "silent on the theme of the source and sanctions of human rights." In fact,

the implication is that the United Nations itself is the source of your human rights. But what the U.N. giveth, it may take away.

Inalienable Rights and Nature's God

There are two other great human rights documents in the history of ideas: the French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1791) and the American Declaration of Independence (1776). The French Declaration contains 17 articles, which promulgate the idea that man has certain natural and inalienable rights with which he is born—namely, liberty, private property, and the inviolability of the person—and that the sole purpose of government is to protect those rights. The Declaration of Independence also states that there are certain "inalienable rights," and that men form governments to protect those rights, but it adds one more important idea: Those inalienable rights are derived from "nature and nature's God" and are so "self-evident" that any reasonable man will recognize them.

The idea that man is *born* with certain innate "natural" rights has an illustrious history going as far back as the great Roman orator Cicero and later jurists of the Roman Empire. Most of the thinking about "natural rights," however, has been done in more modern times. The concept's premier expositor was John Locke. Locke used as his starting point a conception of how men would be without government and asked what rights men would have in that situation. He concluded that if men had certain *rights* before they formed governments, they retained those rights afterwards also. French philosophers who had similar ideas were Rousseau and Voltaire. More recently, the idea of natural rights has been developed by Robert Nozick in a 1975 book which won national recognition, entitled *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Nozick starts with the same assumption as Locke: Men are born with certain natural human rights which they have before they ever form a government.

The Shifting Sands of Human Rights

But the Lockean idea that man is born with natural human rights can

be attacked at its base. Just the assertion that one is born with certain human rights does not make it so. In fact, many philosophers have rejected this notion. Jeremy Bentham, for example, said the idea of natural human rights was "nonsense upon stilts." Apparently, it just isn't something which is self-evident.

In fact, a modern-day supporter of Locke, noted English barrister and economist Arthur Shenfield, has admitted this problem and has even gone so far as to state that "it may be that no absolutely firm philosophical basis for natural rights can ever be found."

No absolutely firm philosophical basis! In our day of the Gulag Archipelago, political torture, the widespread confiscation of private property, the arbitrary arrest of potential political opponents, and the proverbial "knock on the door," there *had better be* a firm philosophical basis for human rights.

The irony is that the basis has been there all along, acknowledged as it was by Jefferson. How ironic that in an era in which we prostrate ourselves before "human rights," we reject the only firm philosophical basis for those rights: God.

The Fountainhead of Human Rights

The hard truth is that man is the created being of God, made in His image. While there may be better or worse ways of organizing human government, unless man has certain rights from God, he has no *absolute* rights at all, and everything he has is at the mercy of society.

Only God can be said to be the original source of human rights. If they come from nature, what "nature" says is subject to arbitrary interpretation. If they come from "society," society can just as easily revoke a right as give it. Indeed, the whole idea of human rights, as the great twentieth-century political philosopher Leo Strauss has said, is that there exists a law *above* society. This idea has been seconded by the evangelical intellectual Francis Schaeffer, who points out that if there are no absolute standards "above" society, then society is absolute. And if society is absolute, then it can take away everything

(Continued on page 44)

WHY PEOPLE DON'T GO TO CHURCH

by Lawson C. Briggs

If that's what religion is all about, it ain't for me."

"I don't feel a person has to go to church to live a Christian life. I'm not against church. It's just that I don't feel I have to go to church to be a Christian."


"No priest, no church is going to possess me."

"I think the churches have gotten like a lot of parts of society. They have to worry so much about paying the rent that they have forgotten the good news. . . . I find some of the clergy are very wonderful people, but a lot of them have to seek out the almighty dollar so much . . . that [they] are robbing the people of the great heritage of the church. . . . The leaders are afraid of theology."

"I feel religion is fine for some people, if you need it. Some people use it as a crutch."

"I didn't see anything [in church] worth taking. . . . Now it's anything goes, just so you don't hurt anybody. It doesn't make any difference. God probably doesn't exist anyhow."

The foregoing quotes are from the book *Who Are the Unchurched? An Exploratory Study*. The author, J. Russell Hale, is a clergyman and professor who traveled nationwide to do on-the-spot interviews with nonchurchgoers in six counties of the United States especially selected for their large proportion of "outsiders." In every location, interviewer Hale sought to identify not only the individual's reasons for not attending church, but any regional, social, economic and geographical



© Punch-Rothco

characteristics that might predispose to higher rates of nonattendance. But most of all, as a clergyman himself, Hale sought to pinpoint and verify just how the churches themselves were failing in reaching and holding the people.

The Unchurched Are Legion

Nonattendance at church does not of itself necessarily signify either unbelief or irreligion. Although over 90 percent of the American people reported to Gallup pollsters in 1976 that they believed in God and in heaven (and most of these believe Jesus was the Son of God, with a majority expecting He will someday return to earth), some 40 percent (near 80 million) are not on any church roll and even fewer regularly attend either church or synagogue.

The situation in the United States seems in some respects to be almost

the reverse of the case in parts of Europe. In Europe, for various reasons probably associated with history and the establishment (at least until lately) of churches as official arms of and partners in government, large majorities of the formally churched are functionally irreligious. These Europeans merely found themselves unconsulted, perhaps "birth-right" members of national churches or of recognized minority churches, among whose members they were born and grew up.

In the United States, such is only marginally so. There are, of course, the dropouts whose names remain on the

books but whose faces are never seen in services. But the more likely circumstance is that the unchurched are often believers in God and religion, but believers whom no church can call its own.

Why do these believers not profess themselves to be Christians through church membership and attendance?

And why is it that while 60 percent of U.S. citizens are church members, in any given week a full 61 percent of the total population does not attend any worship service?

Contrary to popular opinion, the unchurched are primarily rural rather than urban. And as a corollary, ten of the fifteen largest U.S. cities rank well below the national average of nonmembership. Smaller communities are apparently not as conducive to religiosity as commonly supposed. For while they

tend to have many church units, they are small, often unattached to any denomination, and are likely to be dominated by extended family groups rather than being truly representative of the community.

The Influence of Geography

Obviously, isolation and terrain have an effect on attendance at church. The length of Appalachia, rugged northern New England, the Ozarks region, and the mountainous and sparsely populated areas of Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, California, Oregon and Washington, for example, are in the lead for nonattendance, which helps explain the fact that the highest rate of unchurched is found in the West—varying generally from 58 to 62 percent. By comparison, the lower rate of nonattendance, the 30 to 32 percent bracket, comprises all the South, the North Central and New England States in general.

Teamed with terrain, there are regional attitudes that influence churchgoing. A typical North-wester, especially one from Oregon, might say: "The ministers and churches . . . are out of their sphere of influence when they try to tell their people what to think or do, or how to behave or act. People here don't listen to that kind of thing." It is the voice of the "common people" with "fierce individualism," their "Oregon spirit." (Don't fence me in!)

They also say: "People here don't like hierarchies—they want the right to fight among themselves and . . . to splinter off into new groups." But as a result of all that human nature on the loose, no wonder another complained: "The churches tend to define their doctrines so narrowly that the bulk of both the old-timers and newcomers are automatically screened out. Each group says, 'We are the true believers.'"

Meanwhile, a citizen of Maine at the opposite end of the country explained a related attitude: "Our ancestors came here to worship as *you* please, or not to worship as *I* please." Another said: Church is "one thing I don't miss." He meant when he *doesn't* attend.

Other areas, like Boone County,

West Virginia, for example, exhibit a high rate of persistent poverty, broken spirits and hopelessness. "Proponents of the 'foxhole theory of religion,'" says Hale, "would argue that such an area was ripe soil for the Christian faith. It is, if the tent-meeting revival conversions are an index of the vitality of faith. . . . It is not unusual to find individuals who have been 'born again' six or eight times, with a baptism by immersion to seal each rebirth. Few, however, find their way into the pews of the churches. . . ."

In places like Marion County, Alabama, there is a high percentage of newcomers to the area, many of them transient. They feel themselves to be outsiders, unwanted, and associate little with the churches, though a church is in walking distance of most.

The Florida sunbelt and the Orange County, California, sunbelt exemplify yet another type of religion—or lack of it. Here live many retired persons, and many thousands who have deserted their former home areas for one reason or another. They are enjoying the climate, enjoying leisure perhaps for the first time in their lives. They have no time for church. Many of those who do go, go early and then hit the golf course, the fishing boat or pier for the day. Churches stand for roots; these people no longer have any roots and want none.

