

The
PLAIN TRUTH

of a magazine of understanding

Nuclear Power
What kind of Bargain?
Halting Fair Love and Marriage
The Ubiquitous UI O
Who Was the Real Jesus?
Wall of Shame

**Is It
Time
to Tame
TV?**



the PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

Vol. XLI, No. 7

August 1976

ARTICLES

Is There Life After Death?	2
The Surprise Issue of the '76 Campaign	4
Who Was the Real Jesus?	7
Is It Time to Tame TV?	12
Fighting Fair in Love and Marriage	16
Living With the Atomic Genie	19
Nuclear Power — What Kind of Bargain?	22
The Ubiquitous UFO	25
"Wall of Shame"	28
They Said I'd Never Walk Again	33

FEATURES

Personal from the Editor	1
Worldwatch	5
TV-Radio Log	36
Commentary	43
Garner Ted Armstrong Speaks Out!	45



ABOUT OUR COVER

Studies show that television mayhem and immorality adversely influence not only children, but also adults. Cover illustration portrays the violence that too often characterizes TV programming. (See article in this issue, "Is It Time to Tame Television?")

Illustration by Neil Boyd

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).

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Managing Editor: Arthur A. Feidig

Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn

News Editor: Gene H. Hoobler

Features Editor: Dexter H. Faulkner

Art Director: Allen Metzger

Associate Editors: Robert Ormskey, Brian Knowles

Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lippross

Copy Editors: Jim E. Lea, Peter Moore

Senior Editors: Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith

Senior Writers: Jeff Calkins, Donald D. Schroeder, Keith Stump

Contributors: Don Abraham, Ron Bedeck, Peter Butler, D. Paul Graubke, Ron Horswell, Ray Kosanke, Aili Muntari, Gordon Muir, David Price, Carole Ritter, George Ritter, John R. Schroeder, Wolfgang Thomsen

News Research Staff: Donnajean Clausen, Werner Jeberns, Marc Stahl

Graphics: Design Coordinator: Monte Wolkerton, Associate Art Director: Greg S. Smith, Staff Artists: Rangan Cole, Garry Haggerty, Ron Lepeska, Gary Richardson, Gene Tikasingh, Mike Woodruff

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

Photo Files, Manager: Alan Keller, Janice Neufeld

Offices: Auckland, New Zealand: Robert Martin, Susan West, Germany: Frank Schinde, St. Albans, England: Frank Brown, Burgess Heads, Australia: Dennis Lake, Johannesburg, South Africa: Robert Jones, Manila, Philippines: Colin Adair, Utrecht, The Netherlands: Roy McCallum, Vancouver, B.C., Canada: Doug Wilson

Founder and President: Herbert W. Armstrong

Executive Vice-President: Garner Ted Armstrong

Publishers: Stanley H. Haber, Robert L. Kuhn

Business Manager: Raymond A. Wright

Circulation Manager: Jack Martin

The Plain Truth is published monthly, except for the August-December issues, which are published bi-monthly. Single copies are available for 50¢. The magazine is published by The Plain Truth Society, Inc., a nonprofit organization, 10000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1000, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. Second-class postage paid at Pasadena, CA and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Please send address changes in the U.S. to The Plain Truth, Pasadena, CA 91123. Outside the U.S., send address changes to The Plain Truth, P.O. Box 117, Pasadena, CA 91123. In Canada: P.O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2Y4. In Mexico: P.O. Box 100, Ambassador Apartments, Suite 509, Mexico City. In New Zealand: P.O. Box 100, Auckland. In Australia: P.O. Box 100, Sydney. In South Africa: P.O. Box 100, Johannesburg. In the Philippines: P.O. Box 100, Manila. In the Netherlands: P.O. Box 100, Utrecht. In Germany: P.O. Box 100, St. Albans. In England: P.O. Box 100, Burgess Heads. In Australia: P.O. Box 100, Melbourne. In New Zealand: P.O. Box 100, Auckland. In the Philippines: P.O. Box 100, Manila.

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

My first visit to South Africa was some years overdue. I had expected, from reports printed about South Africa and *apartheid*, to find whites arrogantly dominant and blacks cowering in fear.

But I found instead — on the surface — apparent racial peace. I found blacks holding their heads up just like whites. I found both blacks and whites, for instance, in the hotel's large coffee shop in equal numbers, each going about their respective jobs just as if they were all the same race.

Then, suddenly, the day before yesterday, I arrived back in Johannesburg from a visit to South-West Africa and found in the evening newspaper the full-page-wide headline, "SIX DIE IN RIOTS." That was Wednesday, June 16. The morning paper of Thursday, June 17, had a giant page-wide headline of two words, "Flaming Night." Under it was a seven-column, full-color picture of motor trucks in flame.


All had seemed to be at PEACE here — on the surface. South Africa is trying the experiment of TWO races, black and white, and also a third, called here "coloured" — a mixture of Indian, mulatto, and other races — each by law living in its one area of the city or country, and each of the three forbidden by law to live in any other than its own area.

Supposedly they are all equal, yet obviously the whites dominate. Supposedly there is no discrimination. Supposedly all are friends, no one race supposedly feeling superior, and no other feeling inferior.

Supposedly, that is the case. And, on the surface, that is the way it appeared when I arrived over three weeks ago. Here in my hotel, the Carlton, blacks are welcome the same as whites, but I have seen almost no blacks as guests, although the number of black and white employees appear to be about equal.

I have no doubt that this area-segregation idea in residences, yet with all races apparently mixing in employment, in shops and stores, and in the downtown city streets could be made to work for permanent peace. IF it were not for human nature.

Personal from...



I VISIT SOUTH AFRICA—WHERE RACE RIOTS FLARED OUT ...MY ANALYSIS

But one of the ingredients in human nature is *prejudice*, which crosses the color lines, and other ingredients in human nature are jealousy and envy, competition and strife, resentment of authority, besides vanity, lust, and greed. And these, sooner or later, spell VIOLENCE!

Still, such violence is nearly always deliberately *organized* and deliberately stirred up.

Some few years ago, a radical known as "Danny the Red" initiated a virtual nationwide strike in France, starting from the University of Paris. He almost succeeded in overthrowing the French government.

Days later, Danny the Red was holding a "teach-in" for university students at the University of London's Graduate School of Economics. It was closed to the press. Ambassador students attended and reported to me. Those attending were given a course in how to bring about a riot and overthrow a government.

The recipe is well-known to subversives and radicals. First, find some issue in which a certain class of people feel they are unjustly treated — such as students, labor unions, etc. Then get to them in

groups, group lectures, etc., and fan the flames of resentment, prejudice, and feelings of injustice. Exaggerate it. Make it an EMOTIONAL ISSUE. After many such meetings or lectures, organize bigger ones, orate to them vehemently, and whip up their emotions of resentment and hate to white-hot heat — turn them AGAINST the "instigator" or class causing the injustice. Then, organize a definite "MARCH OF PROTEST." Try to turn the march into a riot. Try to make the riot spread.

In the WORLD TOMORROW which is coming soon, two things will bring about RACIAL PEACE. One, human nature will be changed. Two, the segregation integration issue will be settled in a way to bring PEACE. And there will be NO DISCRIMINATION, no one race over any other. Opportunity for success and welfare will be FOR ALL.

Then humans will learn, as the apostle Paul said to the Athenian "thinkers" on Mars Hill, that God the Creator "hath made of *one blood* all nations of men." And not of "white" blood or "some other colored blood." We all have one ancestor, Adam, and ultimately we shall be ONE FAMILY, not in color but in spirit and in LOVE.

THE INCREDIBLE HUMAN POTENTIAL—PART X

IS THERE LIFE AFTER DEATH ?

Does the Bible teach transmigration of souls? Going to heaven at death? Does LIFE end at death? Does life offer us no more than this "three score and ten"? WHY was humanity put on earth? Is there, after all, as Winston Churchill said to the U.S. Congress, a PURPOSE BEING WORKED OUT HERE BELOW? The mystery here solved!

By Herbert W. Armstrong

WHY this mystery about life after death? Why so many beliefs of so many different religions? How can we know? Can we believe God? Adam and Eve didn't. I've believed I just don't know. I've believed what He said? Could we believe God? He told us.

I said to my wife fifty years ago, "I know the Bible says 'Thou shalt keep Sunday.' How do you know?" she asked. "Did you read it?"

"No, but I know it's there because all these Christian churches get their religion from the Bible and they do keep Sunday."

"Why don't you look it up and find out if it's really there?"

"But I couldn't find it."

"I chanced to read in Revelation 6:23, 'The wages of sin is

DEATH.' Now wait a minute! I exclaimed, surprised. In Sunday school they taught me the wages we earn for sinning is eternal LIFE, not death. Eternal life *in heaven*. Then I read the remainder of the verse, "...but the gift of God is eternal life."

That's a shocker! I expressed further surprise. I thought I'd really had eternal life. I'm an 84-year-old man!

I had left church and Sunday school when I was 18. But I had been brought up in an established and respectable Christian denomination. I became intrigued. I had heard the people say, "The Bible says when we all get to heaven..." I decided to read where Jesus said, "No man hath ascended up to heaven." And after reading a few more plain biblical

statements, I began to believe that even the churches TODAY do not believe what Jesus said!

What does the Bible say about life after death? Did anyone ever die and then actually experience a life after death—and who could prove it and explain to us what that life was like?

The answer is YES. Jesus Christ Himself died and was DEAD. But He rose from the dead and was seen by MANY—including His disciples who had been with Him for three and a half years before He died, and 40 days after His resurrection. And they went about loudly proclaiming that they were eyewitnesses of His LIFE AFTER DEATH.

Christ Himself taught that there is LIFE AFTER DEATH.

He taught the Pharisees, Sadducees, but Nicodemus didn't believe.

Him! Jesus said to him, "... I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not" (John 3:12).

Why didn't the Pharisee, Nicodemus, understand when Jesus said to him: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God?"

Why do people not understand those words today? How many know, today, that Jesus' gospel was a sensational, never-before-proclaimed NEWS ANNOUNCEMENT?

Jesus Was a Newscaster

Those in Judea knew - or should have known - Malachi's prophecy concerning this. It was the gospel of God - and the word "gospel" means GOOD NEWS!

Jesus was a NEWSCASTER. His news was something absolutely NEW - never before proclaimed to man's kind. It was the most wonderful NEWS ever reported, actually almost too wonderful for humans to believe. It was news of the utterly transcendent potential of man.

The tremendous message that Jesus brought was not a report of past events. It was ADVANCED news of an almost unbelievable UTOPIAN WORLD TOMORROW! It was news of life after death. And it was news that we may be BORN AGAIN! Yet almost nobody understands it!

Why has it never been recognized by the world as the stupendous NEWS that it actually was?

Because first-century enemies of the gospel SUPPRESSED IT!

The Church of God - on the foundation of the original apostles and Christ - was founded on the day of Pentecost, A.D. 31. About two decades later, when the apostle Paul wrote his letter to the churches of Galatia, it had already been suppressed and false ministers had turned the people to a DIFFERENT GOSPEL. Paul wrote, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto *another gospel* - which is not another - but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ" (Gal. 1:6-7). Again in Romans 1:18, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth" (RSV). And in II Corinthians 11 Paul speaks of

false apostles of Satan (verses 13-15) who *come preaching* "another gospel" (verse 4).

The time was at hand, then, for this message to be announced! The time is at hand, today, for its true MEANING to be made so PLAIN that people may UNDERSTAND IT! (Matt. 24:14.)

IT WILL BE, in this article. And it is a crucial CHALLENGE to you who now read it! And you have to UNDERSTAND what was that news announcement, or you can never UNDERSTAND what Jesus meant about being "born again."

What Was the News?

Notice, briefly, first, what that astonishing NEW message was! The preannouncement, in Malachi's prophecy, says: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek [the Messiah], shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant..." (Mal. 3:1).

Now notice the beginning of the MESSENGER'S proclamation of the MESSAGE. It is recorded in Mark's gospel, chapter 4. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets..." Then follows the citation from Malachi, written above. That is followed by the account of John the Baptist preparing the way before the messenger.

Then, verses 14-15: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel' - that is, BELIEVE the good news!"

What IS the Kingdom of God?

What did He mean - the Kingdom of God? Jesus' whole message - His gospel - was about the KINGDOM OF GOD! Yet few know anything about it today!

A kingdom is (a) a NATION composed of people, and (b) the GOVERNMENT of the nation.

In some cases the people of a nation are the descendants - the children - of one man. Secular history indicates that the nation of Turkey probably descended from

ancient Esau, the twin brother of Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel, father of the nation Israel. Before the twins were born, God said to their mother, Rebekah, "Two nations are in thy womb..." (Gen. 25:23).

Now Jesus the Messiah was to come as "the messenger of the COVENANT." The "old covenant" had established the human children of Israel as a NATION or KINGDOM of humans, called the KINGDOM OF ISRAEL. Jesus came as the messenger - heralding the message of the NEW covenant that shall set up the spirit-composed children of God as the kingdom of God!

As the ancient kingdom of Israel was composed of the human FAMILY of the human man Israel, so the kingdom of God will be composed of the *divine* family of the divine God!

And what does this have to do with life after death? It has *everything* to do with it!

WHY Jewish Rulers Rejected the Message

The Jewish rulers of Jesus' day thought He was proclaiming a government to be set up immediately to overthrow the Roman Empire, then ruling Judea as a vassal state.

One of these prominent Jews was a man named Nicodemus mentioned earlier. He was a Pharisee, and the Pharisees were hostile to Jesus because of this new gospel. Nicodemus, however, wanted to meet this astonishing messenger and discuss it with him. To avoid criticism from his colleagues, he came to Jesus by night.

"We know," he said, "that you are a teacher come from God..."

The "we" implies that the divine identity of the messenger and the source of His message was known to the Pharisees. But they were "now" people concerned with protecting their status as rulers under the Roman government, not with receiving revelation from God.

Jesus perceived the import of Nicodemus' first words. His message was the good news of the coming WORLD GOVERNMENT OF GOD - that is, the KINGDOM OF GOD - the GOVERNMENT of God.

(Continued on page 39)



THE SURPRISE ISSUE OF THE '76 CAMPAIGN

by Jeff Calkins

All of a sudden, religion in politics has become respectable. Ten years ago, the spectacle of a presidential candidate openly and publicly expressing his heartfelt religious convictions would have been unthinkable.

But times have changed. Today, "God [is] not only alive, but stamping with the candidates," remarks one liberal Catholic magazine. Billy Graham takes a less cynical tone: "It's a refreshing thing to have candidates come along and talk about their devotion to God, especially if they back it up with their lives."

A Far Cry From 1960

The last time religion came up as an issue in a presidential election, the emphasis was different. Many voters feared that John Kennedy's Catholicism would influence his decisions as President and Mr. Kennedy took great pains to dispel the idea. His narrow victory over Richard Nixon in 1960 can even be attributed to his successful defusing of the religious issue.

Today, in contrast, many voters are seemingly prepared to abandon such traditional political considerations as ideology or specific stands on issues in order to support someone primarily *because* of his religion. There is evidence that in some key primaries of the 1976 presidential campaign, a significant percentage of voters made their choice solely on the basis of a candi-

date's religious preference. The issue was first raised in the early days of Jimmy Carter's primary campaign. Mr. Carter took no pains to hide his religious convictions, nor did he make any attempt to moderate the traditional Southern Baptist framework in which he expressed them.

To be sure, Mr. Carter's public professions of his faith (among them, "The most important thing in my life is Jesus Christ") have not gone down well with many urban liberals who resent what some call the "smug moral tone" of the Carter campaign. Evidently, his frankness hasn't put that many people off, however, as Mr. Carter's primary performances attest.

Religious Views of the Candidates

While it has been the former Georgia governor who has made the most conspicuous profession of his religious faith in the campaign, the two other major candidates still in the running, President Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan, also have firm religious convictions. Briefly, here is a religious profile of the candidates:

President Ford. Mr. Ford is an Episcopalian who frequently attends St. John's Episcopal Church across the park from the White House. He regularly takes part in evangelical prayer gatherings in Washington. Mr. Ford encouraged his son Michael to go to a seminary. (Continued on page 24)

WORLDWATCH

An Overview of Major News Events and Trends

SOVIETS SEEKING WAR-WINNING CAPABILITY?

Americans have been led to believe that an all-out nuclear war would be mutually suicidal — that no one could “win” a nuclear war and that it is therefore “unthinkable.”

But such a line of reasoning may not hold true inside the powerful military establishment of the Soviet Union. Leading United States defense experts are deeply concerned that Soviet strategic military policy is aimed no longer at achieving nuclear parity with the U.S., but at securing a potential war-winning capability.

In their view, the Soviets are intent on breaking out of the present nuclear standoff, with the aim of achieving such superiority so as to be able to strike first and absorb an expected counterblow, all the while having enough in reserve to deliver a nuclear coup de grace — a winning two-for-one exchange.

In line with this philosophy is the increased evidence that the Soviets are engaged in an intensive civil defense program designed to enable Russia to absorb — at limited cost — any retaliatory strike the U.S. could throw at her.

As O. C. Boileau, president of Boeing Aerospace Company, revealed in a speech in March, “An official Soviet estimate declares that, even if United States missiles strike their cities, they can hold their casualties to from five to eight percent of their urban population. For Soviet demography, this works out to about ten million potential fatalities.”

A Soviet attack on American

cities, on the other hand, could take an estimated 96 million lives.

The Soviet buildup has reached the point where it threatens strategic stability, according to Paul H. Nitze, a former secretary of the Navy (1963-67), deputy secretary of defense (1967-69), and a member of the U.S. delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) from 1969 to 1974.

In a major article in the January 1976 issue of the prestigious journal, *Foreign Affairs*, Nitze asserts that if the United States does not act now to redress the nuclear imbalance and maintain high-quality deterrence, America could find herself in a very dangerous position.

Nitze remains skeptical as to whether a SALT II agreement could ever result in strategic stability between U.S. and Soviet forces.

“On the contrary, there is every prospect,” he asserts, “that under the terms of the SALT I agreements the Soviet Union will continue to pursue a nuclear superiority that is not merely quantitative, but designed to produce a theoretical war-winning capability.”

Seven Years of SALT

Talks on limiting strategic arms began in November 1969, in Helsinki, Finland. Two and one-half years later, in May 1972, the first SALT I treaty was signed in Moscow, becoming effective on October 3, 1972.

SALT I, as the treaty is called, limited the U.S. and Soviet Union to two defensive antiballistic missile (ABM) sites each, with 100 missiles at each site. In addition to the ABM accord, an accompanying 5-year interim agreement set ceilings for each side on the number of land-based and submarine-based offensive missiles. Forces were essentially frozen at May 1972 levels.

The United States ceiling was set

at 1,700 — 1,054 land-based ICBMs and 656 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). The Soviet limit was about 2,400 — over 1,600 ICBMs and some 740 SLBMs.

The resulting 3 to 2 missile ratio in favor of the Soviets was to be offset by the fact that the U.S. had over twice as many deliverable nuclear warheads (about 6,000 to the Soviets' 2,400). This was due to MIRVing, or putting more than one nuclear warhead on the same missile — a capability which the Soviets, at that time, did not have.

Coming — SALT II

The SALT I treaty, however, did not cover qualitative improvement of missiles. Controls on quality and sophistication of weapons were left to the SALT II negotiations. Such controls are much trickier to agree upon than controls on numbers of weapons.

In November 1974, a preliminary SALT II agreement was finally reached by President Ford and Soviet Party Chief Brezhnev in Vladivostok. The technical details are still being filled in.

Their executive “understanding” provides for a ceiling of 2,400 strategic missiles for each side, 1,320 of which may be equipped with multiple warheads, or MIRVs. Long-range bombers would also count in the total.

This agreement, if concluded, would mean the Soviets would have to phase out some of their more obsolete missile launchers, while the U.S. would be free to increase to the numerical limit.

On the other hand, however, the Soviets — who are far behind the U.S. in MIRV technology — would be allowed to catch up to the U.S. in MIRV strength. Furthermore, as Soviet missiles are larger and more powerful than America's, the Kremlin will be able to pack more MIRVs

into their payloads than America can fit into its lighter rockets, giving the Kremlin immense superiority in warhead power and number. One somewhat oversimple analogy holds that this situation would ultimately amount to a U.S. arsenal of 1,320 BB guns against 1,320 Soviet rifles.

In any case, this lack of so-called throw-weight control has been a major criticism of the SALT II treaty. "The Vladivostok Accord," summarizes Nitze, "continues to codify a potentially unstable situation caused by the large disparity in throw-weight, now being exploited by Soviet technological improvements."


The potential implications of this exploitation are staggering. "By 1977," Nitze concludes in a scenario summary, "after a Soviet-initiated counterforce strike against the United States to which the United States responded with a counterforce strike, the Soviet Union would have remaining forces sufficient to destroy Chinese and European NATO nuclear capability, attack U.S. population and conventional military targets, and still have a remaining force throw-weight in excess of that of the United States. And after 1977 the Soviet advantage after the assumed attack mounts rapidly."

Clearly, now is the time, as Nitze suggests, for the U.S. to take stock of her nuclear standing.

SEVERE DROUGHT GRIPS NORTHERN EUROPE

A prolonged and record-breaking drought has been afflicting wide portions of Northern Europe for many months, dashing hopes of a large increase in Common Market grain production this year.

The drought, believed due to a shift northward of North Atlantic weather patterns, is hitting the highly productive areas of southern Britain, northern and western France, the eastern parts of West Germany, northern Italy and por-



TWO COWS—pose by watering hole now left dry by France's worst drought since 1725.

tions of Belgium. In all, about one third of the European Community's farmlands are affected.

EEC Agriculture Commissioner Petrus Lardinois estimates that projected Common Market wheat exports have been cut in half because of the drought. Potato, sugar beet, and vegetable yields may also be sharply down, depending on the duration of the dry spell.

The drought afflicting the southern half of normally green Britain is the worst to hit the isle in 250 years, according to the British Meteorological Office. Water there is in such short supply that authorities have seriously suggested that families climb into the bath together to conserve water. Strict water rationing has been instituted in many areas as reservoir and water-table levels fall and rivers and streams slow to a trickle.

In a nation which under normal conditions imports half of its basic food, a drop in domestic agricultural production could have severe economic consequences. In these days of ever-rising prices.

In West Germany, the Farmers' Federation expects the worst harvest since the World War II. Prices of bread and beer—staples of the

German diet—are expected to rise steeply.

The drought in northern France is the worst since 1725, and government officials in Paris are very concerned over its impact on food prices.

Cattle and sheep farmers throughout the drought-stricken areas have been forced to kill off their livestock months ahead of time for sale at reduced prices because of the shortage of fodder. The early slaughtering of cattle is also expected to affect milk output.

Complicating the dry conditions, record heat in some areas is posing major problems for fire fighters. Trees, grass, and crops are tinder dry, and brush fires are becoming increasingly frequent.

Unless big downpours are experienced soon, experts feel Western Europe may face the risk of large-scale fires, as well as critical shortages of water and some basic foods. And if drought returns next year or worse yet, becomes a long-term recurring feature of the European weather scene, the Continent could find itself having to eventually import large quantities of foodstuffs. That would not be good news in an increasingly food short world. □

There are about as many varied opinions and conflicting ideas about Jesus Christ as there are people to express them.

Every publishing season authors grind out a whole new mill of theological ideas about Jesus Christ, claiming he was anything from an occultic leader of some mystic sect steeped in hallucinogenic experiences to a frustrated Jewish revolutionary.

Someone wrote a book supposedly "proving" he was married. Others have claimed that he was a hypnotist and a magician. One author even went so far as to assert that he was a mushroom.

Movie makers are now turning out Jesus films at a record rate. The latest in the series -- called "The Passover Plot" -- is at this writing being filmed in the state of Israel. Various of these film odysseys picture a "harried Christ," a political and religious reformer, a loving drop-out, a self-styled Messiah, a hippie Christ, a revolutionary Christ -- anything but the real Jesus.

The Traditional Jesus

Today the traditional Jesus is experiencing a *serious identity crisis!* The latest spate of Jesus movies is simply the most recent manifestation of it.

Television has succeeded in further confusing and complicating this identity. By the time a kid reaches the age of six, Bugs Bunny and Pink Panther are his real heroes.

Before the age of television, there was Samson the strong man, David and Goliath, Jonah and the whale, Daniel in the lion's den, Joshua and the battle of Jericho, and maybe even Noah and the flood.

Youngsters in Sunday School experienced no identity crisis whatsoever with such Old Testament "machismo" characters and their heroic deeds.

But what about the traditional Jesus? How does he stack up against all these biblical heroes?

The "Sunday School" Jesus

Does the "Sunday School" Jesus inspire thoughts of admiration, worship, and respect? Does the traditional Christ make children automatically think of strength, cour-

age, masculinity, and manliness? Does the personality of Jesus Christ truly capture the imagination of our youth? Do strapping young men want to grow up to be "just like Jesus"? Why don't they?

Take a close look at the traditional Jesus. You'll hardly be surprised that children rapidly outgrow the tender shepherd and find their heroes elsewhere.

Christ's traditional image begins with the Christmas story depicting a little Lord Jesus in the manger. He is lauded with hymns of praise and poems of love and tenderness.

A quote from the book *Your God Is Too Small* is all too typical of the traditional teaching about Jesus:

"Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, look upon a little child. Christian children all must be mild, obedient, good as He." And so goes many Sunday School primers.

But the traditional Jesus was never allowed to grow up and develop strength, masculinity, and a dynamic personality. Even in manhood he is depicted as delicate and decidedly effeminate. He is sanctimoniously portrayed kneeling in a long flowing purple robe, with brown tumbling locks flowing down his back, a thin face, an aquiline nose, a frizzy, wispy little beard, a pious look on his face, and perhaps with his hands (with long, slender, tapering fingers) neatly folded on a rock.

This "Jesus" is pictured as a soft, semi-sick, womanly, shaky, pale, sorrowful, sad-eyed, and always much put-upon young man with no sense of humor.

Whether you run the gamut all the way from the little Lord Jesus in the manger to the Jesus smiling serenely from stained-glass windows, or finally to a dead Christ on a cross, this is the consistent Sunday School picture.

Do you understand why our youth might have an identity crisis with Jesus Christ when you consider the manner in which he is traditionally portrayed? This "Jesus" would even be *persona non grata* with the average businessman, machinist, truck driver, or military man. He is the ultimate in lack of "machismo"!

WHO WAS THE REAL JESUS?

The traditional Jesus is suffering an identity crisis of growing proportions. Was Jesus of Nazareth the Christ of the Crusades? Was he the Jesus of the Jewish persecutions or the Spanish Inquisition? Was he the Jesus of some first-century artist's imagination? Who was this most enigmatic figure in all of history?

by Garner Ted Armstrong

But did you know that the *real* Jesus Christ of Nazareth did not look like, did not dress like, did not act like, and was not like the traditional Jesus which we have been "fed" all of our lives?

The Only Authentic Historical Source

There have been more books written about the life, works, actions, and deeds of Jesus Christ than any other man throughout all of history — more than 60,000 in this century alone. Whole series and bulky volumes of books have been written on "the life and times of Jesus." Books about his life, teachings, birth, infancy, manhood, and ministry have watered down, negated, misinterpreted, misapplied, and perverted the only authentic historical source of his life — the Christian Bible.

As one German theologian put it: "At no time has Christianity quietly accepted this likeness [of the biblical Jesus]. On the contrary it has always worked at it and remodeled it. Sometimes within limits, and sometimes so passionately that it has been refashioned out of all recognition."

Scribes have sometimes scoured mythology, legend, tradition, and the superstitions of past dark ages to come up with the traditional Jesus image. Yet the true, open, plain explanation of the scriptures of your Bible has been virtually ignored.

Most people in the modern world have either blindly accepted the traditional Jesus or created a Christ of their own convenience.

The Bible itself adds its own testimony. The apostle Paul told the Corinthian church that he was "afraid that as the serpent [Satan] deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ. For if some one comes and preaches *another Jesus* than the one we preached, you submit to it readily enough" (II Cor. 11:34 RSV). This *other Jesus* is the fragment of demonic and human imagination and is not based on the true biblical account.

Only four minibiographies were written about the life and times of Jesus, mostly concentrating on his

three-and-one-half-year ministry. Other Old and New Testament documents supply additional details. Only the barest information is given about his life prior to the age of 30. However, more than enough information is provided to create an accurate overall picture of just what Jesus was like.

Two of the New Testament gospel writers were men who constantly ate with Jesus, sometimes in his own house, slept in the same area that he did, and sang songs together with him. They were his very closest friends — not biographers 200 years removed from the scene reconstructing the story based on some third-hand account.

Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John wrote about Jesus' habits, appetites, attitudes, personality, and to a degree, appearance. A fair-sized portion of their writings is composed of first-person quotations from the mouth of Jesus himself.

It is *only* from these biblical documents that we can obtain the "straight scoop" about the true Jesus on any given subject. We can learn *what* he looked like, what he did to earn a living, whether he had a family, and much more.

In this first installment we'll examine some clues about Christ's physical appearance — with biblical support for each point. Read on.

Jesus Was a Jew

Notwithstanding some of the ultra-conservative, Nazi-like paramilitary organizations and the anti-Semites of the world, Jesus Christ of Nazareth was a member of the Jewish race. The English word "Jew" either means a man or woman racially descended from the patriarch Judah or a citizen or national of the house of Judah. Jesus was both of the race and house of Judah.

The genealogies in two of the gospels in the New Testament define Jesus as coming right through the line of Judah (see Matt. 1 and Luke 3). Jesus was a direct descendant of David (who was a Jew by race as well as nationality) both in his natural and legal genealogies. Notice what the apostle Peter said of Jesus' ancestor David: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried. . . . Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit upon his [David's] throne (Acts 2:29-30). He was to inherit "the throne of *his father David*" (Luke 1:32). Scriptures too numerous to quote here show Christ as *the son of David* (see Matt. 15:22; 20:30; 22:41-46; Mark, 10:47-48; Rom. 1:3 among many).

Jesus knew that he was a Jew! Notice part of his conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well. She said to him: "How is it that thou, *being a Jew*, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria?" (for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans' (John 4:9 KJV). Racial bigotry was as bad then as it is today. The only difference is that it was between Jews and Samaritans then.

Later at the end of the conversation Jesus told her: "Ye Jews and the Samaritans] worship ye know not what we [Jesus and the Jews] know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews" (Verse 22).

Add the weight of the apostle Paul to the mounting evidence. He wrote: "It is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah" (Heb. 7:14 RSV). In the book of Revelation Jesus is called the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" (Rev. 5:5). Both Genesis 49:10 and I Chronicles 5:2 predict that the Prince of Messiah (Christ) would come from the line of Judah.

Pilate knew Jesus was a Jew. "Thine own nation and the chief priests" harassed him, and said: "John 18:35).

Scripture after scripture proclaims over and over again that Jesus was born of human flesh, by a human begetting into the material world, of the *family of Judah* (see Acts 13:26). Jesus was a Jew.

What Did Jesus Look Like?

Jesus' looking, varying from what we see in his day. People seem to have thought Jesus

Iscariot had to be paid a fairly large sum of money (thirty pieces of silver) to identify Jesus with a kiss on the cheek—a familiar, friendly type of a gesture to unmistakably point him out in the midst of a crowd.

Notice it in the longest of the gospel accounts written by Matthew, a tax collector by trade: "While he [Jesus] was still speaking, Judas [Iscariot] came, one of the twelve, and with him a great crowd with swords and clubs. Now the betrayer [Judas] had given them a sign, saying, *The one I shall kiss is the man; seize him.*" (Matt. 26:47-48, RSV.)

If Jesus had looked any different in any particularly outstanding way from any other of the eleven disciples with him, why did Judas need to go to the trouble of identifying him with a kiss on the cheek (the

customary greeting of the day, comparable to today's handshake)?

No, Jesus did *not* have a constant halo above his head that would instantly tell any passerby who he was. Jesus did *not* have, as a human being, a shining face like Moses returning from the mount.

Believe it or not, Jesus was not handsome! All heads did not turn when he walked by. Does that shock anybody?



Almost all religious commentators agree that the 53rd chapter of Isaiah constitutes a prophecy of key facts and events surrounding the first coming of Christ. Notice what that prophet predicted about Jesus: "He hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is nothing that we should desire him, because he is despised and he is despised, and he is despised, and he is despised, and he is despised." (KJV.) The Revised Standard Version ren-

ders the same verse: "He had no form or comeliness that we should look at him. . . ."

Jesus had no specific outstanding characteristics that made him especially physically attractive. His charisma was in his message, personality, and example, not in his physical appearance per se.


Jesus Did Not Have Long Hair

Many will be surprised to know that Jesus had a fairly short haircut. The traditional Jesus with long hair was a later Greek innovation inspired by the fact that Zeus and other Greek gods were fashioned with long hair by their human creators. Originally during the days of Jesus, even the busy, hot Roman rulers and leaders showed shorter hair like some of the



DID JESUS HAVE LONG HAIR?

From a historical point of view, the hair of Jesus is a matter of debate, and the only thing that is certain is that he had hair. The Bible does not say anything about the length of his hair, but it does say that he had a beard. The Bible also says that he had a crown of thorns put on his head. The Bible does not say anything about the color of his hair, but it does say that he had a beard. The Bible also says that he had a crown of thorns put on his head.



fuller styles of today, i.e., the Italian cut.

Short hair was the dominant, accepted mode for wearing men's hair in the time of Jesus Christ. On pages 126 and 127 of *A History of the Holy Land* (edited by Michael Avi-Yonah) are busts of Pompey, Augustus, and one believed to be *Herod the Great* (an observant Jew by religion) — *all with short hair!* All statues and carvings of Roman legionnaires show them with closely cropped hair. All Roman emperors before, during, and after the time of Jesus Christ, from Julius Caesar to Trajan, wore their hair short. The Roman emperor was the individual who set the pattern in styles and modes of dress for the whole empire — which included Galilee and Judea in Jesus' day.