But all of these things put together are insufficient to explain why many people do not attend church. The reasons are perhaps as numerous as the nonattenders themselves, and many of them deeply personal. Acknowledging the possibility of improvement on his "initial attempt" to explain church nonattendance, author Hale sought to tentatively classify his interviewees into twelve broad categories:

1) *The Anti-Institutionalists*. For these people the institution's leadership, or what were thought to be its unwarranted demands, were a stumbling block. "The pastors now, they won't even pick up a broom and sweep. Yet they want a big salary. . . . They don't do nothing ex-

cept preach." "The thing that disenchanted me was the pastor involved." "They move them on and bring someone else in. . . . They haven't kept a minister long enough for you to get acquainted." "I think that the ministers have lost their religion, and that may be the reason there is not much religion left [in a certain local area]." "They have no education, get hooked on strange doctrines and murder the King's English. They simply have nothing to say that makes any sense to the guy who thinks."

Some, mostly younger people, faulted the religious hierarchies for not getting more involved in social and political causes. Other ministers had espoused such causes and some complained because they had.

2) *The Boxed-In*. The *Constrained*, the *Thwarted* and the *Independent* are subtypes in this group. The *Constrained* have felt mistreatment which they had to endure, or have been offended by things (apart from matters of moral behavior) which were required by their church, or things unnecessarily prohibited. "Just negative in their teaching. You can't get a high school ring because the church doesn't believe in wearing jewelry."

Rules and interference led the *Constrained* inevitably to a break. "Last time [the pastor] came here, I suggested he turn around and leave. He was upset about it, said it was the first time he had ever been thrown out of someone's house. I didn't throw him out. I just didn't let him in."

The *Thwarted* had found their social and intellectual growth stymied. "The environment wasn't accepting at all. So I went to outside people, outside of the church. And I found much more acceptance, much more affirmation of me as a human being. . . . When I stepped outside of the church, I learned to resolve [a lot of things]. . . . The church perpetuates irresponsibility, dependence, a reliance on the authority of others."

Some seem just to have been born *Independent*. "Nobody will push me around. You see, I'm kind of rebellious in that I'm not really a follower. I don't march to a different

drummer or hear a different beat. I just am a leader."

Said another: "I don't have anything against the church. A certain amount of people need that kind of life. They need to believe, I guess."

With experience in several churches, another was openly hostile. "I have been to churches . . . and the guy came down and dragged me up front [in an altar call]. I told him, 'When I get ready, I can walk up on my own two feet.' Nobody's going to drag me down, coax me up. . . . If they would leave me alone, probably I'd go . . ."

3) *The Burned-Out*. Overexposed, even as children, or "used up" in church service—having filled every office, handled every duty, carried too much load—this was the story of the too heavily involved. Now they are tired. Or the church no longer seems to promise help to their careers. They may keep their membership, but for now they just aren't around to be asked for their time anymore. They plan to go back—someday.

4) *The Cop-Outs*. "I couldn't believe I'd go to hell for [ignoring church taboos/traditions]."

"Oh, I don't know that I ever lost my interest. I just don't have the time."

Akin to the *Apathetic* are the *Drifters*, who go here and go there but never take any church seriously. One described her current choice: "Then we found this little [denominational] church—we chose it for looks, the right location and so forth, nothing else."

5) *The Happy Hedonists* are enjoying the thrills of the flesh, not necessarily things actually morally wrong. They are busy, happy. They feel no guilt.

6) *The Locked-Out* include the *Rejected* ("I know poor people has a rough time in churches. 'Cause we have been down there. We just ain't got clothes fitten to wear"); the *Neglected* (many of the elderly, especially); and the *Discriminated Against* ("Manuel had a personal conflict there. He is Mexican-American. . . . Certain remarks were made by certain people. He won't go to that church again").

7) *The Nomads*. From illegal immigrants to upper-class business people subject to frequent transfer by their companies, for one reason or another some people are unwilling or unable to find roots.

8) *The Pilgrims* bounce from church to church to church looking for the ultimate truth—and are still searching.

The churches had better believe that Christians speak the languages of mortal men, not of angels. And every act of the Christian is observed, analyzed and evaluated by non-Christians.

9) *The Publicans*. According to almost all the unchurched, church people are hypocrites, phonies and fakers. How much of this is a face-saving device for the outsider? And how much of it is honest misunderstanding of how perfection is attained? Misunderstanding appears to be the main factor. "If that's a Christian, I don't want to be one." "He was one of the biggest crooks I ever ran into in my life." "Churches aren't too good for people. I think they are leading people astray."

10) *The Scandalized*. Is Christ divided? (I Cor. 1:13.) Multitudes are turned off by the multiplicity of Christian-professing denominations, and the splits and schisms even within the historic denominations. "If every church could get together . . . instead of always knocking the other one [many might believe]."

11) *The True Unbelievers* are made up of the *Atheists/Agnostics* (the true evolutionists); the *Deists/Rationalists* who think the universe itself is God ("If there is a God, He is in the beauty of the flower, the tree, the hills, the moun-

tains." "Belief in a personal God is just not rational"); and the *Humanists/Secularists* ("The thing that is most important to me is having faith in and love for people. That, to me, is what God is").

12) *The Uncertain*. "Legion were those who simply said, 'I don't know why I don't go to church. I really don't know.'"

It's Not What You Say, But What You Do

Having researched, compiled and sifted his material, author Hale concludes: "Even the most cursory survey . . . is evidence that hosts of unchurched people have been learning more 'bad news' than 'good news' from the churches and pulpits they have known. Sectarian versions of the Christian message have come across to many who are now outsiders as overloaded with law, moralism, judgment and rejection. Many have simply never heard of a loving God who accepts persons while they are yet sinners."

And so clearly does this message come across that one may be tempted to wonder if the following idea—a result of the belief in a stern, harsh, unloving God and disillusionment with hypocritical clergy and members—which was repeated by several people in Alabama, may not actually be common: "You are safer outside the church. Because then you don't hear the Word and what God requires of you. Then you're ignorant and God may be easier on you. But if you go to church, then follow the devil instead of God, you're in real trouble! You're going to hell. That's what the Bible says. You better believe it."

The churches had better believe that Christians speak the language of mortal men, not of angels. And every act of the Christian is observed, analyzed and evaluated by non-Christians. Thus the outsider is often able to say, "Look, their lives and acts are just like our own. They do not correspond in the least to what they are saying."

A mere excuse? In many cases, yes. But a *real* excuse, nevertheless. □

IS IT TRUE THAT... "EVERY MAN HAS HIS PRICE"?

That statement has been attributed to Sir Robert Walpole, an English statesman of the 1700s. What was apparently true then is still a major factor in today's world of politics and big business. Unethical compromise and conspiracy are very much a part of the fabric of modern society.

by George Ritter

Ernest Fitzgerald was no ordinary Department of Defense employee. During his tenure as cost analyst and program evaluator, he had received outstanding performance ratings. In 1967 he was nominated for the Department of Defense distinguished civilian service award.

Unfortunately, Fitzgerald was one of those types who didn't let fame and fortune get in the way of his honesty. In 1966 he began informing defense executives about massive cost overruns in both the C5-A and Minuteman missile programs.

"I think," he wrote in a letter to higher authorities, "the Minuteman program has suffered and is suffering from its own credibility gap. Some time back, lying was a way of life in the program. Financial figures were plucked from thin air, and deceptive technical information was presented as a matter of course The solution to this problem is ultrasimple: Tell the truth, no matter how painful."

But to Air Force officials and the defense brass the truth, in this case, had to be repressed. The Secretary of the Air Force subsequently charged that Fitzgerald had "hurt his relationship with people in the Air Force by the manner in which he carried out his job."

Fitzgerald's superiors chose to ignore the real problem and instead focused their grilling on him. He soon found his performance ratings declining from outstanding to satisfactory. He in turn observed that "opponents of cost control proposals tried to ignore the analysis or ridicule the analysts without coming to grips with the facts."