Prior to the Roman Empire, the Hellenistic Greek culture dominated the Eastern Mediterranean area, including the Holy Land. Even in Christ's day, a large portion of the Jewish population was Greek-speaking and Hellenistic in outlook. (See John 12:20, Acts 6:1, etc.) Short hair was also the Greek Hellenistic style for men. (See Gaalyahu Cornfield's *Daniel to Paul*, pp. 15, 146.)

Professor Cornfield, a noted author, historian, and archaeologist, captioned one of the statues: "Marble statuette of an unidentified man of the Hellenistic period — a time of close contacts between the Jewish and Hellenistic civilizations in thought, art and everyday life. Whether Jewish or Gentile, he evokes his age and environment" (ibid). The statue had short hair!

Non-Hellenistic Jews, also traditionally wore their hair short. Even the anti-Hellenistic Jewish *Talmud* states that all priests should have their hair cut once every thirty days (Ta'anith 17a). This priestly law is undoubtedly based on the biblical injunction found in Ezekiel 44:20: "They [the priests] shall not shave their heads or let their locks grow long; they shall only trim the hair of their heads" (RSV).

The *Talmud* specifies the "Julian," or what we would call the "Caesar cut" (Sanhedrin 22b). God had set rather stringent regulations for the conduct of priests in the Pen-

tateuch. They were supposed to set the example for the rest of the community (see Mal. 2:7).

Statues and other reproductions of Jewish men from Jesus' day are few and far between because many Jews objected to them on religious grounds. But those few representations we do possess inevitably point to *short hair* (see *Daniel to Paul*, p. 287).

Other sources of ancient pictures of known Jews having short hair are (1) Nathan Ausubel's *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, 25:26; and (2) *The Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia*, p. 167. The former shows Jewish conceptions of both David and Ezra dating from A.D. 25. The latter shows Jews of the third century with short hair.

Christ was an average Jew of his day. How long do you think he wore his hair?

An Apostolic Example

Have you ever read the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians — a letter written to a Gentile church? A portion of that particular biblical chapter is devoted to hair lengths of both men and women. The apostle Paul wrote in verses 14 through 16: "Does not nature itself teach you that for a man to wear long hair is degrading [a shame, KJV] to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her pride [glory, KJV]? For her hair is given to her for a covering. If any one is disposed to be contentious, we recognize no other practice, nor do the churches of God" (RSV).

Paul, primarily the apostle to the gentiles, received the gospel *directly* from Christ. He wrote to the Galatians: "For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:11-12, RSV). Jesus actually appeared directly to the apostle Paul (see 1 Cor. 15:8).

Paul said: "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (1 Cor. 9:1). He also said: "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1) in the very same chapter where men wearing long hair is mentioned as being a shame.

My point is that Jesus Christ did

not contradict the words of his own apostle while he was a human being. He did not deliver a gospel to Paul that contradicted his own personal life-style.

Paul did not say: "Follow me as I follow Christ" and then go out and preach and write the diametric opposite of what he was directly taught.

Jesus was *not* a shame to Paul. Jesus Christ, who was Paul's champion, soon-coming king, and high priest, *did not wear long hair!*

Jesus Was Not a Nazarite

Some religionists claim that Jesus Christ was under some sort of "Nazaritic vow," and therefore automatically wore his hair long. The truth is that Jesus did *not* fulfill a single one of the strict scriptural obligations laid upon a "Nazarite."

A Nazarite was (1) not to drink wine, (2) not to cut his hair as a token of humiliation, (3) and not to touch a dead body (see Numbers 6:1-27). The Bible proves that Jesus drank wine, touched a dead body on occasion (Matt. 9:18-25; Mark 5:35-43, etc.), and had his hair cut, as we have already proved.

Some few have even gotten the terms Nazarite, Nazarene, and Nazareth mixed up in their minds. In Matthew 2:23 it says: "And he [Jesus] came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: [why?] that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene" (KJV). Almost any Bible dictionary will tell you that a Nazarene was merely an inhabitant or citizen of Nazareth — the city where Jesus grew up (Mark 1:9, Luke 1:26, John 1:45). A man from Texas is a Texan; a man from Nazareth is a Nazarene. Neither of these two names has anything to do with a Nazarite vow.

Paintings of Christ—Accurate?

Down through history artists have portrayed Christ as he reflected their ideas and ideals. The "earliest Christ" pictured by artists is found on the walls of the catacombs in Rome. These post-apostolic repre-

sentations were painted somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 to 200 years after the time of Christ — all probably done in defiance of early Catholic thinking concerning idolatrous images.

Various authors have commented on these earliest paintings of Christ. Dr. Farrar, in his authoritative book, *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*, has this to say about these primitive paintings: "He [Christ] is almost invariably boyish and beardless. . . His hair is short" (p. 43).

What is thought to be the oldest of these catacomb pictures is described by Roderic Dunkerley: "In particular, there is a painting of the Resurrection of Lazarus in which Christ is shown youthful and beardless, with short hair and large eyes. . . Although it is now only barely recognizable. . ." (*Beyond the Gospels*, p. 57).

The early, classic, youthful Christ was consistently painted beardless and with short hair. No doubt these very first artistic renderings were heavily influenced by the Hellenistic culture extant during the days of Jesus — who lived in a short-haired culture.

I personally doubt their authenticity because the book of Isaiah definitely indicates that Christ would have a beard. "I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard. I hid not my face from shame and spitting" (Isa. 50:6, RSV).

Gradually the artistic conception of Jesus changed over the centuries. By the time of the tenth or eleventh century a sadomasochistic view of self-suffering, ascetic, self-denial and self-flagellation was in vogue. So spanning several centuries of time artists tended to picture Jesus as a man of complete sorrow, sadness and seriousness — never with a smile on his face.

Later Michelangelo accepted the idea of an Old Testament God of wrath — and the painters of his era generally pictured a God of divine fury that had to be placated by saints like Mary and St. Francis.

In the 19th century, the pendulum swung back in the other direction, probably in reaction to Michelangelo. Then an "effeminate,

overly pious Christ was pictured smiling serenely from a stained-glass window as he held a shepherd's crook while being surrounded by lambs.

Not a single one of these pictures, of whatever era, represents the true Jesus. Nobody painted him when he was a human being on this earth.

Did you know about the so-called *Report of Publius Lentulus* which describes Jesus as having long hair? This letter was supposedly written by the Roman governor of Judaea to the Emperor Tiberius. But accurate historical records of the Roman governors at that time are still in existence. There was *no governor of Judaea by the name of Publius Lentulus during the time of Jesus Christ*.

Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed, a well-known biblical scholar, comments on this totally spurious forgery: "The 'Letter of Lentulus' is evidently a fiction, designed to give currency to the description contained in the painter's manuals about the personal appearance of Jesus. . . It is probably as old as the thirteenth century, but it was unknown to Christian antiquity, and has no claims to serious attention as throwing any light on the personal appearance of Jesus" (*Modern Apocrypha*, p. 91).

Why the Identity Crisis?

Jesus knew he was a Jew. Pilate knew that Jesus was a Jew. The Samaritan woman knew. The apostles knew. The Bible plainly says that he was. Then why do some people today believe otherwise?

Because they almost never go to the only authentic source — the biblical scriptures. Or if they do, their biases and prejudices are so thick that they simply can't see what their eyes plainly tell them is there. That is why people have an identity crisis with Jesus Christ of Nazareth. That is why people want to cling to their many misconceptions about Jesus Christ and the Bible itself. Human nature would like to hang on to happenstance tradition, possibly, perhaps, probably's, and maybe's — rather than face the straight-from-the-shoulder biblical facts.

Jesus' generation was no different from ours in that respect. One of the major points of the gospels was the

continuing struggle between opposing points of view as to who Jesus really was.

The book of Matthew makes it plain that those people back then had an identity crisis with Jesus Christ of major proportions. "When Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, 'Who do men say that the Son of man is?' And they said, 'Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets'" (Matt. 16:13-14, RSV).

The question is: Did the general public believe some of these fantastic stories? They certainly did! Some carried these utterly untrue convictions with them to their graves.

Most of the people of the Middle East were thoroughly confused as to Christ's true identity. But not his immediate disciples. "He [Jesus] said to them, 'But who do you say that I am?'" Simon Peter replied, "You are Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answered him, "Blessed are you Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven" (verses 15-17).

Peter knew who the real Jesus was! And it wasn't just the fact that he had been one of his closest friends and companions. There was a miraculous element of revelation involved in his understanding.

The Next Installment


In this article we've substantiated that Jesus Christ of Nazareth was a common, everyday, ordinary-looking young Jewish man of his day with a fairly short haircut.

The concluding article in this two-part series will show you that, believe it or not, Jesus Christ did not convert one single person during his entire earthly ministry, that he lived in and owned as many as two houses in two different cities, that he sometimes hobnobbed with the upper crust of society, that he paid his taxes as a property owner, and that he was subject to civil authorities.

All this information and more is coming up in either the next or a soon-coming issue of this magazine. If you don't wish to wait that long, write for the free booklet entitled *The Real Jesus*, which contains much of the same information. □

IS IT TIME TO TAME TV?

by Dexter I. Faulkner



Many recent studies have assailed television aggression, violence, and immorality for adversely influencing children. But now, research shows that even adults are definitely affected by television violence. This article describes some of these profoundly significant studies and it also discusses the question, "Is it time to tame television?"

By any measure, whether magnetic appeal, amount of exposure, or power to change behavior, commercial television now wields the major educational impact in the land.

Does that sound like a sensational exaggeration? Then ponder these statistics:

By the time the average American child reaches adolescence, he will have spent twice as many hours watching television as he has sitting behind his school desk. Believe it or not, he'll have had 22,000 hours of television "instruction," as opposed to 11,000 hours worth of school instruction.

Even before he reaches age five he will already have spent more time in front of a television than the average student in a liberal arts program spends in the classroom throughout his entire four years of college attendance.

And what will make up a child's TV diet? Studies show that children favor adult TV programs — especially crime thrillers.

Just how violent are these television shows?

In a Washington, D.C. survey, three major television networks were surveyed to determine how much violence would be viewed in one week between 3 p.m. and 11 p.m. During this span of time there were 113 stabbings, 92 shootings, 168 beatings, 9 stranglings, and 179 other specific acts of violence per-

petrated before the television audience. There was one specific act of violence every 16.9 minutes, a killing every 43.8 minutes.

These statistics take on greater significance when you consider that the average American family watches over 6 hours of television every day.

By the time the average American child reaches age 14 he will have witnessed the violent destruction of over 13,000 human beings on television! His TV diet will have been filled with thousands of bodily assaults of one man or woman against another. He'll have witnessed thousands of violent crimes and seen countless numbers of belligerent acts.

Violence Affects Viewers

Does this steady diet of violence and immorality have an effect on TV viewers? Some social scientists say it doesn't, claiming there is no actual proof that TV violence has any real effect on children. Others say, "We need more refined research on the subject."

But the fact is that numerous studies have already conclusively established that television *does* directly influence not only children, but also adults.

Dr. Harry J. Skornia, professor of radio and television at the University of Illinois, states that television can have a profound effect on viewers.

According to Dr. Skornia, "The most all-encompassing single finding from educational television research has been that in almost all projects there has been 'no significant difference' between what thousands of students learn from TV (often from single teachers or program series) and what they learn from face-to-face conventional teaching."

"Thousands of individuals can now learn life-saving (or life-destroying or safe-cracking) as well from TV as they would be able to learn from the thousands of individual teachers (or gangsters) that

would be required for conventional teaching."

In summing up all the research, which unquestionably shows how effective television is in teaching, Dr. Skornia says, "Judged by those criteria which educators find useful in predicting effectiveness in teaching, the principal characters in westerns, crime and private-eye series, situation comedies, and other popular TV programs would seem to rate fairly high in teaching effectiveness."

There is considerable evidence or danger that what these individuals demonstrate regularly will, by all valid learning theory criteria, be learned.

"To believe that all or most of these attractive, admired characters, often using and illustrating techniques of physical violence, revenge, burglary, escape, fighting, and do-it-yourself justice, are unsuccessful as teachers, failing to teach what they demonstrate, is directly at variance with what we know about television's superiority, specifically for demonstration purposes, in teaching specific skills and behavior."

In the early 1970's noted researchers J. R. Dominick and Bradley S. Greenberg studied youth attitudes toward violence as related to TV exposure. They found that "the greater level of exposure to TV violence, the more the child was willing to use violence, to suggest it as a solution to conflict, and to perceive it as effective."

In another study, F. B. Steuer and a team at the University of North Carolina, compared the aggressive behavior of nursery school children matched in pairs according to how much television they ordinarily watched. One member from each pair was shown an aggressive TV show on 11 different days, taken from among those ordinarily broadcast on Saturday mornings. The other member of the pair saw a non-aggressive show on the same days. Afterward, the children were observed during natural play.

In every pair of matched children, the child who had viewed the violent

ARE YOU A TV ADDICT?

Nicholas Johnson, former head of the FCC, recently suggested, with a wee bit of facetiousness, that television could be as addictive as alcohol. He offers this list of ten questions which will help you to determine if you are already addicted to television.

1. Do you turn down the set when you answer the phone so the caller won't know you're watching television?

2. Do you stay up late watching television, but can't remember the next morning what you saw?

3. Do you have to watch a television program as soon as you get up in the morning?

4. Do you suddenly find that you have watched several television programs in a row without thinking about it?

5. When you have visitors, do you find it impossible to turn off the set or to carry on a conversation without continuing to watch?

6. If unexpected visitors come, do you rush to turn the channel to a "better" program?

7. Did you refuse a social engagement because you didn't want to miss a program, but were ashamed to tell anyone that was the reason?

8. If you try to go through an evening without television, do you become nervous and irritable? Do you have trouble figuring out what to do with your eyes?

9. When other people say you're watching too much television, do you become defensive?

10. Do you find yourself saying, "I never watch TV, but I just happened to turn the set on the other night and . . ."

show had become more aggressive than his partner!

Television-Induced Apathy

An even more disturbing conclusion was found in a recent study by researchers Ronald Drabman of the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson and Margaret Hanfatty Thomas of Florida Technological University in Orlando. They found that violence on TV directly contributed to giving children a head start on the apathy that has grown to such scandalous proportions in the adult population of society.

In three separate experiments, they found that "exposure to TV violence can increase normal children's toleration of real-life aggression."

"These studies provide strong evidence that continued exposure to TV violence is teaching children to accept aggression as a way of life," the researchers stated. If TV is teaching some to become more violent while others are learning to tolerate their aggression, "a future society in which virtually all adults have been exposed to a continued deluge of violence since infancy could well be an unfortunate place to live."

Many scientists are convinced the cause-and-effect relationship in *children* has been well established. "But remember," points out Dr. Fredric Wertham, "children grow up to be adults incorporating into their psyches the thousands of hours of television they saw in their youth."

Adults Also Affected

Indeed, new recent research is now establishing that it is not only impressionable children that are adversely influenced by TV programming. Scientists are now finding evidence that television is also directly pushing adults toward aggressive behavior.

The results of a University of California study "are especially important," says researcher Dr. Roderick Gorney, "because adults, after all,

are the ones who are making decisions, declaring war, voting for president, putting additives in our food . . ."

Dr. Gorney and other researchers are finding indications that excessive viewing of crime and violence shows (they constitute 30 percent of prime-time TV) apparently can stimulate aggressive behavior in adults and can also develop in them a distorted view of how dangerous the world really is.

The adults in the test group that were presented with a constant diet of violence on TV rated themselves as increasingly more hostile and aggressive in mood as time passed. They also were observed to be acting more aggressively toward their families and associates, and they were less tolerant of minor frustrations. By contrast, those exposed to TV programs encouraging beneficence and humanitarianism generally became more charitable in mood and actions.

Distorted View of Reality

Dr. George Gerbner, dean of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, stated that his research shows that constant viewers of television believe there is a 50-50 chance of being involved in a violent incident in any given week. In actual fact, says Gerbner, the statistics are one in 100, but the viewers' distorted ideas about the world came from their immersion in the TV world of muggings, violence, and murder.

Does all this mean a person should yank his television cord out of the wall socket or take an ax to his TV set? No, television is a technological and social phenomenon that's here to stay, and we need to make the best use of it.

The television set of itself is not the problem. It only receives what broadcasters choose to sell and audiences choose to watch. Nor is the television the only media source of violence and immorality. But it is unquestionably the largest and most influential source.

What You Can Do

The way to protect you and/or your children from being adversely affected by television is to be more selective of the programs you watch. Where television is actively promoting values, thoughts, and mores which are alien to your home, you will have to exercise parental authority.

Take the time to select better quality programs for family viewing. Don't always assume that children are only interested in the lowest level of cartoon pap or violence.