Fitzgerald would not be denied. Some of his charges came to the attention of Congress. A series of hearings was convened and the pressure for truth and light began to tell on the defense executives. In their eyes Fitzgerald was no longer an eccentric organizational gadfly; he now posed a major threat to their hierarchical existence. Strenuous efforts were made to have his role in the hearing reduced to that of a backup witness. If anything, the Air Force brass didn't want to be the subject of a full-blown series of inquiries by Congress.

Fitzgerald spoke the uncompromising truth at the hearings. From then on he was treated as an "organizational untouchable." His work was reduced to mundane tasks like monitoring cost overruns on bowling alleys in Thailand. One of his assistants was reassigned.

Finally, in November 1969, Fitzgerald was summarily told that his services were no longer required—his job was being "abolished" as part of the "current Air Force retrenchment program."

When the Secretary of the Air Force was later pressed by prominent congressmen about the incident, he replied: "I did not decide to fire Mr. Fitzgerald. I prefer to use the term, the correct term, 'to abolish his job.'" This bureaucratic double-talk quickly brought a chorus of laughter from the press, the audience, and congressmen who were attending the hearing.

Not satisfied with a simple dismissal, the Pentagon brass tried to further cover their tracks by charging that Fitzgerald had leaked confidential documents to Congress.

They accused him of having "moral lapses" and even tried to dredge up vague and tenuous insinuations that "conflict of interest" was involved.

A Not-So-Isolated Example

Ernest Fitzgerald was later vindicated by subsequent events, and the Air Force was forced to reinstate him. But his case is not unique. He is only one of many who in their conscientious efforts to preserve some semblance of decency and truth have run afoul of the political and corporate establishment.

Men in high places can and are bought off in our society—with surprising ease. In most cases principle succumbs to expediency as power and position-conscious individuals do a fast shuffle in looking out for old number one.

In recent years the military has shown classic symptoms of turning men into soulless corporate zombies. "If a man wants to get on," writes Ward Just in *Military Men*, "he goes along with his superior officer, which means making few waves. . . . Colonel David Hackworth, one of the most outspoken and abrasive (as well as the most decorated) officers in the Army," related what happened to individuals who only planned to compromise until they reached the top. "He [a two-star general] wanted his star, which is all right, and he admitted to me once that he would have to yield, to compromise to achieve his end. He said to me that once he had three stars he would straighten it out, fix the system. And that's the irony, because you're a different man then. You become the guy who you started out to impersonate'"

(*Military Men*, pp. 120-121).

Another officer, Lieutenant Colonel Edward King, also found that moral convictions could play havoc with a career in today's Army. Then opposed to the Vietnam War, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Army stating: "It is impossible to render honest, beneficial service to the nation or the Army in the atmosphere of fear, repression, injustice and selfish career promotion and advancement-seeking that flourishes within the command levels of the U.S. Army." The Army in return asked King to undergo a psychiatric examination.

The Corporate Cop-Out

The highly competitive career-oriented environment found in many modern corporations also tends to rob individuals of their personal integrity and moral scruples. The pressure to produce, meet corporate goals, and turn a handsome profit often take their toll. As Vance Packard wrote: "Those who reach the top level of hierarchy are, increasingly, those who have successfully shed their rough edges of individualism.

"Some corporate hiring agents are favorably impressed if an applicant has been through military training because that training, among other things, has taught him to accommodate to hierarchy" (*The Status Seekers*, p. 109).

One executive involved in a price-fixing scheme by the General Electric Corporation in the 1950s perhaps best summed up some of the primal forces that shape the thinking and personalities of many in positions of power: "I guess I am an organization man," he told the investigating congressional committee. "I felt I had to go along with the price-fixing scheme or I couldn't get promoted in the company. I always felt guilty about it, yes, but I felt I had to go along."

Another executive explained: "The tendency is for executives, who get stock options, big salaries, pensions and so on, to accept the facts of life going on around them. It is very hard to quit when you get a big compensation, and it's also

tough to be a nonconformist under such conditions."

The problem is compounded in government circles, where it is often difficult to identify the real villains. Politicians and bureaucrats are usually quick to make pious pronouncements about the sins of business and labor, but will vigorously decry any efforts to eliminate wasteful spending as a threat to "the vital public service" role of government. The upshot is that countless thousands of less-than-public-spirited individuals can cleverly disguise the perpetuation of their existence at taxpayer expense.

An Age-Old Problem

Those who tend to unashamedly voice their personal convictions often end up being placed in virtual political exile. While a few individuals may profit politically or economically, in the long run it's the man in the street, the citizen who has no voice or control, who suffers.

But in this respect there is nothing all that unique about our society. For centuries men have found ways to oppress their fellowmen in order to maintain a firm grip on the reins of power. Ancient Israel in the time of the kings certainly was no exception. Notice how the prophet Isaiah addressed this problem in the tenth chapter of his book: "Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees [legislation designed to benefit not the majority but powerful political supporters, entrenched bureaucrats, government monopolies, and public employee unions?], and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey, and that they may rob the fatherless!" (Verses 1-2.)

Also, in the third chapter, he wrote: "The Lord will enter into judgment with the ancients of his people, and the princes thereof [the leaders]: for ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses. What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor?" (Verses 14-15.)

The same practices were prevalent in New Testament times. "Look here, you rich men," the apostle James wrote, "now is the time to cry and groan with anguished grief because of all the terrible troubles ahead of you. Your wealth is even now rotting away, and your fine clothes are becoming mere moth-eaten rags. The value of your gold and silver is dropping fast [like today's dollar?], yet it will stand as evidence against you, and eat your flesh like fire. That is what you have stored up for yourselves, to receive on that coming day of judgment. For listen! Hear the cries of the field workers whom you have cheated of their pay [in the mad rush to maximize profits and prices above all else, and the tendency of some managers, past and present, to pay minimal wages until forced to raise them. Also the eagerness of politicians to rob people through inflationary governmental spending policies]. Their cries have reached the ears of the Lord of Hosts" (James 5: 1-5, *The Living Bible*).

As long as motives of political expediency and preserving the status quo overshadow moral and ethical considerations, mankind will continue to be plagued with the same basic problems. Men of principle and conviction will be driven from seats of power. James Bryce, writing in *The American Commonwealth*, eloquently explained what can happen when people in positions of leadership fail to have the courage of their political convictions. In criticizing the Whig party for not taking a strong stand against slavery, Bryce noted that "they did not perceive that in trying to preserve their party they were losing hold of the people, alienating from themselves the men who cared for principle in politics, sinking into a mere organization without a faith worth fighting for"

Perhaps Bryce's narrative on American history stands as a warning to us today if we are unwilling to demand the most difficult and courageous course of unwavering honesty and integrity from ourselves, our leaders, and our institutions. □

by Bill Moore

REVERSING RELIGIOUS IRRELEVANCE

*Is a minister simply a conductor-of-funerals, blesser-of-babies
and officiator-at-weddings, whose favorite food is chicken?*

There are probably more misconceptions about who a minister is, and what he does and why, than just about any other profession. Look at some of the stereotypes we have created in Western society:

The Father O'Flannigan-type—A kindly old gentleman, a bit feisty at times, but his lilting Irish brogue and concern for orphans endears him to all.

The Reverend Mr. Good—Forty years old, he has two teenage sons who indulge in all manner of mischief behind his back. His wife is petite and demure. He drives a faded blue 1974 four-door sedan and makes it a policy to visit each of his parishioners at least once a year—for dinner. Although a bland individual, he is respected by most.

The Youthful Idealist—Fresh out of seminary, he's full of theory, but short on experience. Bursting with enthusiasm over this or that new program, he can't figure out why his superiors don't share his zeal. The congregation tolerates him.

Those are some of the more positive images people have of ministers! Other stereotypes are less complimentary:

The Peddler of Pious Platitudes—His fifteen-minute message is full of felicitous phrases plagiarized from

the innumerable volumes in his study.

The Gold-Bricker—His job consists of giving a twenty-minute sermon once a week. The rest of the time he's free to play golf or work on his numerous hobbies.

The Hypocritical Windbag—Although his sermons are liberally laced with numerous moral exhortations, everyone knows he is guilty of the very vices he so earnestly denounces.

Irrelevant or Irreplaceable?

Within the past few years a small but growing body of critics has questioned the value of and need for a professionally trained clergy. They assert that the professional ministry is an outmoded institution that no longer effectively meets the needs of modern society. After all, goes their reasoning, of what relevance are medieval sacraments and pious phraseology in an age of computers and cruise missiles?