Programs that glamorize crime and emphasize illicit sex, cruelty, and violence should obviously be minimized if not eliminated from your TV diet.

Along with being selective about what you and your household watch on TV, be sure to watch programs together. Scientific studies show how it's actually best if parents watch TV with their children, especially small children. When parents watch television with their children and comment on fallacies or wrong actions which sometimes creep into "good" programs, the effect of these fallacies and wrong actions on children is minimized. Remember, many so-called family programs are filled with various forms of rebellion, disrespect for authority, and lying. Children should not be allowed to assume that this sort of conduct is acceptable.

Another important television viewing guideline is to limit the amount of television you watch, and the amount you allow your children to watch. Anyone who spends four, five, or six hours a day sitting passively in front of the TV tube watching a world of make-believe and fantasy is probably losing vital hours that should be spent learning how to relate and talk to husband, wife, brothers, sisters, playmates, parents, relatives, and neighbors.

You should replace much of your TV viewing with family interests. What happened, for example, to the good "old-fashioned" family get-

MAKING THE MOST OF YOUR TELEVISION VIEWING

Like many activities, television viewing should be evaluated in terms of benefits vs. shortcomings. To summarily unplug the set would probably deprive you or your family of many well done and valuable programs. Yet an uncritical indulgence in extensive TV viewing may also be unwise, depriving you of precious time that could profitably be spent in other pursuits.

In deciding how much TV to watch, it is good to scan the television listings for the coming week and mark those programs that seem particularly interesting — ahead of time. Of course, in some cases, a final evaluation cannot be made until the program begins, but basically, the following criteria should be helpful:

1. Does the program encourage worthwhile ideals, values, and beliefs? Does it uphold acceptable standards of behavior, promoting moral and spiritual values and respect for law, decency, and service? Or instead does it glamorize crime, immorality, intolerance, greed, or cruelty? Does

it encourage bad taste, false standards of material success, or personal vanity?

2. Does the program stimulate constructive activities? Does it encourage you to learn more, to do something constructive, to be creative, to solve problems, to work and to live with others? Or does it glamorize violence, theft, robbery, smuggling, and other crime? Does it, at least by example, teach that problems are (or should) be solved by brute force?

3. Finally, ask yourself, "Honestly, is watching this particular program the best use of my (or my family's) time?" Granted, watching TV can be relaxing; and it certainly requires little or no effort on your part. But is a large investment of time in TV viewing consistent with other goals and aspirations you have? Would the time be better utilized in recreation, hobbies, in reading, or even in family conversation.

Only you can provide the answer.

together, where family members simply talked, sharing interests, ideas, needs, desires, thoughts on current world events, happenings at school, work, or the neighborhood? Don't let television stifle or replace your family conversation.

Rather than permit the television set to absorb all your leisure time, develop an interest in some constructive hobby. Children also need to be encouraged to take up constructive hobbies rather than spending all their time in front of the TV.

With teenagers, respect is the key. If you show an interest in what your older children want to watch, you should find some common

ground, later, for discussion. Often teenagers are interested in the same programs as adults, and watching the same programs may be one of the easiest things a parent can do with his adolescent children.

Yet the more a parent sets the example of having outside interests, the more apt his children will be to develop other interests besides watching TV.

Yes, it is time to tame the influence of television.

Take the necessary first step by turning the television set off earlier and utilizing the needed initiative and thought to develop more interests for you and your family. □

FIGHTING FAIR



IN LOVE AND MARRIAGE

by David L. Anton

Marital squabbles aren't fun. But they need not be destructive if a couple knows how to "fight" correctly. Here are the rules.

It comes as no surprise to hear that married couples have arguments. In fact, sometimes they have more than arguments. They have fights! But it isn't polite to call them "fights" — so let's call them "opportunities."

This article is about opportunities to calmly or not so calmly discuss troublesome issues, to improve communication in a marriage, and to

increase true intimacy between husband and wife.

According to Robert Kelley, author of *Courtship, Marriage and the Family*, a marital argument is "a result of a breakdown in the working partnership between husband and wife." These breakdowns occur for a number of reasons — emotional frustrations, hurt feelings, misunderstood role expectations, and

every variety of poor communications. Sex, money, and children seem to be the subjects most often argued about.

It takes skill and self-control to turn these destructive squabbles into "fair fights" that improve husband-wife communications, solve problems, and produce positive results. But it can be done by following the rules.

RULE



Do Your Thing to Cool Off

Whatever the source of an argument, once it begins people can become extremely angry. In an atmosphere of tension, frustration and hurt feelings, facts can get distorted and common sense talk isn't always achieved. Instead, evil motives may be imputed to every statement. Words may be seized upon and taken completely out of context. So if a couple is obviously heading into an argument, it's best to reduce the level of their emotional state before they begin.

Each of us has his own particular way to cool off. Some people like to go for a walk, others might want to engage in violent sports activities, such as handball or tennis. A bath or sauna can also be relaxing. But however you do it, cool off!

Once you've calmed down from your initial anger, you may choose to forget the whole thing. If not, you are ready to implement rule #2.

RULE



Argue with the Right Person

This may sound like a ridiculous thing to say. After all, you might ask, who else would I argue with? What this rule actually means is that we should argue with the person we are really angry with and not pick on an innocent party. For instance, if you are angry with your boss, don't take it out on your wife. If it's your wife that's the problem,

don't take it out on the kids or the dog. A definite sign that you're arguing with the wrong person is when your anger is all out of proportion to the actual offense.

Some psychologists refer to this type of arguing as "dumping" — piling your frustrations, angers, and hostilities on others, taking out your built-up wrath on innocent people. Children are often the victim in this game of "dumping." They are scolded, spanked, or criticized, sometimes, because their parents are frustrated with others, not really with them.

Dumping is cruel, and it allows a person to escape a confrontation with the real issue at hand. It solves nothing.

RULE



Argue About the Right Thing

You'd be surprised how many arguments are started and fought viciously about the wrong subjects! Counselors and psychologists are well aware that the problems people present are not necessarily the problems of prime concern to them. The real problems lie underneath.

The same goes for married couples. For instance, a husband may criticize his wife's housekeeping when he really may be upset with her lovemaking. Or a wife may criticize her husband about always being at work, when, in reality, she is hurt because she doesn't feel he gives her enough attention.

When we argue, we need to carefully examine ourselves to find out how we feel and exactly what is the source of our irritation. A husband should ask himself, "Am I really angry with my wife's housekeeping? Is that really the issue? Or could it be something else?"

Of course sometimes it is difficult — humiliating, embarrassing and potentially hurtful — for us to share

what is really troubling us with our mates! It takes courage to open up and reveal ourselves! We become vulnerable when we show what really hurts us. It could be used against us. There must be love and trust in the relationship in order to argue about the right thing. But it pays big dividends when it is done.

RULE



Argue at the Right Time

Bringing up a sensitive subject to one's mate not only requires courage and trust, but also proper timing. In fact, the choice of the right time is more important than the choice of the right words. It may work out fine if you blurt out from the heart what's troubling you, instead of keeping it hidden. But if you don't choose the right time to bring up a sensitive subject, you may only make matters worse.

How many times have couples begun an argument just before they were supposed to leave for a party? Not only have they damaged their marriage relationship, they've ruined a good evening as well.

When bringing up a sensitive subject to your mate, one over which you are irritated and must confront him or her, do so at the right time, when you're both able to cope with a discussion. Don't bring it up in front of company. And don't bring it up when you know that your time is too limited to properly discuss it.

Some people play what Eric Berne in his book, *The Games People Play*, called the "Sweetheart" game. One mate brings up faults of the other in front of company. He usually does this in a way that is quite a putdown to his spouse. However, at the end of the putdown, he usually says something like this: "Isn't that right, Sweetheart?" Of course, the use of this affectionate term makes him look good. It also

puts his mate in the awkward position of not being able to say anything in retaliation. This is a "game" but it is not fun or pleasant to play! However, married couples sometimes use other names in their arguments besides "Sweetheart."

RULE 5



Don't Bring Up Past Fights

Once an argument has taken place, it ought to be resolved and buried, never to be resurrected! However, some people tend to "give in" in order to end the argument before they are really satisfied with the outcome. Because they abandon an argument before it's really resolved, they will tend to resurrect that old argument in the context of a new one. Once again, this is subtly showing dissatisfaction with the outcome of past arguments. The unsuspecting mate was previously *deceived* into thinking everything was okay. This breeds mistrust and lack of confidence and can only damage the marriage relationship.

RULE 6



Avoid Name-calling

In a "fair fight" both parties are trying to resolve a conflict in the best way possible. But in the course of an argument, frustrated and hurt mates may lash out, and in turn hurt and frustrate their spouse. And they usually do it through the medium of insults or name-calling.

This form of personal verbal as-

sault is very destructive. First of all, it throws the entire argument off any logical track. Instead of trying to settle the problem at hand, it only serves to add another problem. Instead of examining one's own words and actions to see where they might be improved and how they might contribute to a solution, the party that resorts to name-calling focuses attention on the mate and attempts to blame him for the problem.

In any case, name-calling hurts. It hurts the relationship between the couple. It sidesteps the real reason for the argument. And it ruins the mutual respect that married people should have for one another.

RULE 7



Avoid "Stamp Saving"

Sometimes we save up grievances like we save trading stamps. Perhaps we don't immediately say anything to our mate about a particular problem. But then after weeks or months when we do have an argument, we unload all kinds of things over which we had hostile feelings in the past.

A mate may be shocked to learn of little incidents (maybe not so little to their spouse) which are now being brought up days, weeks, or even months later during an argument over something else. The husband or wife may not even suspect the other spouse felt this way because his true feelings weren't revealed at the time of the original offense. But now, since an argument is in progress, one mate decides to cash in all these "trading stamps" at once.

"Stamp collecting" breeds a reaction of distrust and lack of confidence. Your mate may begin to wonder about everything that happens from that point on, thinking thoughts like: "He seems okay now, but will he throw this up in my face later on?"

Your mate may develop an insecurity and a distrust of you because of not knowing whether bygone incidents may be resurrected in the future.

The cure for cashing in stamps is this. Either express your displeasure about the incidents *at the time they occur* or at the earliest convenient time, or make up your mind to forget them forever!

But what if you see a recurring fault and decide that it needs correcting? Then bring up that fault or action at the proper time when it occurs again. But don't bring it up during an argument over something else.

In Summary

Marital arguments should always be constructive—beneficial to a marriage. They should enhance each partner's understanding of the other and make for increased harmony in the future. They should bring two people closer together, as the problem is resolved. For each partner should learn to see things from the other's point of view as well as from his own.

As mature partners, each can realize that it is possible for two human beings to live together and have differences, that differences are not of themselves wrong or evil, and that those differences can be worked out compatibly, amicably, and lovingly.

They can learn that there is absolutely no reason to hide or pretend. Rather both partners can be honest and aboveboard, instead of allowing a wall of silence to come between them or letting hostility drive them apart.

If you and your mate can discuss these rules together and apply them, you'll have fewer marital squabbles. And you will find that your occasional arguments don't have to be a source of major depression, but can instead be a source of profit for both of you and a real benefit to the precious relationship you hope to keep. □

RECOMMENDED READING

The Intimate Enemy by George R. Bach and Peter Wyden. This excellent book outlines in more detail how to fight fairly in love and marriage (New York: Avon Books, 1968, 364 pages, paperback)

HUMAN SURVIVAL

Then Aladdin brought out the lamp and rubbed it, and straightaway appeared a Genie asking, "How may I serve you, oh Master."

Thirty one years ago this month, the world was changed forever. With a blinding flash and a deafening roar, the most devastating device known to man was detonated over the Japanese city of Hiroshima. The result was consummate destruction and the killing or maiming of over 100,000 human beings. The date was August 6, 1945, just three weeks after the first test of an atomic bomb in the New Mexico desert.

"Scientists have now known sin," mused J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the famed Manhattan Project that produced the atomic bomb. But the sin was not in the discovery of the atomic genie; the sin was in its use. Indeed, no scientific discovery in all of human history has such an awesome potential for either good or evil.

In the heady days following the Postdam conference (July 17 to August 2, 1945) and the Hiroshima blast, the United States emerged as the sole possessor of nuclear technology. Only the U.S. had the bomb and only the U.S. had the sophisticated facilities needed to quickly develop the atom for a multitude of peaceful purposes.

The Gentle Genie?

The atomic genie was immediately touted as good for a myriad of applications in medicine, agriculture, and industry. And true to its promise, the nuclear genie has offered mankind gifts ranging from radio-tracer studies of crops and nutrients to atomic-powered heart pacemakers. The past 30 years have indeed seen millions of the earth's inhabitants benefit from the secrets of the atom.

Knowledge of Good and Evil

LIVING WITH THE ATOMIC GENIE

by Plain Truth Research Staff

The promise of cheap, abundant power from the atom also loomed on the horizon in 1945. And today, with the worldwide energy crisis, there is an increased impetus for the development of nuclear energy sources. Yet the promise of cheap and clean power has been assailed as a risk-filled route to reactor roulette. (Please see the accompanying article.)

Nuclear Fusion — Tomorrow's Energy?

There may, however, be another energy option — nuclear fusion.

Power derived from the splitting of atoms in nuclear *fission* has two major disadvantages. (1) the fission process produces large amounts of intensely radioactive wastes; (2) the amount of fissionable material available on earth could conceivably be used up in just a few decades.

By contrast, the combining of atoms in nuclear *fusion* releases four times as much energy as fission (on a pound for pound basis) and has neither of the above disadvantages. Only mildly radioactive materials are produced in nuclear fusion, and the raw materials necessary (primarily heavy hydrogen) are copiously abundant in the world's oceans.

Unfortunately, nuclear fusion has one major drawback: No one has yet achieved a controlled fusion reaction on a significant scale. The energy put in has always exceeded the energy taken out.

The problem is that in order to get fusion to take place, hydrogen atoms must be heated to more than 100,000,000 degrees centigrade. Such temperatures are found only in the stars, gigantic fusion furnaces which are held together by their own gravity. On earth, such temperatures are created only during an atomic bomb explosion, or by means of a powerful laser pulse.

So far, some success has been achieved, and laser fusion expert Charles Gilbert believes a breakthrough may be made in the next few years. But progress has been slow.

Yet the hope remains that man will eventually succeed in creating a controlled "mini-star" on earth and thus tap what is often considered the fundamental energy source of the physical universe. If so, mankind will have a virtually unlimited source of clean power — power that, even at 100 times the current consumption, would last for 10 billion years.

Peaceful Nuclear Explosions

The term "peaceful nuclear explosion" is a mockery and a sham (if not a contradiction in terms) to many people, especially in the aftermath of India's "peaceful" entry

HUMAN SURVIVAL

into the nuclear weapons club. To be sure, the technology needed for a peaceful explosion is virtually identical to that needed for a military nuclear bomb. Yet many scientists believe that there is at least a possibility of using nuclear bombs for a wide variety of peaceful projects. Underground nuclear explosions could, in the opinion of some, prepare shale oil for *in situ* processing, stimulate the flow of natural gas, or create storage caverns for natural gas and oil.

By far the most ambitious application of such peaceful nukes is Project Pacer. In the Pacer technique, thermonuclear devices would be fired inside huge partly water-filled cavities leached out of salt domes. Through the use of a heat exchanger, the radioactive steam from the cavity would be used to make secondary steam to operate conventional turbines.

For a 2,000-megawatt facility, two 50-kiloton nukes would be detonated each day, or roughly 750 each year, all within the same cavity!

Some experts challenge whether there are really any benefits to be gained from peaceful nuclear explosions. William Epstein, Special Fellow at the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, is skeptical about it. "Such operations would be extremely costly as well as hazardous," explains Epstein, "and no practical way of dealing with the radioactive by-products has yet been discovered."

Perhaps Epstein is correct, perhaps such projects as the Pacer "shortcut" to fusion energy may face insuperable technical problems. But the very idea of quite literally taming the stupendous power of the hydrogen bomb cannot help but bring to mind the words of Genesis 11:6: "And now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do."

Mushrooming Proliferation

Of course, it was inevitable that other nations would seek to utilize the services of the atomic genie. The U.S.S.R. officially "went nuclear" with an A-bomb explosion in 1949,

and since then, four other countries — Britain, France, China, and India — have joined the nuclear weapons club.

But at least until recently, there remained a certain mild optimism that "pressure" from the superpowers (and international agreements like the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) could successfully hold the line at five or six nuclear weapons powers. Even if many "nuclear-weapons-capable" countries existed, it was hoped that none would opt for atomic weapons.

Today, that optimism no longer exists. Nuclear experts almost unanimously expect that there will soon be nuclear-weapon-powered nations number 7, 8, 9, and 10, and eventually numbers 20, 30 and 40.

This expectation, according to nuclear authority Lincoln P. Bloomfield, "could be a snowballing, fantastic belief that becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy unless it is countered by a different belief that is equally potent." Yet given recent developments, such as the detonation of a nuclear "device" by India, and the fact that 19 nations already have 149 power-producing reactors and 23 other countries have plants under construction or on the drawing boards, it is hard to find much to be optimistic about.

The Fifth Horseman?

"Widespread weapons proliferation is sure to follow on the heels of commercial nuclear power facilities," contends Denis Hayes, senior researcher at the Worldwatch Institute and author of a recent report called "Nuclear Power: the Fifth Horseman." "The world's nuclear arsenal already contains the equivalent of 25 billion tons of TNT," adds Hayes. "With each additional finger on the nuclear trigger, the chances of an accidental or intentional nuclear war grows greater." Of course, no country wants to be placed in a position of perceived inferiority to others. If a neighbor or a rival country goes nuclear, a tremendous pressure is exerted to do likewise. As a result, more and more nations realize the potential psychological, political and economic values of enlisting the power of the atomic genie.

Red China, for example, was deliberately ignored by the great powers until she went nuclear, at which time China's international stock rose precipitously. Little wonder then that in introducing a bill calling on the Argentine government to build a nuclear bomb, one legislator declared: "Recent events have demonstrated that nations gain increasing recognition in the international arena in accordance with their power."


Much attention has been given to the possibility of countries taking the nuclear option on the sly or under the guise of "peaceful" research. But increasingly the probability looms that a nation will *openly* decide to acquire nuclear weapons capability for reasons which, since time immemorial, have driven nations to seek prestige, influence, power, and equality.

In a world where dozens of nations have nuclear weapons, the danger of atomic warfare increases drastically. Apart from the danger of the outbreak of such nuclear war by design, there is the more likely possibility of its happening as the result of accident, miscalculation, or sheer madness.

"I would like to remind you of an old but pertinent story," observes Dr. Edward Teller, one of the sages of nuclear energy. "Adam ate the apple of knowledge and was expelled from paradise. It is true that all knowledge is dangerous. It is also true that we must work hard, using our heads and hearts as well as our hands, if knowledge is to bear good fruit. It is not true that we should abstain from knowledge or from the practical applications of this knowledge."

Dr. Fred Ikle, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, puts it somewhat differently. "It is as if mankind has been burdened by a curse," says Ikle. "The fruit of the Tree of Knowledge — the great accomplishment of our nuclear scientists — holds both promise and threat; it can keep alive our civilization and it can destroy it."

For good or evil, the atomic genie has escaped from the lap. "Choose life or death," says the Gnome, "whatsoever pleageth thee." □



NUCLEAR ENERGY — THE ODDS AGAINST CATASTROPHE

Electricity from the atom is produced very much like that from conventional power plants, with one crucial difference: the source of heat. An atomic reactor derives its heat from the fissioning of uranium atoms located in fuel rods, containing millions of small pellets of uranium dioxide.

In most reactors, the heat generated by nuclear fission is carried away by a primary cooling system of pressurized water (2,500 psi). Upon leaving the reactor, the 600° F. water in the primary system is passed through a heat exchanger, where it transfers its heat to a secondary system (see diagram). The water in the secondary system is at a lower pressure and vaporizes as steam, which drives the turbines and generators of the power plant.

In nuclear power generation, experts say the worst malfunction that could occur would be a "double-ended guillotine break," that would completely sever one of the pipes carrying the pressurized water of the primary cooling system (see arrow). If such a failure occurred, the reactor would be automatically turned off by special control rods. Yet the residual heat in the reactor core would still require continued cooling. If emergency cooling pumps also failed, the core's temperature would soar above 5,000 degrees, vaporizing the remaining water and

producing a deadly cloud of radioactive steam and other gases. Eventually, the dome could rupture and the entire reactor core would melt into the ground.

Thousands of people could be killed in such an accident, and thousands more would be expected to develop cancer from the exposure to released radioactivity. Hundreds of acres of contaminated land might need to be sealed off for many decades.

What are the odds of such a disaster? The so-called Rasmussen Report, recently revised, has concluded that 100 nuclear plants would be expected to experience an accident involving 1,000 or more fatalities only once in every 1 million years — the same probability that a meteorite impact would kill the same number. On the other hand, the report concludes that with 100 reactors operating, the chances of a reactor meltdown is a not-so-remote 1 in 200 per year.

What are an individual's chances of being killed by a nuclear accident? The report says less than 1 in 5 billion per year. This compares to about 1 in 4,000 that an individual will be killed in an auto accident in a given year. By any standard, the odds of 5 billion to 1 seem pretty favorable, and hopefully these odds will grow even more favorable as safety techniques are further refined.



NUCLEAR POWER— WHAT KIND OF BARGAIN?

Do the benefits of nuclear power outweigh the risks? Those who think the answer lies in a bet that nuclear power is probably the only hope for the survival of our energy-dependent civilization. Without nuclear power, advocates assert, the U.S. and many other nations will be more and more dependent on ever-increasing imports of costly Middle East oil. If we don't pay the price, the argument goes, we ultimately face blackouts, economic depression, massive unemployment, and inevitable total deterioration of our entire way of life. Indeed, the U.S. is now importing almost as much oil as it produces. We really have no viable alternate to nuclear power, say proponents.

By contrast, critics see nuclear power as a technological monster that not only gobbles up billions of taxpayers' dollars with no real guarantee of benefits but also threatens the health and lives of untold mil-

lions of Kapliss' human beings. A nuclear catastrophe, say opponents, is too big a price to pay for your electric bill.


The result is that few public debates have generated more emotion and controversy than those on the question of nuclear energy.

Those who favor nuclear energy extol it as a viable source of cheap energy, while those who oppose it say we are toying with an incredibly risky mortgage on our future.


In Search of Energy

The whole question of atomic energy can only be properly understood in the context of the energy crisis. As America—and the whole world for that matter—grapples with an energy crisis that threatens to drastically alter our way of life, nuclear energy often seems to be a way out.

We're running low on oil and natural gas. Domestic production of these two fuels has been declining



WCF SOLIDS STORAGE BINS



since 1970. Yet they provide about 75% of U.S. energy requirements. Energy experts say regardless of whether or not natural gas is deregulated, it will supply only half the energy in 1990 that we are getting from it today.

On the other hand U.S. energy consumption has grown an average of 3% annually over the past 70 years—and recently even faster than that. The relationship between energy consumption and economic growth is well known.

Even the most conservative and optimistic projections say we will need to double our energy consumption by the year 2000.

Ultimate energy sources such as nuclear fusion, the sun, the wind, ocean thermal gradients, bioconversion, and geothermal power are the most desirable alternatives to oil and gas—and they should be developed with maximum speed. But we're told they probably cannot be expected to provide more than 10%

to 20% of the nation's energy demand by the year 2000. The exotic energy sources remain future possibilities, not present realities.

What options, then, do we have? We could continue to pay the skyrocketing costs of imported fuels and be constantly at the mercy of the OPEC countries. But domestically there are only two sources of energy that are available to replace oil and natural gas: coal and nuclear power.

A crash program to drastically increase mining of coal could provide a partial solution to our energy needs. Yet to expect coal to provide virtually all of our energy requirements in the next 50 to 100 years may be totally unrealistic.

The Nuclear Option

But what about nuclear power? On the positive side, proponents point out that the nuclear power industry is already here, the technology is known. In fact the AEC report to

450,000 KILOWATT San Onofre Nuclear Power Generating Plant (above left) is located just south of San Clemente, California. If we choose the nuclear power option, radioactive wastes must be safely stored for thousands of years. (center) At right Lawrence Livermore Laboratory scientists work on an alternative and virtually inexhaustible energy source: nuclear fusion.

the President in 1962 predicted that 70% of U.S. electricity would come from nuclear power by the year 1980. As it turns out, it is already nearly 9%.

One pound of uranium fuel as it goes into a nuclear reactor with present technology will supply as much heat as 50,000 pounds of coal going into a coal burning plant.

The average total generating cost of electricity from nuclear power is reported to be 1.05 cents per kilowatt hour, which is 40% less than the fossil fuel cost of 1.73 cents.

The U.S. Dept. of Energy, August 1980.

In the Chicago area, about a third of the electricity supplied by the Commonwealth Edison Company comes from seven nuclear plants. Proponents of nuclear power claim that had this third been generated from environmentally acceptable low sulfur coal, the electric bills paid by consumers during each of the last two years would have totaled about \$100,000,000 more.

Opponents, however, claim that all the blarney about cost savings is a deceptive and illusory gloss to cover up the real costs of nuclear energy which so far have been hidden by government subsidies.

But the prime concern, say opponents, is that a nuclear reactor might release dangerous amounts of radioactivity. They point out that plant malfunctions have already released small doses of radioactivity into the environment and they assert that a major malfunction could contaminate thousands of square miles, killing tens of thousands or even millions, considering the long-term effects.

On March 22 of last year, a nuclear disaster was narrowly averted when a crippling fire broke out in the control room of two reactors in Alabama. Other near disasters have also occurred. Moreover, some plants are vulnerable to possible earthquakes in nearby faults. For example, the Diablo Canyon plant under construction in California is designed to survive a quake registering 6.75 on the Richter scale. But after construction began, geologists discovered an underwater fault that runs only 2½ miles west of the plant site.

A further source of worry is the problem of radioactive waste storage. High-level radioactive wastes from the nuclear reactors must be stored for thousands of years. Yet doubts remain over the long-term suitability of proposed methods for nuclear waste disposal.

Terrorists vs. Nukes

Another grave concern is nuclear terrorism and theft. If nuclear development follows the course originally charted for it, 440 million pounds of

plutonium will be produced by the year 2020. A skilled bomb-maker with the right materials would require less than nine pounds of plutonium to make an atom bomb.

One "nuclear option" for terrorists - short of atomic bombs - would be to blow up a nuclear power plant. Although this could release a considerable amount of radiation, the actual radioactive contamination would be very small even compared to a low-yield nuclear explosion. Nevertheless, many nuclear authorities and laymen are concerned that atomic power plants are insufficiently protected from disruption and sabotage. One power station which has received considerable attention is the San Onofre plant, located just 2½ miles south of the former Western White House in San Clemente, California. If destroyed by terrorists, the San Onofre reactor could be the source of radiation danger to tens of thousands of southern California residents.

Are such plants safe from sabotage? Officials of the San Onofre power station were understandably reluctant to discuss the details of their security systems. But Kenneth Chisholm, a spokesman at the San Onofre site, maintained that the plant's security was adequate.

"Who can say what will happen if and when one armed group of men encounters another armed group of men?" Chisholm told *The Plain Truth*. "Nobody can guarantee there's no chance that terrorists could succeed in damaging the plant, but we believe our security system is quite adequate, and we do have the Marine base [Camp Pendleton] close at hand."

A recent publication by the American Nuclear Society agrees that sabotage of nuclear power plants "is potentially possible," but "the saboteur could more easily attack food, water, or communication services with at least equally disastrous results."

Such statements are far from totally reassuring; yet such are the uncertainties of the times in which we live.

"Nuclear facilities are, by their nature, highly centralized," says nuclear expert Denis Hayes in a recent report, *Nuclear Power: The Fifth Horseman*. "Increasing deployment

of nuclear power is likely to lead to a more authoritarian society, to protect nuclear installations and transmission lines."

The Uranium Crisis?

A final difficulty is that, even if we avoid the pitfalls of nuclear energy's other dangers, we may find that, like oil and natural gas, we are running short of uranium. The troubling fact is that no new major uranium producing areas or potential producing areas have been identified in this country during the past 17 years. Yet based on current estimates of the number of plants we will require, Americans will need to find from 4 to 8 times as much uranium as the present U.S. total of proven reserves.

The breeder reactor could make use of the uranium 238 that is now largely unused by present reactor power plants, but this would mean the production of prodigious amounts of plutonium, which is not only incredibly toxic, but also directly usable in nuclear weapons. Like it or not, the decision to develop the breeder reactor seems certain if we choose to rely on the atom for power in the future.

Nuclear energy - is it a kind of Faustian bargain? Do the risks outweigh the advantages? "Nuclear energy is not a Faustian bargain," says famed nuclear authority Edward Teller. "Rather, it is powerful instrument that can be used or misused. It would be completely naive to recommend nuclear energy as a cure-all. At best it is a potential answer that will have to be accompanied by a determination to use this power in a constructive manner."

Most Americans seem to be in favor of building additional nuclear plants. Indeed, the recent California referendum on nuclear power showed that the majority of Californians believe we must rely on nuclear power in the future. But only if we are fully aware of the risks involved in using nuclear reactors and only if we insist that every precaution be taken to insure their safe operation can we be reasonably secure in relying on the awesome power of the atom. To do otherwise is to invite disaster. □

THE UBIQUITOUS UFO



UPI

by Robert A. Ginskey

A strange, glowing, cone-shaped object with dazzling colored lights moves mysteriously in the early morning Wisconsin sky as five state troopers watch with utter amazement.

Experienced pilots report chasing a silver, disk-shaped craft over Missouri — only to have it outdistance them with a tremendous burst of speed.

Two fishermen in Mississippi are reportedly abducted into a giant cigar-shaped spacecraft and "examined" by three faceless extraterrestrial creatures.

Is it possible that, while science searches for primitive life on Mars and aims giant radio telescopes toward the heavens to probe for radio signals from distant civilizations, abundant evidence of extraterrestrial life can actually be found right here on Earth?

Millions of Americans apparently believe so. In fact, according to a recent Gallup poll, the majority of Americans believe that UFOs — Unidentified Flying Objects — are real and, "not the figment of people's imagination." Moreover, some 15 million Americans claim to have actually seen a UFO.

Few subjects generate more fascination than the hotly debated contention that UFOs represent some form of alien intelligence.

Actually, strange and mysterious objects have been seen in the sky for thousands of years. Even the prophet Ezekiel reported seeing an awesome "wheel within a wheel" that has served as an oft-quoted precedent for unusual sightings in the heavens:

"The appearance of the wheels and their work was . . . as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel. When they went, they went upon their four sides; and they turned not when they went. As for their rings, they were so high that they were dreadful; and their rings were full of eyes round about them four. And

when the living creatures went, the wheels went by them; and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up" (Ezek. 1:16-19).

What Ezekiel saw was apparently a "portable throne" of God, complete with representatives of the angelic host.

Yet the modern UFO era did not really dawn until just after World War II when an Idaho businessman described a formation of disk-like objects skimming through the sky "like a saucer would if you skipped it across water." From that early account came the term "flying saucer."

Since that time, UFObia, UFOria, and UFOlogists have proliferated at an amazing rate. Not even veteran pilots are immune. In fact, at one point baffling and ominous reports of "flying saucers" observed over air bases grew so worrisome that the Air Force launched a full-scale investigation.

For 22 years, the Air Force kept track of UFO reports. Then in 1969, after investigating nearly 13,000 "phenomena," the Air Force closed Operation Blue Book, saying that further investigation could no longer "be justified either on the grounds of national security or in the interest of science."

That conclusion followed a two-year study, sponsored by the Air

"You no longer can dismiss these reports as the result of overheated imaginations."

"Even honest and sincere individuals often misinterpret an unfamiliar object."

"We're being watched by an advanced but benign race of creatures from outer space."

"... there seems to be no reason to attribute them [UFO sightings] to an extraterrestrial source without evidence that is much more convincing."

"I have no quarrel with those who see unidentified flying objects. It is only when they are identified that I sometimes have misgivings."

Force and conducted by scientists at the University of Colorado under the direction of Dr. Edward U. Condon. According to the Condon Report, about 90 percent of UFO sightings proved to be "related to ordinary objects," such as planes, satellites, balloons, street lights, beacons, clouds, birds, and other natural phenomena. The report said that no evidence had been found that any UFO was a "space craft visiting earth from another civilization."

The National Academy of Sciences agreed and asserted there are "so many reasonable and possible directions in which an explanation may eventually be found that there seems to be no reason to attribute them [UFO sightings] to an extraterrestrial source without evidence that is much more convincing."

Following the Air Force study, saucerian circles cried "cover-up" and resolved to continue their quest for final proof that UFOs should be taken seriously.

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, chairman of Northwestern University's astronomy department and majordomo of UFOlogy, believes the Condon Report was premature in its conclusions. "Sightings have gone on too long for it to be a fad," says Hynek. "You no longer can dismiss these reports as the result of overheated imaginations."

Indeed, the past few years have witnessed thousands of UFO sightings and a growing number of believers. Books on UFOs, have become best sellers; newspaper headlines proclaim the latest developments. And who could resist at least a cursory perusal of the article entitled "A UFO Saved My Virginity"?

In 1973, after several years of relative quiet on the UFO front, a new wave of sightings brought widespread coverage from national as well as local news media. Literally hundreds of UFOs were reported sailing through the heavens.

Many of the mysterious objects turned out to be balloons. In fact, this writer has launched hydrogen-filled laundry bags with flares attached, only to hear and read the following day that "numerous highly reputable citizens saw a be-

wildering multi-colored UFO traveling at an enormous rate of speed."

Of course, to claim that all UFO sightings have such simple and mundane explanations would clearly be absurd. Yet the fact remains that honest and sincere individuals often misinterpret an unfamiliar object.