They point out that where the Church was once the focal point of community life, it now has been relegated to the periphery. It seems that Western culture has passed by traditional Christianity in its hurried race toward secularism, leaving the

ministry to tend to the elderly and the psychologically "walking wounded" who are no longer able to keep pace with the rapid-fire changes taking place in our culture. So the question many churchmen are continually asking themselves is, "How do we make relevant a two-thousand-year-old religion?"

But fortunately for humanity, the essence of that two-millennia-old religion is as relevant to today's world as it ever was. True Christianity is more than lovely parables or noble but ancient virtues. It is a dynamic, living way of life. And it contains a message of good news—a gospel proclaimed by Jesus Christ—of salvation for mankind. Proclaiming Christ's message to all nations is what we in the Worldwide Church of God call the *Great Commission*. This commission fired first-century Christians with zeal and dedication. For them, the reality of that promise—of Christ returning to establish the much longed-for Kingdom of God—was enough to drive them on in the face of all obstacles (Acts 1:3, 6-11).

It is a basic tenet of the Worldwide Church of God that this gospel of the Kingdom of God must be proclaimed to the world. Over forty years ago, in the depths of the Great Depression, the Pastor-General of the Worldwide Church of God,

Herbert W. Armstrong, began a crusade not only to warn of a rapidly approaching holocaust, but to speak out about a coming new age of universal peace to be established by Jesus at His return. Then came the Second World War which resulted in the unparalleled extinction of untold millions of human beings. It ushered in the age of potential human annihilation when an American B-29 released its top-secret payload over the Japanese city of Hiroshima in August 1945. Mankind had taken a giant leap forward toward fulfilling what Jesus said in Matthew 24:22: "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved . . ."

"But," Jesus continued, "for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." This is the positive part of the message: Mankind will not be allowed to destroy itself. Christ will return just in time and inaugurate His Kingdom of peace and prosperity.

Feed My Flock

Jesus Christ knew that as the ministry of His Church proclaimed this exciting and dynamic message, many would be convicted by it. His final instructions to the apostles included the provision that those who did believe should be baptized and taught "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you . . ." (Matt. 28:20). So, not only is each minister charged with the responsibility of carrying the gospel of the Kingdom to the world, but also with educating those God is calling in how to live according to His holy, righteous ways. To effectively accomplish this, God instituted a hierarchy of responsibilities that would enable people of diverse talents to serve Him and help others. "Some of us have been given special ability as apostles" (Eph. 4:11, *The Living Bible*), an administrative as well as evangelistic office. The Worldwide

Church of God recognizes that Herbert W. Armstrong has for many years fulfilled that function in the Church. "To others he has given the gift of being able to preach well; some have special ability in winning people to Christ . . . still others have a gift for caring for God's people as a shepherd does his sheep, leading and teaching them in the ways of God."

Rather than "lording it over people," the purpose of the ministry is to serve those who comprise the Church or Body of Christ. It is a position of *service*, not of prestige. The words of the New Testament serve as a constant reminder of this point: "Fellow *elders* [one of the first-century titles for a minister], this is my plea to you: Feed the flock of God; care for it willingly, not grudgingly; not for what you will get out of it, but because you are eager to serve the Lord. Don't be tyrants, but lead them by your good example . . ." (1 Peter 5:1-3, *The Living Bible*). The New Testament is filled with admonitions to the ministry to carefully guide, teach and care for the Church.

But for what purpose? Why is there so much emphasis on teaching and training the congregation? Is it just so they can successfully "retire" to heaven or make life here and now a little more bearable for themselves? The apostle Paul explained to the Christians living in and around the Ionian city of Ephesus: "Why is it that he gives us [ministers] these special abilities to do certain things best? It is that God's people will be equipped to do better work for him . . ." (Eph. 4:12).

Man's Ultimate Destiny

But why? It is a foundational precept of the Worldwide Church of God that man has been created for a great purpose; a purpose few have ever dreamed possible. The first chapters

of Genesis clearly show man was created to rule: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion [rule] over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle . . . and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1:26, 28). But tiny planet Earth is just a training ground, a preparatory school for something far, far bigger; something more awesome than the human mind can fully comprehend.

It is the Creator's express intention to share rulership not only of this earth with mankind, but eventually the entirety of the universe. Salvation isn't just immortality, which in itself is priceless, but it is also the exhilarating, joyous opportunity to share in the creative powers of God, possibly carrying His programs to distant solar systems and galaxies. That's something mortal humanity is incapable of accomplishing physically or spiritually. (For more information on man's destiny write for the free booklet *Why Were You Born?*)

However, before anyone is given the *gift* of eternal life (Rom. 6:23), not to mention the gift of the awesome powers of God, God must know these gifts will never be abused or misused. Thus the need to test mankind by giving him (through his limited intellectual and creative abilities) the opportunity to learn the kinds of lessons that will serve him for eternity. God designed this great master plan to move through successive stages, each building upon the foundation of the previous one. Down through history He has taught and prepared various groups of individuals—the patriarchs, kings, prophets, the apostolic Church—to take their place in that plan. Through this plan *all men* everywhere and from *all times* will someday be given the opportunity to qualify as a son of God.

Since each Christian will

someday serve all mankind as a spirit-composed leader and teacher, the ministry endeavors to provide each member with the opportunity for instruction and encouragement in the development of godly character, the most essential ingredient needed to one day guide others in a just and righteous way.

From Sermons to Seminars

To accomplish this goal, the ministry utilizes many educational programs. One is the weekly Sabbath Church services, which include sermons that fulfill Paul's admonition: "And so I solemnly urge you before God and before Jesus Christ—who will some day judge the living and the dead when he appears to set up his kingdom—to preach the Word of God urgently at all times, whenever you get the chance, in season and out, when it is convenient and when it is not. Correct and rebuke your people when they need it, encourage them to do right, and all the time be feeding them patiently with God's Word" (II Tim. 4:1-2, *The Living Bible*). As a consequence, sermon subjects range from how to live by the Ten Commandments to principles of good health. Each sermon is heavily biblical in content, with the congregation encouraged to follow along in their Bibles as well as take notes for further study. In order to present such a varied spectrum of subjects, a minister is required to spend a great deal of his time researching and reading. A one-hour sermon may take many hours of preparation, not to mention the weeks or even months of background study in that particular subject. This is why a minister's study is usually filled with books, magazines, and journals; they are tools of his trade.

However, a sermon is only one means of imparting information. Certain types of subjects are better

suited to formats that also allow people to ask questions about what they have heard or read. Thus, as well as giving sermons on the Sabbath, ministers of the Worldwide Church of God also conduct informal Bible studies in members' homes or in small meeting halls if numbers warrant it. Like Sabbath services, these Bible studies are open to anyone interested in coming and asking questions about the Bible or the Church. The topics of these studies may be a detailed discussion of a particular Church doctrine or a verse-by-verse exposition of a book of the Bible, including its background and relevance to the life of a Christian in the twentieth century. A minister may conduct one or two of these Bible studies each week, thus requiring more study and preparation on top of the preparation for his weekly sermon.

But the time devoted to sermon and Bible-study preparation occupies only a small percentage of a minister's weekly schedule. The Church's ministry must deal with all types of human problems and meet the needs of each age group in the congregation. To do this effectively requires additional study and, when possible, graduate-level courses in sociology and human development. The result is a program tailored to reach the young, enrich middle-aged marriages, or more effectively utilize the elderly.

As an adjunct to the efforts of the local pastor, the Church from time to time sponsors a series of professionally conducted seminars that are open to the public. For example, some of the topics presented are "Finding Your Personal Identity," "Keys to Motivational Leadership," "Achieving Success in a Changing World," and "Facing the Alcoholism Challenge." These and similar programs have already been conducted in over 50 American and Canadian cities, with another fifty scheduled for 1978.

Another important aspect of a minister's job is his role as counselor. A considerable portion of his week is devoted to working with people on a one-to-one basis, explaining the Church's teachings to those interested, visiting the sick, counseling about personal needs or problems, and making social, get-acquainted visits in members' homes.

Also occupying much of the minister's often hectic schedule are typical pastoral functions such as baptisms, lay-leadership classes, various church social activities and organizations, public relations, and community services like the P.T.A., Alcoholism Rehabilitation Centers, the Little League, or even the Civil Air Patrol.

And somehow in the midst of all these numerous duties a minister must also assume his share of the Church's Great Commission of preaching the "gospel of the Kingdom" to all the world through his own personal efforts of evangelism as well as those of each member of his congregation. The Church has never practiced the door-to-door style of evangelism, preferring instead to let the Christian's life be a witness and light of Christ's work. It has been found that often as high as fifty percent of new people who express interest in joining the Church do so because of the example of members' lives.

So a minister's job is more than holding the hand of the dying. It is more than administering the ordinance of baptism or the Passover bread and wine. It is the exhilarating challenge of an Olympic coach training his team to the peak of their skill and endurance, infusing them with the enthusiasm and determination to win. It is a dynamic, exciting, always interesting, never ending quest for excellence as an individual and as a member of Christ's Body, the Church. □

RUSSIA?

(Continued from page 7)

by high U.S. State Department officials, that unless all parties to disputes—Communist-backed guerrillas included—come to negotiated settlements, then war in which the Russians and Cubans are invited in by the militants is inevitable.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger lashed out against this reasoning in a major address to a gathering of international radio and television executives in New York City this spring: "It is time," said Kissinger, "that one overcomes the ridiculous myth of the invincible Cubans. Who has ever heard of Cubans conducting a global foreign policy? We cannot conduct our foreign policy under the threat of the possible intervention of Cuban troops. It is a sign of the decline of our world position that we have inflicted upon ourselves through Vietnam, the collapse of executive authority produced by Watergate and our own internal disputes.

"Twenty years ago this would have been considered absurd.... Let us justify our foreign policy by arguments other than the fear of Cuban military intervention."

Ignoring Reality

The younger U.S. State Department bureaucrats, conditioned by the trauma of Vietnam, would undoubtedly quarrel with Dr. Kissinger's analysis. Many simply cannot or do not wish to fathom the intention of Soviet leaders: a doctrinal dedication to achieving world domination. In the words of Paul Nitze, former U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, they aim to achieve "a world controlled by regimes fashioned on the scientific socialist model—a world in which they, because of their longer experience, their years of effort and sacrifice on behalf of the Communist movement, and their preponderant power, will be the unchallenged hegemonic leaders."

Many in America seem to want to wish away the reality of power politics; to treat, in the words of political analyst George Will, "the U.S.S.R. as if it were just like any

other state, in the hope that it will finally behave that way."

Dreaming of a man-made utopia based upon the "brotherhood of man," "those things that unite us," or "human rights" doesn't change reality. "Power politics," says one expert, Dr. Dirk Kunert, "is the enduring condition of international politics."

How true. And it will remain so until Jesus Christ returns with unchallengeable power to put down warring mankind. "We give thee thanks, O Lord God, sovereign over all, who art and who wast, because thou hast taken thy great power into thy hands and entered upon thy reign. The nations raged, but thy day of retribution has come.... the time to destroy those who destroy the earth" (Rev. 11:17, 18, *The New English Bible*).

Allies Speak Harsh Words

Getting back to the present, it is no wonder that key allies around the world are having doubts about the ability of the United States to defend the free world against the rapidly mounting Soviet challenge.

What the leaders of America's allies are saying about the current administration in Washington, in fact, is hardly flattering. But it reflects the growing frustration they feel over the demise of American world leadership; over a country that seemingly has lost its bearings.

The respected West German newsmagazine *Der Spiegel*, in its cover story of April 10, 1978, reported that Chancellor Helmut Schmidt sees President Carter as "an unfathomable amateur who tries to stamp his private morals on world politics, but in reality is incapable of fulfilling his role as leader of the West."

Chancellor Schmidt has also delivered strong words to Washington about a major sore point with the Germans in particular: the Carter Administration's prolonged neglect to come to the aid of the sinking U.S. dollar.

Opposition leader Franz Josef Strauss was, as expected, extremely vocal in his reaction to Mr. Carter's decision to postpone development of the neutron bomb. "In my knowledge of American history," Strauss

said, "this is the first time since World War II that an American President openly and perceptibly lay down before a Russian czar." He used the German word *gekuscht* for "lay down," the past tense of "to lie," as in lying down like a dog at its master's feet.

The Germans are not the only ones reacting negatively to current U.S. policy. The French press (with the exception of the Communist newspapers) almost unanimously condemned the neutron bomb decision.

President Giscard d'Estaing is known to think that the U.S. should be much tougher on the Soviets for their African adventurism; that Washington should "punish" the Soviets by halting sales of grain and sophisticated technology. The French sense a power vacuum in the Western alliance, especially concerning Africa, and have decided to fill it themselves for the time being.

On the other side of the globe, the Communist Chinese, who consistently advocate a strong Europe and NATO to counterbalance the Soviets, denounced the Carter decision on the neutron bomb as a "grave error." The Chinese also reacted strongly to the Moscow/Havana-engineered flare-up in Zaire. Peking's Foreign Minister Huang Hua made a hasty visit to Kinshasa to show support for embattled President Mobutu. The Chinese leader promised to send military advisors.

The Japanese, too, are showing signs of anxiety about the overall U.S.-Soviet power balance. Specifically they are worried about the growing might of the Soviet Union's Far East fleet and the corresponding shrinkage of the U.S. Pacific fleet. If the sea-lanes to Japan were ever cut, her economy could barely last a month.

The lack of confidence in America's commitment to defend Japan was revealed recently in a public opinion poll taken by a Japanese newspaper. "Do you think that the United States would really defend Japan in the case of emergency?" was the question asked. Thirty-eight percent replied no, and only 21 percent said yes.

The chairman of one of Japan's big chemical companies said:

"There are Russian planes and submarines all around us. I am no right-wing warmonger, but I do believe we must have more of our own self-defense."

Don't Count on America

As never before America's allies are giving thought to the idea that if they are to survive the Soviet challenge they are going to have to do it themselves. Washington isn't likely to come to their aid when the chips are down, as the late French President Charles de Gaulle warned repeatedly.

At a recent speech at Cornell University, former British Prime Minister Edward Heath said: "We in Europe will no longer be able to expect the United States to take action in any part of the world to put right something which we don't like. This is a new world into which we have moved. Europe must be prepared to make a greater contribution to the security of the Atlantic alliance as a whole."

A particularly acute analysis of the impending rift between America and Europe appeared in London's *Sunday Telegraph* of April 16. Columnist Peregrine Worsthorne, in his article entitled "A Chamberlain in the White House," reminded his readers that for about a quarter of a century Europeans slept happily at night, secure in the knowledge that America's free-world leadership, backed up with her nuclear strategic force, kept them safe. But 1978 is no longer the 1950s and 60s, he said. Europeans must reflect upon more traditional "19th century doubts about the United States' capacity for international leadership."

The United States, stressed the columnist, "has succeeded in arousing distrust about its leadership across the whole political spectrum in Western Europe. . . ."

A Call for Self-Defense

American policy in southern Africa was a major ingredient of this lack of confidence. According to Worsthorne: "The Carter Administration, dragging [British Foreign Secretary] Dr. Owen behind it, is determined to destroy the black-white internal settlement in Rhodesia and to bring about revolutionary conditions in South Africa itself,

wholly regardless of the consequences of such evil courses on the economic life and security of Western Europe. If it succeeds in this endeavour, it will be the beginning of the end of the Western alliance, since vital European interests will have been sacrificed."

The same could be said of critical European interests in the Middle East—the source of Western Europe's energy needs.

"So perhaps the prewar generation was correct after all," concluded Worsthorne, "not to rely on the United States. When even pro-American Europeans are compelled to reach this conclusion—as increasingly they are—then surely the time has come for something to be done about it. In fact, the obvious reaction, which may well be long overdue, is for Western Europe to look more and more to its own defenses and its own interest, if need be, in defiance of the U.S. Such a world could well be intensely dangerous, but even this could be a blessing in disguise. Without the shelter of the American umbrella, Europe might once again find the will—after decades of decadence—to be true to its own destiny."

Needed: A New Bismarck

But which nation would lead this unified Europe? In an article in the *Daily Telegraph* of April 7 titled "Europe in Need of Pilot," a British member of Parliament, Julian Critchley, wrote: "Is there a modern Bismarck in Europe? He, too, may well be German, for it is the Federal Republic which has become the most powerful nation within the [European] community. The Iron Chancellor was the architect of German unity in the 19th century; if the Common Market is ever to become a superstate and not just a supermarket, it will be the result of German leadership."