Last November, the world's first "serious" international UFO conference was held at Fort Smith, Arkansas. As usual, the believers attacked the Air Force and other authorities for suppressing UFO reports. But despite the rhetoric, there was little new evidence to convince skeptics. Charles Hickson, one of the men allegedly "captured" by spacemen near Pascagoula, Mississippi, in 1973, repeated his tale, but prudently refused to submit to a promised lie detector test.

Yet the evidence that was presented was apparently sufficient to convince UFOouts (more UFO-mistically, UFOnuts) to continue their vigil. At the conference, Hynek, who has recently founded the Center for UFO Studies, declared that far too much time has already been wasted trying to convince non-believers of the reality of UFOs. According to Hynek, "We need to stop arguing the existence of the eggs and get down to cooking the omelet."

Hayden C. Hewes, director of the International UFO Bureau in Oklahoma City, is confident UFOs are of extraterrestrial origin. "I've diligently studied UFO reports for 19 years," he told *The Plain Truth*, "and I conclude we're being watched by an advanced but benign race of creatures from outer space."

Why the recent rash of sightings? "Man's warlike mentality is being propagated beyond the earth by the space program," adds Hewes, "so these peace-loving creatures are worried and have decided to make themselves known."

But UFO debunker Phillip Klass remains unconvinced. After spending thousands of hours analyzing alleged UFO encounters, Klass has concluded that the strange phenomena people describe are a combination of honest misperception, distorted sensationalism, and outright hoaxes.

UFO's


▶ Why they are here.
▶ Who they have come for.
▶ When they will leave.

Not a discussion of UFO sightings or phenomena.



Two individuals say they were sent from the level above human, and will return to that level in a space ship (UFO) within the next few months. This man and woman will discuss how the transition from the human level to the next level is accomplished, and when this may be done.

This is not a religious or philosophical organization recruiting membership. However, the information has already prompted a number of individuals to devote their total energy to the transitional process. If you have ever entertained the idea that there might be a real, PHYSICAL level in space beyond the Earth's confines, you will want to attend this meeting:



THE UFO EXPERIENCE has an intriguing attraction for millions of people. Lectures and programs dealing with man's relationship to creatures of outer space continue to generate widespread interest

He cites, for example, the highly publicized "craft with 10 large square windows, brilliantly illuminated from inside the object" that many observers reported watching on March 3, 1968. Actually, claims Klass, the "strange craft from outer space" was a Russian rocket, disintegrating as it fell to earth as a man-made meteor.

On the other hand, the famous case of a UFO "landing" outside a Kansas farmhouse was actually, according to Klass, a hoax designed to generate publicity — and hopefully some money — for a family in financial difficulties.

"I acknowledge that the idea of

visitors from distant worlds is a fascinating myth for adults," muses Klass. "It is especially so because it fills the void left many years ago when we outgrew the fanciful and wonderful fairy tales of our childhood, when an ugly frog could suddenly become a handsome prince."

Klass has a standing "\$10,000 offer" for anyone who can actually demonstrate that UFOs are from outer space.

Astronomer and exobiologist Carl Sagan is equally skeptical. "I have no quarrel with those who see unidentified flying objects," observes Sagan. "It is only when they are identified that I sometimes have

misgivings. As long as people are credulous and soft-minded, and as long as their wishes determine their beliefs, there will be a market for myths and prevarications dressed up in the robes of science."

But Hynck disagrees. "I think we may be seeing the birth of a new science," contends Hynck. "The physical world we perceive with our senses is by no means the sum total of our environment."

In the final analysis, the UFO controversy persists largely because after the frank and readily explicable cases have been excluded, a nettlesome residue remains. Roughly one in 30 UFO reports seemingly defies satisfactory explanation. For these especially puzzling cases, three possible solutions exist:

1. They would be explicable in terms of conventional science and known phenomena if the observational data were only more extensive and precise. This possibility is based on the paucity of reliable information about many UFO sightings, but includes the likelihood that many unsolved UFO reports are secret military aircraft or simply clever, sophisticated hoaxes.

2. They result from purely natural phenomena which are either not yet discovered or not yet completely understood. This possibility would include certain bizarre atmospheric occurrences, plasma (the so-called fourth state of matter), and other rarely encountered events.

3. They are, in fact, not of this world, coming from another place and time, constructed by an alien technology and intelligence. They may even be nonphysical, supergatural "spirit" beings. This possibility, while considered to be a "cop-out" by many, would at least explain the seemingly "impossible" feats that some UFOs are allegedly capable of performing.

Perhaps the final answer to the ubiquitous UFO lies in a combination of all three possibilities. In any case, reports of UFOs and extraterrestrial visitations undoubtedly will persist — if only because there are so many man-made objects in our twentieth century atmosphere and because so many people have the will to believe.


© Wenzel - The Plain Truth

BARBED WIRE GREETINGS: The sign reads, "A Hearty Welcome to the Capital of the German Democratic Republic."

WALL OF SHAME

by Terence Prittie and Walter H. Nelson

Editor's note: On the 15th anniversary of the Berlin Wall, The Plain Truth is pleased to publish the following account of the "Wall of shame." Terence Prittie was a diplomatic correspondent and has written several books about German affairs. Walter Nelson has been a news editor with Radio Free Europe and is now a free-lance author working in partnership with Mr. Prittie.



At one minute past midnight, the alarm went off at Checkpoint Four. Sergeant Rudi Thurow scrambled into his uniform and awakened his troops. Ten minutes later, they assembled before Lieutenant Witz, their company commander. Witz repeated what he'd just been told by his Soviet Army superiors. "A bolt is being slammed in the door," he announced, "to stop the 83 espionage and terror centers in West Berlin from draining our country of its best manpower."

Then he explained: Their unit, part of the East German Army Border-Guards, would be joined by 40,000 other troops in sealing the border between West and East Berlin. Barbed wire and other barricades were being put up; soon a wall would be built between the two halves of the city. A soldier standing next to Sergeant Thurow muttered, "Will the Western Allies stand for that?"

They did. The date was August 13, 1961, and this August marks the fifteenth anniversary of the Berlin Wall — one of the most monstrous monuments to the loss of liberty ever erected. The West "stood for it" then, and the West has taken the Wall in stride ever since; the West has learned to live with the Wall — and, to its shame, comfortably.

The "Wall of Shame" Arises

The night Thurow and his men were ordered to throw up the barrier left its mark on them. Private First Class Gottfried Hermann entered Thurow's office a few hours later, walked over to the sink, and scrubbed his hands like Pontius Pilate. Then he confronted his sergeant. "I'm ashamed of myself," he said simply (PFC Hermann was the first of Thurow's company of border guards to flee to West Berlin. Within the next 12 months, 16 of Lieutenant Witz's 96 soldiers had fled too among them Sergeant Thurow.)

The night before the border was sealed, West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt (later West German chancellor and Nobel Peace Prize laureate)

was resting in a train, his "campaign special," which was taking him on a round of electioneering speeches throughout the Federal Republic of Germany. At 4 a.m., four hours after Rudi Thurow's men were awakened, Brandt was called from his sleep at Hannover. Stunned by the news, he took the first flight to Berlin. As soon as he stepped off the plane, he raced to the border between his "free Berlin" and the Soviet-occupied eastern sector of the city. What he had been told was true. The split of the city appeared final.

Another man whose sleep was interrupted that night was the late Konrad Adenauer, then Federal chancellor. He was telephoned at 4:30 a.m. at his home at Rhöndorf by one of his aides just two hours before he was due to be called for Mass. It was Sunday, and the chancellor, a devout Roman Catholic, went to Mass as usual. He did nothing after Mass until the next day when he told the German people over television there was no cause for alarm.

For Brandt, by contrast, this was a Sunday of desperate activity. At 11 a.m., he met the commanding generals of the American, British, and French occupying forces in West Berlin and urged them to send Allied armed patrols to the sector boundary — not to roll back the barbed wire, but just to reassure the West Berliners and to underscore Allied readiness to defend West Berlin. He also asked that Allied protests be sent to Moscow "this very day." (Actually, it took more than two days for the Allied commanders even to protest to their Soviet Army counterparts in East Berlin; it took even longer for a protest to reach Moscow.)

By daybreak, August 13, 1961, East German troops had sealed all but 13 of the remaining 80 crossing points between West and East Berlin. Armed police, "People's Army" soldiers, and reservists guarded those checkpoints which had not actually been blockaded. Four nights later, Communist "shock workers"

built a concrete barrier six feet high across the Potsdamer Platz. What had once been Berlin's and Central Europe's busiest, most congested traffic intersection soon became a concrete wasteland in which wild rabbits lived — because every man, woman and child was moved out.

By August 22, the number of checkpoints through which Berliners could pass — but now only with special permits — was reduced to 7, and the East German authorities warned everyone to keep 100 meters back from the Wall on both sides "for their own safety." The West Berliners were outraged. Willy Brandt wrote to President John F. Kennedy on August 16, asking for a stronger Western response. Kennedy sent Vice-President Lyndon Johnson to West Berlin — along with a U.S. Army battle group from West Germany — to demonstrate that Free Berlin was still "an ultimate American commitment."

In Moscow, West German Ambassador Hans Kroll went to see Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev to deliver a protest. He was surprised to find Khrushchev almost sympathetic. "I know the wall is an ugly thing," the Soviet leader told Kroll. "And one day it will disappear — but only when the reasons for its construction have disappeared."

Why the Berlin Wall Was Erected

What were the reasons for the Wall's construction? Khrushchev put them in his own words during that conversation with Kroll.

"What was I supposed to do?" he asked. "More than 30,000 people and mind you, among them the best and most capable people, from the G.D.R. [the Communist German Democratic Republic] left their country in the month of July. It isn't hard to figure out how soon the East German economy would have collapsed had we not taken steps against this mass flight."

"There were only two kinds of countermeasures possible," Khrushchev continued. "For us to block air transport, or the Wall. The first would have brought us into serious

conflict with the United States, which might possibly have led to war. I neither could nor wanted to risk that. So there was nothing left but the wall.

"I also do not want to conceal from you that it was I who in the final analysis gave the order. It is true that Ulbricht [the late East German leader Walter Ulbricht] had been pressuring me for a long time, but I do not want to hide behind his back — he's much too narrow for me."

Khrushchev had spoken with remarkable forthrightness. He had admitted the "mass flight" of 30,000 East Germans in July 1961, and he even admitted that these included "the best and most capable people." In fact, as he well knew, *more than three million* East Germans had "voted with their feet" since 1945, by leaving the Communist-run Soviet Zone of Occupation, including East Berlin, for the freedom and prosperity of the West. Those who fled were from the younger generation, and chiefly the ambitious among them. Few from the older generation made the break because they wanted to live out their lives in their homes, no matter what.

Just about one out of every five East Germans had fled Communism; the East Germans tried to halt this flow by making "flight from the Republic" a crime punishable by three years' imprisonment, but it didn't work. From 1950 until the first half of 1961, an average 19,000 East Germans escaped to West Berlin every single month. East Germany denounced this exodus as "slave trading" and "pirating of individuals," ignoring the fact that no one was urging these refugees to come West, that what impelled them to flee was life in a totalitarian, atheistic state.

That top talent was fleeing infuriated Ulbricht. More than 1,600 scientists fled to West Germany in just the three years prior to 1961, and the effect was devastating. In East Berlin alone, the number of apprentices was cut in half; 30,000 students fled from East Berlin after getting

their diplomas at Humboldt University there.

Those fleeing Communism wasn't the only thing that bothered that Communist super-hardliner, Walter Ulbricht. The open border between West and East Berlin allowed *half a million* to visit the West every single day. Of these, about 60,000 actually had jobs in West Berlin, and the remainder came over to refresh themselves in the libraries, museums, theaters, and operas of the free Western sectors. So many came to read books which were forbidden them under Communism that, when the border was sealed, the American Memorial Library in West Berlin noted the loss of thousands of volumes which East Berliners were then unable to return.

All these factors had created one Berlin crisis after another — or so the official version goes. While mass flights from Communist East Germany had led to the building of the Berlin Wall, the blame for the Wall cannot be placed on those who fled; it must be assigned to those who tried to stop them and those whose system of government provoked the exodus in the first place. Nevertheless, the West had grown weary and nervous of "Berlin crises," and there were many in Washington, London, and Paris who privately welcomed the Berlin Wall, while publicly denouncing it.

The Berlin Wall, wrote Kennedy adviser Arthur M. Schlesinger, "represented a solution, at considerable political cost, of the problem that, more than anything else, had led Khrushchev to reopen the Berlin question earlier in the year," and had led to the "Berlin Ultimatum" the Soviets had issued.

"It's no use denying that the Wall has helped the West," said an American diplomat stationed in West Berlin. "The fact of the matter is that all these hundreds of thousands of East German refugees were an unsettling influence on West Berlin, as well as a constant international irritant. The Wall's changed all that."

The Wall itself has changed over

the last 15 years. On August 13, 1961, it consisted only of barbed wire strung knee-high; then the wire was raised; next, the first stones were put in place. A mined "death strip" one hundred yards wide was created to stop escapees from reaching the Wall, and this was, in places, "prettified" with flower beds.

The fact that much of the sector boundary between East and West Berlin runs through actual city streets made the job easier for the Communists. They bricked up the windows of houses on their side of the demarcation line, making the emptied apartment buildings a barrier in themselves. Wherever there was a gap between buildings, they erected a stone barrier, but the total length of the Berlin Wall which they actually *had to build* runs to about nine miles, or a third of the length of the boundary.

Still, this monument to Soviet domination was a costly and laborious undertaking. Materials alone cost about \$2 million; more than \$1.6 million was spent on barbed wire, and another \$2 million on towers, bunkers, searchlights, and the construction of the "death strip." All this does not take into account wages paid to construction and demolition workers, the cost of maintaining troops along the Wall, the value of property either bricked up or torn down, or the loss of income from the stores, workshops, and factories affected. Since then, much of the "old" wall of 15 years ago has disappeared, and vast sums have been spent on a "modernized" barrier — one yet more formidable.

What Price Freedom?

Seventy East Germans have been killed at the Berlin Wall since it went up. (The death toll at the much longer frontier between East Germany and the Western Federal Republic is a great deal lighter.) The body count for the Berlin Wall amounts to one innocent person murdered every ten weeks, over 15 years, but in fact most of the deaths occurred at the beginning.


(Continued on page 32)



EARLY VIEWS OF THE WALL: East German border guards (top left) retrieve the body of Peter Fechter, one of the Berlin Wall's most famous martyrs. On August 17, 1962, Fechter was mortally wounded in his break for freedom, though a companion successfully scaled the Wall; bricklayer (above) encloses windows along Bernauer Strasse, where sealed, vacated buildings form a part of the barrier; children (below) play ball in West Berlin, the infamous Wall separating them from playmates in the East sector.

AP/WIDEWORLD





No death was more tragic than that of Peter Fechter, an eighteen year old East Berlin youth. Fechter, together with a friend, also 18, tried to reach West Berlin at 2:12 p.m. on August 17, 1962 - a year after the Wall went up. They charged up to the Berlin Wall at top speed, two blocks away from "Checkpoint Charlie," the Friedrichstrasse sector crossing point reserved for Allied personnel and foreigners wanting to enter East Berlin. Border guards spotted the two youths and fired. Fechter's friend made it over the Wall, but Fechter fell, severely wounded, in between the Wall and the barbed wire adjoining it.

He lay there slowly bleeding to death in full view of angry, despairing West Berliners. The East German border guards took no action for a full hour, in spite of Fechter's repeated and agonized cries for help. Horrified, the West Berlin on-lookers urged, pleaded with, and demanded that the American Military Police at Checkpoint Charlie send a military ambulance to rescue the boy, but they turned a deaf ear to their pleas.

It wasn't till 3:10 p.m. that the East German border guards finally decided to recover Fechter's body. But first they tried to throw a smokescreen around Fechter, presumably to hide themselves while they retrieved his body. At this stage, American MP's who had earlier driven up to join the West Berlin police, actually withdrew, and only a U.S. Army helicopter remained, circling overhead and keeping headquarters informed.

East German Government Relaxing Restrictions

The only East Berliners and other East Germans whom the Communist regime allows to emigrate are the elderly and pensioners. Nowadays pensioners are even allowed to spend some time each year in the West, but for all other ordinary East Germans, the West is still *verboten*.

Still, contact between families has over the years been made much easier. The terrible human tragedy of

the Berlin Wall - indeed, of the division of Germany into West and East - lies in the division and separation of families. Mothers have been torn from their sons and daughters; grandparents have had to be "abandoned"; even husbands and wives have been divorced by Communism's unwillingness to allow the free passage of people or ideas.

Until December 1963, no West Berliners were allowed into East Berlin, even for a brief one-day visit. This cut them off from their family members. For almost every West Berliner had perhaps still has relatives in East Berlin, just a few short blocks away.

From December 1963 until June 1972, East Germany "liberalized" their regulations and allowed West Berliners to visit East Berlin on a very few specific days. Today, this practice has also been further liberalized, and many West Berliners are now able to visit East Berlin and even bring their cars with them.