Critchley added that such a German-led union could come about "in the face of a common enemy"—alluding to the Soviet threat. "Fear would be the cement."

For years—even before the conclusion of the Second World War—the editors of *The Plain Truth* have warned their readers that, based upon biblical prophecy—specifically the 13th and 17th chapters of Revela-

tion (coupled with the book of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7)—there would eventually arise a powerful united Europe, reconstituting, in modern form, the ancient Roman Empire. Such an entity, cemented by the fear of being swallowed up by Soviet power, would, of necessity, move first into an adversary relationship with the United States before its ultimate showdown with Communism.

Now news reports bear out this very trend. (For a concise explanation of end-time events, write for our free booklet *The Book of Revelation Unveiled at Last*.)

For the past three decades the nations of free Europe have inch by inch coalesced into a common economic bloc. It has been a slow process—even though the professed goal of the European Community is political unity.

The final union of Europe could very well be forged out of fear for the future—and fear that Europe's two-millennia-old Roman Catholic-based culture is about to be trampled under the heels of atheistic Soviet "scientific socialism."

Western Europe is not quite at this stage yet. Its rulership is primarily socialist oriented, more to the soft left of the political spectrum. But as the Soviets continue to eat away at Europe's worldwide interests, and the U.S. response remains confused and timid, there will, to use the words of columnist Worsthorne, "be a right-wing backlash against the United States of a ferocity which will make the left-wing revulsions of Vietnam seem puerile."

U.S. Isolated; Europe to Unite

The end result, according to a prominent international investment expert, could be this: "Watch out for the possibility of a massive reshuffling in world alliances. Given our [America's] present foreign policy, the United States could be left alone in the world without allies. . . . We have an extraordinary foreign policy: Abandon friends, subsidize enemies."

In Europe, when this "massive reshuffling" is over, the result will be a United Europe unified in the face of the Soviet threat, standing apart, if need be, in defiance of an isolated United States. □

ON EARTH

(Continued from page 3)

rior to that possessed by man. One might suppose that, endowed with such great knowledge and being created holy, they would never choose wrongly, or commit sin.

But some of them did! Their superior knowledge did not prevent rebellion, sin, and worldwide chaos and destruction.

Originally, the angels under Lucifer were holy—and Lucifer himself, sealing up the sum of wisdom, perfection and beauty, was created perfect. Yet he led the first rebellion, and evidently induced his angels to follow him in this supersin. Thus the angels sinned (II Peter 2:4). They rebelled against God's way. They deliberately formed within themselves *evil* character. They turned from God's government to vanity, lust and greed; jealousy and envy; competition leading to strife, violence, war. They resented any rule over them. They wanted to choose *their own way*, not God's way.

Thus the government of God was rejected, removed from the earth.

The creation of this group of angels was now complete! They had formed evil character. They became *demons*. And the great Lucifer became Satan the devil.

So possession of vast knowledge and endowment with free choice does not constitute perfect righteous character. Neither does it absolutely prove that the remaining two-thirds of the holy, righteous angels will not turn to sin.

There are three alternatives. One is that all of the angels were put on earth and a third of them went the wrong way, while the remaining two-thirds developed righteous character. The second possibility is that God placed a third of the angels on earth and they all sinned by following Satan in his rebellion. The final possibility leaves the angelic attainment of perfect, righteous, holy character uncompleted as of now. Perhaps this latter possibility is the most likely.

What God Is

But now look at God Himself, and consider what He must have consid-

ered. God possesses perfect, righteous character. God will not sin. God will not go contrary to the perfect, holy, spiritual law which He created and set in living, active, inexorable motion, to cause and produce *all good*. God has *so set* Himself that He cannot sin.

So here we have the state of things, as God saw them, after the sinning devil and demons were cast down to the earth they had ruined. When the earth first was created, the angels shouted for joy (Job 38:7). There was happiness, joy, ecstasy, perfect peace on the earth as long as the government of God was administered on earth. But the universal sin of the angels on earth had apparently brought universal destruction! The earth was in a state of ruin.

Can we see, therefore, that God had these facts to consider? That immortal beings possessing great knowledge and freedom of choice, but *without* proven righteous character, could not guarantee the preservation and improvement of His creation. You see, *God is Creator and Preserver* of His creation. It is Satan and his angels who turned to destruction—and became destroyers.

The Second Phase of God's Great Purpose

God knew that if the angels chose evil character, it left Him as the only Being in existence who could possibly be relied upon never to deviate from His government, its laws, and its way of life.

We have now reached the point where the government of God—the means of building and instilling righteous, holy, perfect character—was abolished from the earth. It must be restored. That is *uppermost in God's mind!*

God must have said: "There's just not enough of me." He needed millions or billions of perfect and righteous beings, governed by His government, to complete in beauty, majesty and glory not only the other planets of our solar system, but of our Milky Way, and the countless other galaxies of the limitless, vast universe. So now comes the next phase of God's overwhelmingly grand purpose: to REPRODUCE HIMSELF into billions of God-beings. □

(To Be Continued)

DIET

(Continued from page 26)

harmful effects on our health. These dietary changes represent as great a threat to public health as smoking. Too much fat, too much sugar or salt, can be and are linked directly to heart disease, cancer, obesity, and stroke, among other killer diseases. In all, six of the ten leading causes of death in the U.S. have been linked to our diet."

"I cannot think of any reason why following the McGovern recommendations would be inadvisable," concludes Carpenter. "One is simply going back to the kind of diet that has been found over long periods to support good health. One would be going back to a tested diet rather than being on the modern diet which in terms of generations is an untested diet."

The Prudent Diet

There's an old saying: "An apple a day keeps the doctor away." Most people today probably think that expression has little relevance to good diet and health. But one thing is certain: Americans—and increasingly other affluent nations of the world—are *not* keeping the doctor away. The cost in dollars is high enough, but the cost in human suffering and death is incalculable. Over 70 percent of all deaths in the United States are caused by diseases linked to the composition of our diet.

"We would never feed the average American diet to farm animals in this country," asserts Briggs. "No farmer would go out and give his pigs or his poultry a good diet and then dilute it down with sugar and fat at the kind of levels that we're doing in the American diet."

"Americans eat too much food," states Dr. Mark Hegsted of Harvard University. "They eat too much meat, too much fat—especially saturated fat—too much cholesterol, too much salt, too much sugar. They should cut their consumption of these and increase their consumption of fruit, vegetables, and cereal products, especially whole grains."

Instead of the affluent diet, we need a prudent diet. Our health and lives depend on it. □

Personal from...

(Continued from page 1)

disseminate what they have never learned themselves?

Just what is emotional maturity? One author defines it this way: development from a state of taking to a state of giving and sharing. There's also a spiritual principle involved—development from natural impulses and responses of human nature to the principle of loving one's neighbor as himself. Few realize it's a recipe for happiness. It is something that must be learned—by the mind—and developed by self-discipline. As I said, it's something you were not born with. Human nature is totally contrary to it.

God's law is based on the giving principle. Its basis is love. Love is outgoing concern. Human nature is a magnet—a pull—in the direction of self. But the way of God's law, which is the way to peace, happiness, and everything good—ah, that is a way humans must be taught. Giving, sharing, serving, helping have to be learned.

But humans are equipped with emotions. And, from babyhood, all humans are actuated more or less by their emotions. Emotions are feelings—disturbances—departures from a calm state of rational right thinking and acting. Emotion is an impulse toward action or expression of feeling, unapproved—unless taught and controlled otherwise—by the mind. Among the emotions are such feelings or expressions as fear, anger, resentment, jealousy, hatred, grief, sorrow, surprise, desire, elation, joy.

Emotions have a first cousin—our moods. The emotionally immature usually are moody, and have not learned to control their moods.

More and more I am impressed with a most important truth we humans are prone to overlook. While animals are guided by instinct into the course intended for them by the Creator, man is given powers and potentialities infinitely higher. The spirit in man imparts to the brain the powers of the human mind—an intellectual and even spiritual quality. Dumb brutes cannot appreciate a Gainsborough, a Rem-

brandt, or a Goya painting; a Beethoven sonata or a Schumann concerto; or the literature of great authors. They cannot acquire scientific knowledge, weigh facts, make decisions, render judgments, exercise self-discipline, develop character. They cannot attain access to and union with Almighty God, become begotten of Him as His very child, enjoy actual communion with the Eternal Creator, have their minds opened and enlightened by His Spirit, come to comprehend spiritual truths and, finally, become born as a son of God in His very divine family!

Man was put on earth to develop and attain to something infinitely higher than animal destiny. Man was intended to develop spiritual character—to become like the Supreme God. This all comes through the marvelous human mind. One comes to knowledge of God through the mind. One realizes sin and repents of it in the mind! God's Spirit entering is the Spirit of a sound mind!

Not only spiritual development, but also emotional maturity, is developed through the mind. It comes by right knowledge, creative thinking, right decisions, the use of will, self-discipline. To rightly direct his actions is man's purpose in life.

Yet most people seem to assume humans to be merely the highest of the dumb brutes! They fail utterly to comprehend the magnitude of human potentiality! They allow themselves to act thoughtlessly on impulse, with feelings, moods, emotions being swayed and buffeted into troubles, tragedies, and sufferings through irrational actions.

I once knew a tragic example. It was a man highly educated, a teacher who readily assumed the responsibility of teaching youths when he himself had never learned this central truth of life.

His mind was stored with knowledge about things—geology, astronomy, mathematics, literature—but he had acquired little knowledge about himself: his moods, feelings, drives, impulses, desires. As a child he had been pampered, petted and spoiled, permitted to have his own way. He had not been taught self-restraint, self-control, or how intelligently to divert his moods and desires, and guide them according to wisdom.

He was married to a beautiful and intelligent wife, had a fine family, an honored position. But when he allowed feelings, impulses, and moods to lead his actions instead of sound judgment and wisdom of mind, his home was broken by divorce; and in the grip of his moods and tendency to run from his problems instead of facing and solving them, he fled in blind fear from his high position and brilliant future. He wrecked not only his own happiness, but his marriage and his home, and he forced great sorrow, suffering and unhappiness on many others.

He had allowed his emotions and moods, instead of his mind, to lead his actions. He had come to see circumstances through the eyes of his feelings, and his understanding had become warped and distorted. He had grown up physically. He had developed mentally. But emotionally he was still a very young child—and, as a sad accompaniment, his spiritual age was no older.

One is not really mature until emotionally and spiritually grown up, as well as physically and mentally. Parents should realize it is their responsibility to study their own children—teach them right direction and control over tempers, impulses, feelings, angers, moods. Teach restraint of selfishness and vanity. Teach love and outgoing concern for others. Teach giving instead of taking.

But emotional maturity does not mean emotionless maturity. The truly emotionally mature control the emotions. They do not anesthetize them! They do express, at the right time, and in proper degree, enthusiasm, happiness, joy. They do feel deep gratitude for blessings, and also they deeply feel reverence, adoration, in the worship of God. They sincerely feel compassion toward others—a feeling of true outgoing concern. They express sympathy and have mercy.

Emotional maturity does not crucify emotions—it controls and guides them with right knowledge and true wisdom. Emotional maturity develops hand in hand with physical, mental and spiritual growth—the four blending, finally, into the perfect spiritual character which is the

true human destiny and the very purpose of life. It can bring very great and rewarding and lasting happiness.

Now, finally, let me describe the three categories into which people generally, and thoughtlessly, fall. And then let us see a few examples of the correct use of the emotions.

First, many, especially those of lesser education, let themselves go to an emotional extreme. They are mere babes emotionally. It never occurs to them to put any check or control on their emotions. They become highly emotional over inconsequential things. If these people drove their automobiles as they guide—or fail to guide—their emotions, their cars would run wild and create disaster.

Their feelings are worn on their shirt cuffs. They are upset over trifles. Their tempers fly, uncontrolled. They flatter, they gush, they exaggerate their compliments and their praise of others. They gossip, they slander, they speak evil of others behind their backs. They continually feel jealousy, resentment, or excessive jubilation.

Some religious sects deliberately attract the overly emotional. In religious meetings their preachers work on the emotions of their congregations, encouraging uncontrolled outbursts of emotional response. They “work it up”—they generate increasingly energetic and noisy displays of out-of-control emotion. But Jesus Christ set no such example. Nor did any of Christ’s own original apostles.

Then there are those who go to the opposite extreme. Often these are the intellectuals and the highly educated—though usually *mis*-educated. They have controlled emotions with their minds to the extent that their emotions have been stifled and put to death. They no longer feel deeply about anything. They are utterly devoid of real sincerity, any depth of gratitude, any feeling of compassion or real sympathy. Their emotions never grew up to maturity—their emotions died in infancy.

Then there is the middle ground, equally unprofitable and tragic. These are those who neither choke off their emotions with mental con-

trol nor exert energy generating them. They are just listless—indifferent. They feel no purpose in life. They have no ambition. They have no spark. They do not radiate—they are like dead fish. In an introduction to another, they extend a cold, clammy hand with no grip whatever. They merely let you grip their hand—and it’s like taking hold of a damp, dead fish. They have no personality. They are nonentities. There isn’t enough life in them to generate any noticeable emotional response.

Which of these three are you? If you are any one of them, you are wrong.

Now look at some right examples!

Where will you go to find the right teaching on emotional response? You’ll find it where you find the true ways of life—in God’s Word to man!

The Bible teaches us that our relationship with God must completely dominate our lives—until it simply is our life! It teaches us to feel deeply, though always intelligently, about it.

Look at God’s instruction through Joel. A tremendous worldwide time of trouble is now generating—such as the world has never experienced before. Joel prophesied the coming famine and disease epidemic. He foretold the plagues of the “day of the Lord.” He foretold the next, and nuclear, all-out world war—the most frightful trouble ever to be experienced by man.

Then God inspired Joel to instruct us how to escape and find protection. Does He say we should go through some routine motions, repeat by rote some prayer already written for us, which we recite without feeling or emotion? No, never! Here is what He says: “Therefore also now, saith the Eternal, turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Eternal your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness. . . . Let the priests, the ministers of the Eternal, weep . . . and let them say, Spare thy people, O Eternal, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over

them. . . . Yea, the Eternal will answer . . .” (Joel 2:12-19).

God says we should turn to Him in dead earnest—fasting, rending our hearts—in deepest real feeling. This is no thoughtless giving way to uncontrolled emotion. This is full mental realization of purpose—of need—and, with deepest intense feeling, seeking God with all our strength and might.

In correcting Israel for their manner of indifferent prayers, God says of Israel: “They never put their heart into their prayers” (Hosea 7:14, Moffatt translation).

Look at some of the sample prayers quoted for us as examples in the Bible. Notice David’s prayer of repentance, when he “came to himself” after his sin of adultery with Bathsheba and the murder of her husband. It is in the 51st Psalm. Notice how David, in dead earnest, put his whole heart into this prayer—with deep feeling of remorse and repentance.

David cried out: “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit. Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee. Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation. . . . O Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise. . . . The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.”

Notice Daniel’s prayers. He was

in intense, dead earnest. His was no light, casual, routine prayer. He put his whole heart into it. Of it Daniel says: "And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: And I prayed unto the Eternal my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God... We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments... O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day..." In this deeply earnest prayer Daniel continued on, beseeching God with his whole heart (Dan. 9:3-19).

Can you imagine these men of God praying in this manner dry eyed? I can't. Surely tears were streaming down their faces. These were intense prayers—prayers of surrendered, yielded men to the great God!

God has graciously granted, by astonishing miracles, many answers to my prayers. But never have I received an answer from God except when I prayed earnestly from the heart. I have never known of a real answer coming from God of a casual routine prayer. Yet do not most people pray casually, perhaps as a matter of duty, and without feeling or emotion? Perhaps this makes plain the reason most people have never received an answer to their prayers.

Jesus gave us an example of two men praying. The one a respected Pharisee, the other a hated publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed, without emotion or feeling, in his own self-esteem and vanity: "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." The other, pounding his breast in earnest, heartrending, deep-feeling remorse and repentance, choked with emotion, could only say, amid his tears, "God be merciful to me a sinner"! Of this latter, Jesus said, "I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other"—the self-exalting Pharisee (Luke 18:9-14).