Although humanitarian considerations must have influenced this liberalization, probably the primary motive of the East German regime was to obtain "hard" Western currency, and no Western currency is "harder" than the West German mark. Every time a West Berliner wants to cross one of the three official border crossing points into East Berlin, he is required by law to exchange six and a half "West Marks" for "East Marks" at a one-to-one rate, although the exchange rate in West Berlin is three to one and on the East Berlin black market, six to one.

"Liberalization" has, however, caused the East German government - which is still the most "Stalinist" and repressive of all Soviet satellite regimes - certain problems. Permission to visit East Berlin has brought in swarms of West Berlin youths each weekend; they're out for a cheap evening in Communist restaurants, beer halls and night spots, and out also to impress the East Berlin girls. The result has been a sharp rise in illegitimate

births in East Berlin, though a recent agreement between the authorities of both parts of the city now makes the Western youths pay for the upkeep of the children they leave behind under Communism.

Also, these West Berliners - many of them bored, restless, rootless, and delinquent - have brought, said Konrad Naumann, a member of the all-powerful Communist Politbureau in East Berlin, "the life-style of imperialism" to East Berlin.

Naumann was talking about, as the East German Communists always do, the "corroding" Western influences and ideas which visitors from West Berlin bring over. Western juvenile delinquency is not a big problem to men like Naumann; what does worry the bosses of the East German Communist government is the influence of the hundreds of thousands of decent, hard-working, courageous West Berliners who cross the very visible Iron Curtain frontier of East Germany to visit their relatives and friends. They bring with them their Western, democratic, ethical, and religious values, and they share them behind the Iron Curtain with those cut off from freedom by the Berlin Wall.

The Wall remains what it is called in Germany, the *Schandmauer*, the "Wall of Shame," but it is also a wall of self-confessed failure. It remains a monument to Communism's inability to capture the hearts and minds of free people and to prevent their flight from Communism except by force. In the end it will prove ineffective.

Aspirations for a reunited Germany may lie somewhat dormant at present, but perhaps eventually there will be a revival of this national dream. Then a powerful drive in both sections of the divided nation for a revitalized, united Germany within a strong federation of European states could bring an end to the Wall. But, however it happens, the Wall will ultimately collapse like the Communist regime which built it. □

THEY SAID I'D NEVER WALK AGAIN

There is sometimes a fine line between failure and success. This warm, inspiring personal story by a well-known N.Y. cartoonist, a victim of arthritis, shows that physical handicaps need not be a deterrent to a productive and rewarding life.

by Bill Boynarisky

In 1927, just after my seventh birthday, the doctor examined me, shook his head gravely, and said: "Bill, it looks as though you will be in bed a few months." I was. But the months dragged on into fourteen long years! I was a victim of arthritis in both hands and both legs. I was taken to the hospital for treatment.

I had always been extremely active, and idle days in bed did things to me. What was I to do? One of the nurses on the floor came to my rescue. She brought me the Sunday comic papers, and it was my daily assignment to copy Dick Tracy, Orphan Annie, and Lil' Abner. Sketching the antics of these imaginary creations amused me and helped pass away the long hours in bed.

As the months dragged by, both my hands became severely crippled. I couldn't straighten out my fingers and found it extremely difficult to hold a pencil. After much effort and struggle, I succeeded in controlling my twisted hand; even today it is supersensitive in that I can handle only very light objects and have limited use of my fingers.

Much flexibility was restored to my hands by a small rubber ball which a thoughtful nurse gave me. Three or four times a day she would see to it that I squeezed the little rubber ball for a few minutes. Without realizing it, not only the condition of my hands improved, but my work also improved until I found myself drawing original cartoon characters.

For fourteen years, every hour filled with excruciating pain and misery, I was unable to walk. Friends would remark, "He will never be able to walk again." Their words, like saber thrusts, seemed to cut deep into my mind and body. My physical suffering was nothing compared to the thoughts that raced through my mind. "Could they be right? Never to walk again?" It was like being sentenced to a living death; a black curtain, thick and impenetrable, hung before me.

Deep down inside, my heart


ticked out encouragement and hope, until I convinced myself that someday, somehow, God willing, I would walk again. At the time it was just wishful thinking. In my dreams at night I rivaled the world's best trackmen as I raced around my imagined half mile track, only to awake exhausted and feverish.

As the days dragged into weeks and the weeks into months, I asked myself, "What should I do?" Then came the resolution to draw again. I would devote all my time — God knows I had that and more to spare — to drawing. I was very determined, in spite of my supersensitive hand. I pitched into things like a fighting Marine, and seemed to find a peace of mind in drawing. Now, whenever I am drawing my cartoons, I feel that God is near me, guiding my "supersensitive hand," making my every pen stroke seem less painful and less laborious.

While going to a crippled children's school, my teacher and the principal encouraged me to take up commercial art. I was talented, they told me. Their staff nurse took a personal interest in me and would help me exercise my legs and hands, very often coming to our home and giving me more of her time to aid me.

The sincere interest in me and my work gave me much needed encouragement, which made me want to prove myself in some way, so that their efforts would not be wasted. With their kind and considerate assistance and patient understanding, I gained much knowledge about health as well as my art. I learned that both go hand in hand; a busy mind makes for a healthy body. As I struggled over my drawings, friends and relatives called and the adjectives slopped around in a pea soup of sympathy.

I soon discovered that sympathy does not pay off in dividends. My determination did. I sold my first cartoon to *Coppers Farmer* in 1938. This was the first ray of sunshine in my overcast life and gave me confidence to continue drawing.



During all those lonely years in a wheelchair, memories of the short span of happiness I had enjoyed in the world of our doors fortified me and kept me from falling into a mood of utter despair. But even that slowly slipped away, and the memories faded into oblivion until the ever-present determination to walk assailed me so strongly that I could feel my inner self struggling for release, much as a fly imprisoned on a sheet of gummed paper struggles to free itself.

It was 1942 when, with the aid of my nurses, I actually began to take my first steps, stumbling and reeling like a toddling baby. Their patience, their constant efforts and their understanding made my will to walk stronger than ever. The sincere personal attitude of many nurses and doctors was beginning to play a vitally important part in promoting my health and happiness. My mother died that year, shocking me into the realization that I just had to learn to walk again and improve my hands, or die in the attempt.

My father's health was failing, and the passing of my mother hastened his death in 1945. Alone, a helpless invalid, I stifled my grief over the loss of my parents and plunged into my art work and the almost insurmountable task of walking. At first, it was as slow and painful as teething. As I tried to stand on my feet, I prayed to God that he would give me strength and courage to fight my handicap. As I think back to those days of my attempts to walk again, I cannot write enough in this short space about the power of prayer and my faith in God. It is absolutely amazing and almost unbelievable what an individual can do when he uses his mind in the right direction.

Learning to walk with the aid of heavy braces and the support of

"GOD GUIDES MY HAND." Bill Boynansky gives God the credit for his ability to walk again, and for his success as a cartoonist. Here are some examples of his work.

cumbersome crutches was difficult. The weakness of my hands made my struggle even greater. It took an hour's effort for one moment of success.

A year passed before I was able to move around with any confidence. As time went by, I tried to laugh at my handicap and found cynical amusement in remarking, "I'm going to have a different pair of crutches to harmonize with each of my suits." But artificial supports are no laughing matter. It requires real courage to go outside, steel on your legs and lumber under your armpits. The discomfort is not only physical, but mental too, and the fear of falling is terrifying.

I have always believed that if you put your mind to doing something, no matter how difficult the obstacle may be, you can overcome it. Your courage must never fail; your mind and body must work in complete coordination for your self-imposed goal. You must keep at it constantly, and you will discover, as I have, that the mind is more closely related to the body than most people fully realize. What the mind wills, the body can do, and there are very few exceptions.

The pain, discomfort, and setbacks I suffered were like a horrible nightmare, gone but not forgotten. However, I did learn to walk without braces or crutches after being in a wheelchair for fourteen years. It was like being reincarnated and my joy was overwhelming, but my happiness was dimmed because my mother was not there to share my victory with me. As I look back now, I give fervent thanks to God, the kind nurse whose little rubber ball has a special meaning to me, and still remains with me, and to the medical staff who actually made it all possible.

That's the heart of my story. But I would like to add a most important message to all. There is still a remnant of ignorance which causes many parents to feel a sense of shame or guilt if they have a child that deviates from normal in any

marked degree. Actually, a handicapped child is born into every third family, and most of them can be brought up to become a satisfaction to their parents and to themselves. The earlier their difficulty is diagnosed and corrective therapy begun, the more nearly normal their lives will be.

Today, we are learning more and more of the necessity for after-care in various illnesses, such as scarlet fever, measles, and the more serious diseases, such as infantile paralysis and rheumatic fever. The part parents can play in helping a handicapped child overcome the temporary or more permanent disabilities, such as weakened eyesight or heart or paralysis of the arms or legs, is increasing daily. By their persistence in following up regimens of treatment and by their maintaining a healthy attitude of mind toward a handicapped child, they will be able to help him enormously in achieving a more normal condition.

A well-known surgeon has said that as a result of years of experience, he is convinced that parents can have great influence on the progress of handicapped children, and that these children can do most of the things that normal children can.

Parents should also help a handicapped youngster to live as much as possible like a normal child, and they should treat him as such. Many children with varying degrees of physical handicap are able to hold their own in sports and games, and parents should actively encourage them to participate at every opportunity.

The easiest way for you to help handicapped people to forget any physical imperfection is for you to forget it yourself. A matter-of-fact attitude and an admission rather than an evasion of a disability are infinitely more helpful to a handicapped person than any pitying indulgence or undue guarding of him, as he attempts to achieve independence and normalcy.

THE GARNER TED ARMSTRONG TELECAST

U.S. STATIONS

Eastern Time

AKRON — Channel 23, WAKR-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 ALBANY — Channel 10, WTEN-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sat
 ALPENA — Channel 11, WBKB-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 ATLANTA — Channel 11, WXIA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun
 BALTIMORE — Channel 45, WBFF-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 BANGOR — Channel 5, WABI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 BINGHAMPTON, N.Y. — Channel 40, WICZ-TV, 7:30 p.m. Sat
 CHARLESTON — Channel 2, WCBD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 CHARLOTTE — Channel 7, WSOC-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 CHARLESTON, S.C. — Channel 2, WCBD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 CINCINNATI — Channel 5, WLWT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 COLUMBIA — Channel 19, WNOK-TV, 4:00 p.m. Sat
 COLUMBUS — Channel 4, WCMH-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun
 DAYTON — Channel 2, WLWD-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 FLINT — Channel 12, WJRT-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun
 GREENVILLE, N.C. — Channel 9, WNCT-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 GREENVILLE — Channel 4, WFBC-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun
 HUNTINGTON, W.V. — Channel 13, WOVK-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun
 INDIANAPOLIS — Channel 4, WTTV-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 JACKSONVILLE — Channel 12, WTLV-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 JOHNSON CITY — Channel 11, WJHL-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun
 LANSING — Channel 10, WILX-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun
 LOUISVILLE — Channel 41, WRB-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat
 NEW YORK — Channel 9, WOR-TV, Rotating schedule
 PHILADELPHIA — Channel 17, WPHL-TV, 11:00 p.m. Sun
 PORTLAND — Channel 8, WMTW-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 PORTSMOUTH — Channel 10, WAVY-TV, 12 noon Sun
 PROVIDENCE — Channel 12, WPRI-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sat
 SALISBURY — Channel 16, WBOC-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 SOUTH BEND — Channel 22, WSBT-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 SPRINGFIELD — Channel 40, WHYN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat

STEUBENVILLE — Channel 6, WSTV-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 *TAMPA — Channel 8, WFLA-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun
 WASHINGTON, D.C. — Channel 7, WMAL-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun
 WILMINGTON — Channel 6, WECT-TV, 12 noon Sun

Central Time

ABILENE — Channel 12, KTXS-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun
 ALEXANDRIA — Channel 5, KALB-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun
 AMARILLO — Channel 10, KFDA-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sat
 BEAUMONT — Channel 12, KBMT-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 BISMARCK — Channel 5, KFYP-TV, 12:00 noon Sat
 CHICAGO — Channel 44, WSNB-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun
 CORPUS CHRISTI — Channel 3, KIII-TV, 10:00 p.m. Sun
 DALLAS — Channel 11, KTVT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 DOTHAN — Channel 16, WDHN-TV, 6:30 p.m. Sat
 EL PASO — Channel 13, KELP-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat
 EVANSVILLE — Channel 11, WFIE-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 FARGO — Channel 11, KTHI-TV, 12 noon Sun
 FT. SMITH — Channel 5, KF5M-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 GARDEN CITY — Channel 11, KGLO-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 GREAT BEND — Channel 2, KCKT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 HATTIESBURG — Channel 7, WDAM-TV, 4:30 p.m. Sun
 HOUSTON — Channel 39, KHTV-TV, 3:00 p.m. Sat
 HUNTSVILLE — Channel 48, WYUR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun
 *KANSAS CITY — Channel 4, WDAF-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun
 KEARNEY — Channel 13, KHGI-TV, 11:30 p.m. Sun
 LUBBOCK — Channel 11, KCBD-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 LUFKIN — Channel 9, KTRF-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun
 MCCOOK — Channel 6, KOMC-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 MERIDIAN — Channel 11, WTOK-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun
 MIDLAND — Channel 2, KMID-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat
 MINNEAPOLIS — Channel 11, WTCN-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun
 MONROE — Channel 10, KTVE-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun
 MONTGOMERY — Channel 32, WKAB-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sun
 NASHVILLE — Channel 2, WNQE-TV, 6:00 p.m. Sat
 NEW ORLEANS — Channel 4, WWL-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 NORTH PLATTE — Channel 2, KNOP-TV, 6:30 p.m. Mon
 OKLAHOMA CITY — Channel 5, KOCO-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 OMAHA — Channel 6, WQWT-TV, 3:00 p.m. Sat
 PEORIA — Channel 19, WRAU-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 ROCKFORD — Channel 13, WREX-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun
 SHREVEPORT — Channel 6, KTAL-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 SIOUX CITY — Channel 14, KMEG-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sun
 SPRINGFIELD, MO. — Channel 27, KMTC-TV, 4:30 p.m. Sat
 SPRINGFIELD — Channel 20, WICS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat

TEMPLE — Channel 6, KCEN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 TOPEKA — Channel 27, KTSB-TV, 12:00 noon Sat
 TUPELO — Channel 9, WTUV-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat
 TYLER — Channel 7, KLTU-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 WICHITA — Channel 5, KARD-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 WICHITA FALLS — Channel 6, KAUZ-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun

Mountain Time

BOISE — Channel 6, KIVI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 GRAND JUNCTION — Channel 5, KREX-TV, 4:30 p.m. Mon
 GREAT FALLS — Channel 5, KFBB-TV, 10:15 p.m. Sun
 MILES CITY — Channel 3, KYUS-TV, 6:00 p.m. Sat
 MITCHELL, S.C. — Channel 3, KXON-TV, 8:00 p.m. Sun
 PUEBLO — Channel 5, KQAA-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun
 ROSWELL — Channel 40, KBIM-TV, 4:00 p.m. Sat
 SALT LAKE CITY — Channel 5, K9L-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 TUCSON — Channel 10, KGUN-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun

Pacific Time

ANCHORAGE — Channel 13, KIMO-TV, 6:30 p.m. Wed.
 FAIRBANKS — Channel 11, KTVF-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat
 *HONOLULU — Channel 2, KHON-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 LAS VEGAS — Channel 8, KLAS-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sat
 LOS ANGELES — Channel 9, KHJ-TV, 9:00 p.m. Sun
 PORTLAND — Channel 12, KPTV-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sat
 RENO — Channel 2, KTVN-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sat
 SACRAMENTO — Channel 13, KOVR-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 SALINAS — Channel 6, KSBW-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sun
 SPOKANE — Channel 6, KHQ-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 TACOMA — Channel 11, KSTW-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sat

CANADIAN STATIONS

Atlantic Time

HALIFAX — Channel 5, CJCH-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun
 ST. JOHN'S — Channel 6, CJON-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 SYDNEY — Channel 4, CJCB-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun
 MONCTON — Channel 2, CKCW-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun

Eastern Time

BARRIE — Channel 3, CKVR-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun
 HAMILTON — Channel 11, CHCH-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat
 KINGSTON — Channel 11, CKWS-TV, 12 noon Sat
 MONTREAL — Channel 12, CBF-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun
 NORTH BAY — Channel 4, CHNB-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 PEMBROKE — Channel 5, CHOV-TV, 12 noon Sun

PETERBOROUGH — Channel 12, CHEX-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat
 QUEBEC CITY — Channel 5, CKMI-TV, 12:00 noon Sun
 SAULT STE. MARIE — Channel 2, CJIC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sat
 SUDBURY — Channel 9, CKNC-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun
 THUNDER BAY — Channel 4, CHFD-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun
 TIMMINS — Channel 6, CFCL-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun

Central Time

BRANDON — Channel 5, CKX-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun
 REGINA — Channel 2, CKCK-TV, 12 noon Sun
 BASKATOON — Channel 8, CFQC-TV, 12 noon Sun
 SWIFT CURRENT — Channel 5, CJFB-TV, 11:30 p.m. Sun
 WINNIPEG — Channel 7, CKY-TV, 12 noon Sun
 YORKTON — Channel 3, CKOS-TV, 12 noon Sun

Mountain Time

CALGARY — Channel 4, CFCA-TV, 4:00 p.m. Sun
 EDMONTON — Channel 3, CFRN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun
 LLOYDMINSTER — Channel 2, CKSA-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun

Pacific Time

DAWSON CREEK — Channel 5, CJDC-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun
 VANCOUVER — Channel 8, CHAN-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 VICTORIA — Channel 6, CHEK-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 WHITEHORSE — Channel 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, WHTV-TV, 7:00 p.m. Sun

PLEASE NOTE

This is only a partial listing. For a Worldwide Radio/TV Log please check inside cover and write to the office nearest you. Some time periods subject to occasional pre-emption. Please check your local listing for possible time or day changes. * denotes new stations or changes.