Jesus Christ is our example. Can you comprehend what extreme deep feeling Jesus experienced when He looked out over the city of Jerusalem, whose deceived, erring, wrongdoing people He loved, and cried out: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them, which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matt. 23:37.) Here was emotion expressed. But it was intelligent expression of feeling—not unthinking, unguided sensual impulse. It was filled with deep meaning!

Of course Jesus had the divine power; He could have gathered the people of Jerusalem to Him by force! But, had He brought them to Him by force, His whole purpose of character building by free choice and free moral agency would have been defeated—so He willed that they, themselves, should make their own decisions. And He was grieved through His whole being that they rejected truth and happiness and salvation and eternal life, and chose curses and suffering and death.

Should we ever feel deeply about things? We certainly should. Jesus did! Just before the Judas-led murdering mob came to lead Him to trial and death, Jesus went apart from His disciples and prayed. "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground" (Luke 22:44).

If we do learn to live by "every word of God"—by God's instruction book—we will learn to guide emotions intelligently—but we shall not suppress them, neither let them run rampant and uncontrolled where they ought not.

Jesus Christ, at age 33½, was the most perfectly developed man, physically, mentally, spiritually, and emotionally, who ever lived. He was fully mature, these four blending harmoniously into the one perfect whole man.

Let us study His life, follow His example, live as He lived. And let us begin, now, to train our children as early as possible in the art of growing up emotionally! □

RIGHTS

(Continued from page 30)

you have, including your life, liberty or property, and still be morally justified.

Only God can put teeth into human rights. If a dictator violates the liberties of a people wholesale, what is to stop him? Only superior force. But as Nietzsche said, if God is dead, then *all* is permitted. Only God always has force superior to that of all dictators in every situation. Only God has the power to judge dictators after they are dead.

Human rights come from God. And if we are to know what those rights are, we must look to God's revelation. There is no other firm source of human rights than what God has stated in the Bible.

There are many rights delineated in the Bible, and to list them would take another article. But certain basic rights are enumerated in the Decalogue:

1) *The right to worship God*, implicit in the commandment that only the true God shall be worshiped.

2) *The right to life*, protected in the commandment against killing.

3) *The right to private property*, protected in the commandment against stealing.

4) *The right to a fair trial*, implicit in the commandment against false witness.

This list is by no means a comprehensive description of the human liberties guaranteed by God, but it is a start. The main point is, if there are any *absolute* human rights, they come from God. If we want to know the real source of our absolute human rights, the clear lesson is we ought to be diligent in studying God's revelation, the Bible. □

RECOMMENDED READING

Request the free booklet entitled *Read the Book*. This booklet gives helpful guidelines for studying God's revelation to man, the Bible. It explains how to remember scriptures and how to apply the principles of God's Word to real-life situations. To receive your free copy of this booklet, simply write to the address of our office nearest you.

orchids

L E T & T E R S

onions

Herbert W. Armstrong's Personal

I read Herbert W. Armstrong's article in the April *Plain Truth* on "The One Great Goal in Life." How wonderful it was. I would like to really have God's character in my mind and life. I must work harder, that I know. I pray earnestly that God will help me. Thank you, Mr. Armstrong, for the wonderful lesson.

Mrs. G. Shireman,
Richland Center, Wisconsin

The Me Decade

I am writing you concerning your April *Plain Truth* article entitled "The Me Decade." At first I became very angry at the way you put down some very helpful books. Then it occurred to me that you were simply missing one aspect of the problem. Yes, this is a Me Decade. But those wrapped up in "the Big I" are enmeshed in some very negative and destructive thought patterns. The self-help books you mention recognize man's helplessness against his own destructive character defects (sins, if you prefer). They try to get people to become more honest with themselves, because once these patterns are recognized they aren't as overpowering. Such books are "right on" when it comes to exposing our human nature, and they try hard to get people out of their negativism. They do make a positive contribution, and as a Christian I've used them to help me grow.

These books try to help people get out of themselves by removing the moles in their own eyes so that they can care for their fellow human beings in a healthier way—and I believe they expedite the time when people will be able to truly love their neighbors as themselves, because they know how to love themselves properly.

Janet E. Buncich,
Ashley Falls, Massachusetts

I just had to write and express my delight with your article on the "Me gen-

eration." It was a masterpiece of thought and colorful description. You really hit the nail right square on the head! How very accurately, yet sadly, does it describe the 1970s.

Jon Kurnik,
Summerland, B.C., Canada

Depression

I commend your writer of the fine article "Depression: Overcoming the Gray Menace" (January *Plain Truth*). Almost forty years ago I had a nervous breakdown after the birth of a child. After many hospitalizations for almost thirty years, I read an article in the paper concerning the self-help after-care organization called Recovery, Inc. I attended the Tampa meetings and later became a leader in Lakeland, Florida. Your magazine would be a helpful source to acquaint people with this excellent program. It does not take the place of the professional, but is an addition to the therapy they provide. For information on locations of Recovery meetings, check your local (or nearest large city) phone directory, or write Recovery, Inc., Headquarters, 116 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

Gene M. Watson,
Haines City, Florida

Who Invented Sex?

Here's an "onion" from a reader. I personally do not care for the cover photo on the April *Plain Truth*. It seems both unnecessary and out of character. I've grumbled to myself about it all week since the magazine arrived and want to get it off my chest. Many of the innovations that have come out recently in the magazine have been good, and I have appreciated them as well as the work and talent behind them. This one I don't appreciate and don't like. So for what it's worth, there's my two bits.

Cecil Maranville,
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

May I say that the April cover was captivating! That type of cover is a very

good advertising tool and could be used to update appeal to a younger audience. I heard recently of high school kids passing out issues to their classmates, with a few wondering why they didn't get their copy! Although, after such an appetizer, I was hoping for a little more than the sex life of mosquitoes. Are there plans for follow-up on a more human-relations plane?

Joan Tovsen,
Anchorage, Alaska

Leisure Time?

The answer to Edward Walsh's question "Whatever Happened to Leisure Education?" is: There is no time for it. The growth in leisure time about which intellectuals have droned for nearly 30 years is a myth as far as most adult Americans are concerned.

Bureau of Labor Statistics data show that the average workweek for manufacturing workers, presently numbering 20 million, has not changed significantly from 40.2 hours since 1955. Out of a dozen nonmanufacturing occupations, only half show decreasing workweeks. The decline of agricultural employment mainly in favor of urban service jobs has done little to shorten working hours because hourly pay is generally so small in the latter that overtime work is necessary for survival.


There is no solid evidence supporting Walsh's claim of a 35-38 hour average workweek. Moreover, commuting, which he overlooks, adds several hours to the work day in most large metropolitan areas. The summertime crowds at our national parks and other recreational facilities consist of affluent people with very limited vacation time. The weekend boredom of workers of which Walsh makes such a big deal is really exhaustion. If the 20-hour workweek that the ivory-tower dwellers predict ever comes, it will have a catch: 20 hours' pay in current dollars.

Philip C. Steffey,
Santa Monica, California

TAKE A LESSON FROM US!

Take a lesson—in fact, take *twelve* exciting lessons that will help you along the road to biblical understanding: The Ambassador College Bible Correspondence Course. The Bible is relevant to today—this present generation. And through this unique correspondence course, you'll find that the Bible is the most exciting, informative, helpful, challenging and up-to-date book you've ever read. You'll learn how to understand the basics of prophecy, and how to put happiness,

achievement, and a new spiritual awareness into your life. And you'll discover the real meaning of that life—an ultimate purpose and destiny far greater than anything you've ever imagined! All this and more is laid out in step-by-step detail. There is no cost or tuition fee whatever, and the course is available in French, German, Dutch, and Spanish. To enroll and begin receiving your free monthly lessons, write us at the address nearest you or call the toll-free number below.



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

Or write us at the address nearest you (see inside front cover). *Residents of California, Alaska and Hawaii may dial 213-577-5225 collect.

LITERATURE REQUEST/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please check:

- Please send the following literature: _____
- Change of address: _____
- New subscriber: _____
Print new address below

Name _____

Address _____

City/State _____ Zip _____

Clip and mail with address label at right to:

The Plain Truth
Pasadena, CA
91123

741203-0303-5 31 P088

ROBERT S KUHNE
2845 WALTERS AVE
NORTHBROOK IL 60062