RADIO LOG

U.S. STATIONS

Eastern Time

AKRON — WSLR, 1350 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon.-Sun, 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sun, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
 ALLENTOWN — WSN, 1470 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ASHEVILLE — WUNC, 570 kc., 11:00 p.m. daily.
 ATHENS — WDOL, 1470 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 BLUEFIELD — WKOY, 1240 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 1:30 p.m. Sun.
 BROCKTON — WBET AM & FM 1460 kc., 97.7 mc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 CAYCE — WCAY, 620 kc., 12:00 noon Mon.-Fri.
 CHARLESTON — WCHS, 580 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.

CHATTANOOGA — WDEF, 1370 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon.-Sat, 6:30 a.m. Sun.
 CHESAPEAKE — WCPK, 1600 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 CINCINNATI — WCKY, 1530 kc., 5:00 a.m. daily.
 CINCINNATI — WLW, 700 kc., 11:00 p.m. Sun.
 CLEVELAND — WERE, 1300 kc., 11:00 p.m. Mon.-Sun.
 COLUMBUS — WWWY-FM, 104.9 mc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 DAYTON — WONE, 980 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
 DETROIT — WDM-FM, 95.5 mc., 7:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
 ERIE — WWGO, 1450 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
 EVANSVILLE — WJRS, 1330 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 EVANSVILLE — WVH-FM 105.3 mc., 4:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FAIRFIELD — WCNW 1560 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FLINT — WKMF, 1470 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FORT WAYNE — WGL, 1250 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FRANKLIN — WFTN 1240 kc., 12:15 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 GAINESVILLE — WAKA, 1390 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 GAYLORD — WATC, 900 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 GREENVILLE — WNCT AM & FM 1070 kc. & 107.7 mc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
 HARRISBURG — WHP, 580 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 HARTFORD — WCNX, 1150 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 INDIANAPOLIS — WBRI, 1500 kc., 2:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 JACKSONVILLE — WBIX, 1010 kc., 10:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 JACKSONVILLE, FL. — WCMG, 1090 kc., 12 noon daily.
 JACKSONVILLE, N.C. — WLAS, 910 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 JOHNSTOWN — WJAC, 850 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KINGSPORT — WKPT, 1400 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KISSIMMEE — WFIV, 1080 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KNOXVILLE — WSKT, 1580 kc., 8:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LANCASTER — WKRL, 1300 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LAURINBURG — WSTS-FM, 96.5 mc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LENOIR — WJRI, 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LONDON — WFTG, 1400 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LOUISVILLE — WFIA AM & FM, 900 kc., 103.9 mc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri. AM; 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri. FM.
 LOUISVILLE — WHAS, 840 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri, 8:00 p.m. Sun.
 MIAMI — WIOD, 610 kc., 8:25 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
 MONTPELIER — WSKI, 1240 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 NEW HAVEN — WELI, 960 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri, 9:00 p.m. Sat & Sun.
 NEW ROCHELLE — WVOX, 1460 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
 NEW YORK — WOR, 710 kc., 8:30 a.m. & 11:30 p.m. Sun, 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 NIAGARA FALLS — WHLD, 1270 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PADUCAH — WDXR, 1560 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PANAMA CITY, FL. — WPCF, 1430 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PHILADELPHIA — WRCP, 1540 kc., 12 noon, Mon.-Sat, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 PIRKESVILLE — WPKE, 1240 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PITTSBURGH — WPIT, 730 kc., 12 noon, Mon.-Sat, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
 PITTSBURGH — KQV, 1410 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.

PORTSMOUTH — WIOI, 1010 kc., 12:35 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PROVIDENCE — WJAR, 920 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 RALEIGH — WPTF, 660 kc., 1:15 p.m. Mon.-Fri, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 RICHMOND — WRVA, 1140 kc., 10:00 p.m. daily.
 ROANOKE — WFIR, 960 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily.
 ROCHESTER — WHAM, 1180 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
 ROCHESTER — WNNH, 930 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SAVANNAH — WSAV, 630 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SCRANTON — WGBI, 910 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sun.
 SPRINGFIELD — WAGE, 730 kc., 12 noon daily.
 SYRACUSE — WSOQ, 1220 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 TAMPA — WING, 1010 kc., 5:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 TOLEDO — WSPD, 1370 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 WALTERBORO — WALD, 1060 kc., 12:00 noon Mon.-Fri.
 WATERBURY — WDEV, 550 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 WINSTON-SALEM — WSJS, 600 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 WINTER GARDEN — WHLY-FM, 106.7, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 WHEELING — WWVA, 1170 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri, 8:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri, 10:30 a.m. & 11:30 p.m. Sun.

Central Time

APPLETON — WHBY, 1230 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ATOKA — KEOR-AM, 1110 kc., 4:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ATOKA — KTEN-FM, 93.3 mc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 AUSTIN — KLBJ, 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 BIRMINGHAM — WYDE, 850 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 6:30 a.m. & 6:30 p.m. Sun.
 BOWLING GREEN — WLBJ, 1410 kc., 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 CHICAGO — WMAQ, 670 kc., 5:05 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
 CINCINNATI — WZIP, 1050 kc., 3:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 COFFEYVILLE — KGGF, 960 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri, 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 DALLAS — KRLD, 1080 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 11:00 p.m. Sun.
 DAVENPORT — KXIC, 800 kc., 6:05 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 DES MOINES — KWKY, 1150 kc., 12:30 p.m. & 9:30 p.m. daily.
 DULUTH — WEBC, 560 kc., 12:00 noon Mon.-Sat.
 *EDEN PRAIRIE, MN. — KRBI, 8:00 p.m. Mon.-Sun.
 FAYETTEVILLE — KFAY, 1250 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 GADSDEN — WAAX 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat, 12 noon Sun.
 GLADEWATER — KEES, 1430 kc., 12 noon daily.
 GRAND FORKS — KRAD, 1590 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 GREEN BAY — WOEE, 1360 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 HOUSTON — KPRC, 950 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
 JONESBORO — KNEA, 970 kc., 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KANSAS CITY — KMBZ, 980 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
 LITTLE ROCK — KAAV, 1090 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily, 9:30 a.m. Sun, 5:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
 MEMPHIS — WREC, 600 kc., 11:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
 MILWAUKEE — WISN, 1130 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
 MOBILE — WKRG, 710 kc., & 99.9 mc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., & 7:30 a.m. Sat. & Sun 6:00 p.m. daily (FM).

MT. VERNON — WMIX, 940 kc., 9:00 p.m. daily
 NASHVILLE — WSIX, 980 kc., 4:30 p.m. Mon-Sat, 8:00 p.m. Sun
 NEW ORLEANS — WWL, 870 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 OKLAHOMA CITY — KTOK, 1000 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily
 PAMPA — KGRO, 1230 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 PEORIA — WMBD, 1470 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily
 ROLLA — KCLU AM & FM, 1590 kc., 94.3mc 8:30 a.m. Mon-Fri
 RUSSELLVILLE — KARV, 1490 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 ST. JOSEPH — KUSN, 1270 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily
 ST. PAUL — KRSI, 950 kc., 8:00 p.m. daily
 SAN ANTONIO — WOAI, 1200 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon-Sat, 7:30 p.m. Sun
 SHERMAN — KTXO, 1500 kc., 5:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 SIOUX FALLS, S.D. — KIOV-FM, 104.7mc 12:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 SIOUX CITY, IO. — KSCJ, 1360 kc., 6:15 p.m. Mon-Sun
 TEXARKANA — KOSY, 790 kc., 5:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 WATERLOO — KXEL, 1540 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon-Sat, 8:00 p.m. Sun, 105.7 mc FM, 11:30 a.m. Sun
 WATERTOWN — KWAT-FM, 96.1 mc, 12:00 noon Mon-Fri

Mountain Time

ALBUQUERQUE — KOB, 770 kc., 11:00 p.m. daily
 ARVADA — KQXI, 1550 kc., 1:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 BLACKFOOT — KBLI, 690 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 BOISE — KAIN, 1340 kc., 6:55 a.m. Mon-Fri
 CASPER — KTWO, 1030 kc., 6:05 p.m., & 10:05 p.m. daily
 DENVER — KOA, 850 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Sat, 7:00 p.m. Sun
 DURANGO — KIUP, 930 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 FARMINGTON — KRZE, 1280 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 FLAGSTAFF — KCLS, 600 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily
 KALISPELL — KOFI, 1180 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 MISSOULA — KGVO, 1290 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 PHOENIX — KJJJ, 910 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 PRESCOTT — KYCA, 1490 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SALT LAKE CITY — KSL, 1160 kc., 5:06 a.m. & 11:06 p.m. Mon-Sat, 5:30 a.m. & 11:25 p.m. Sun
 TUCSON — KTUC, 1400 kc., 12:45 p.m. daily, 6:00 a.m. Mon-Sat, 6:30 a.m. Sun
 WHEATLAND — KYCN, 1340 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Fri

Pacific Time

ANCHORAGE — KYAK, 650 kc., 9:00 p.m. daily
 BOVINA — KGRB, 900 kc., KOB-FM, 98.3 mc, 12 noon Mon-Sat, 9:00 a.m. Sun
 EUGENE — KATR, 1320 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon-Fri
 FRESNO — KBIF, 900 kc., 3:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 FRESNO — KMJ, 580 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon-Sat, 5:30 p.m. Sun
 KEALUKEUA, HI. — KKON, 1700 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 LAS VEGAS — KTRI-AM & FM, 970 kc., 92.3 mc, 6:30 a.m. daily
 LOS ANGELES — KLAC, 570 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Sat, 8:30 a.m. Sun
 MEDFORD — KAGN-FM, 98.5 mc, 8:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 MEDFORD — KSHA, 860 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon-Sat
 OLYMPIA — KITH, 920 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 ONTARIO — KEVA, 1380 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 PASCO — KOTY, 1340 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon-Sat, 12:00 p.m. Sun

PORTLAND — KODL, 1440 kc., 8:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 PORTLAND — KYXI, 1520 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 SACRAMENTO — KRAK, 1140 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SALINAS — KTOM, 1380 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 *SAN DIEGO — KSDD, 1130 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Sun
 *SAN FRANCISCO — KFMR-FM, 104.9 8:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 SAN FRANCISCO — KNBR, 680 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SAN FRANCISCO — KKIS, 990 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SANTA ROSA — KPLS, 1150 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 SEATTLE — KIRO, 710 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon-Sat, 11:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SEATTLE — KXA, 770 kc., 7:00 a.m. Mon-Fri
 SEWARD — KRXA, 950 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 WAIKAPA, HI. — KAHU, 940 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 YAKIMA — KUTI, 980 kc., 9:30 p.m. Sun, Thurs. & Sat, 7:30 p.m. Fri

CANADIAN STATIONS

Atlantic Time

BAIG-VERTE — CKIM, 1240 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 CABBELLTON — CKNB, 950 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 FREDERICTON — CFNB, 550 kc., 10:05 p.m. Mon-Fri
 GANDER — CKGA, 730 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 GRAND FALLS — CKCM, 620 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 MARYSTOWN — CHCM, 560 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 MONCTON — CKCW, 1220 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 NEWCASTLE — CFAN, 790 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 SAINT JOHN — CFBC, 930 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 ST. JOHN'S — VOXM, 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 SYDNEY — CJCB, 1270 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 YARMOUTH — CJLS, 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Sat

Eastern Time

BLIND RIVER — CJNR, 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 BRANTFORD — CKPC, 1390 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 CORNWALL — CJES, 1220 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily
 DRYDEN — CKDR, 900 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon-Fri, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 ELLIOTT LAKE — CKNR, 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 FT. FRANCES — CFOS, 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon-Fri, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 HULL — CKCH, 700 kc., 6:30 p.m. Sun
 KENORA — CJRL, 1220 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon-Fri, 10:30 p.m. Sun
 KINGSTON — CKWS, 960 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 KIRKLAND LAKE — CJRL, 560 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 *LEAMINGTON — CHYR, 710 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 LINDSAY — CKLY, 910 kc., 10:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 MONTREAL — CFMB, 1410 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon-Fri
 MONTREAL (French) — CFMB, 1410 kc., 5:00 p.m. Sat & Sun
 NEW LISKEARD — CJTT, 1230 kc., 9:30 p.m. daily
 NORTH BAY — CFCH, 500 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Fri, 9:00 p.m. Sat
 RIMOUSKI — CJBR, 900 kc., 7:00 a.m. Sun
 SARNIA — CKJR, 1250 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily

SAULT STE. MARIE — CKCY, 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 *SHERBROOKE — CHLT, 630 kc., 8:00 p.m. Sun
 SMITHS FALLS — CJET, 630 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 STE. AGATHA (French) — CJSA, 1230 KC., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Wed., & Fri.
 ST. JEAN — CKCV, 7:00 a.m. Sun
 THETFORD MINES — CKLD, 7:00 a.m. Sun
 THUNDER BAY — CKPN, 580 kc., 9:30 p.m. Sun
 THUNDER BAY — CJSD-FM, 94.3 mc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 TIMMINS — CKGB, 680 kc., 9:00 p.m. Mon-Fri, 9:30 p.m. Sat
 TROIS RIVIERES — CHLH, 550 kc., 7:00 a.m. Sun

Central Time

DAUPHIN — CKDM, 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE — CFCY, 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 PRINCE ALBERT — CKBI, 900 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon-Fri
 REGINA — CKRM, 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily
 SASKATOON — CFQC, 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily
 SWIFT CURRENT — CKSW, 1400 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily
 WINNIPEG — CKJS, 9:00 a.m. daily

Mountain Time

BROOKS — CKBR, 1340 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily
 CAMROSE — CFCW, 790 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 DAWSON CREEK — CJDC, 1350 kc., 8:00 p.m. daily
 EDSON — CJYR, 970 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily
 GRAND PRAIRIE — CFCP, 1050 kc., 8:30 daily except Wed.
 LLOYDMINSTER — CKSA, 1080 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily
 MEDICINE HAT — CHAT, 6:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 PEACE RIVER — CKYL, 610 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 RED DEER — CKRD, 850 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily

Pacific Time

CASCADE — CKOR, 1230 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon-Fri
 COURTENAY — CFCP, 1440 kc., 9:20 p.m. daily
 *GRAND FORKS — CKGF, 1340 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 KAMLOOPS — CFFM (FM) 98.3 mc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Fri, 10:30 p.m. daily
 KITIMAT — CKTK, 1230 kc., 7:30 p.m. Sun
 OSOYOOS — CKOO, 1240 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 PENTICTON — CKOK, 800 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily
 PRINCE GEORGE — CKPG, 550 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon-Sat
 PRINCE RUPERT — CHTK, 560 kc., 7:30 p.m. Sun
 REVELSTOKE — CKCR, 1340 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily
 SALMON ARM — CKSA, 580 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily
 SUMMERLAND — CKSP, 1450 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon-Sat

PLEASE NOTE

This is only a partial listing. For a Worldwide Radio/TV Log please check inside cover and write to the office nearest you. Some time periods subject to occasional pre-emption. Please check your local listing for possible time or day changes. * denotes new stations or changes.

LIFE AFTER DEATH?

(Continued from page 3)

These Jewish rulers feared that message. Jesus was of their race - a Jew. If they did not oppose Him, they feared being shorn of their power and perhaps put to death as subversives threatening the overthrow of the Roman government. And the Pharisees thought Jesus proclaimed the *immediate* takeover of that rule!

Not of This Age

Therefore Jesus did not waste words. He struck straight through to the crux point - the kingdom of God is *not* of *this* world - *this* time; *this* age - but of the **WORLD TOMORROW** - a different and a following AGE. Not composed of humans, but of immortals - the **GOD FAMILY!**

So Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3).

Notice carefully that being "born again" has a vital connection with the kingdom of God - with **THE FACT** that it is *not* of this time - *this* age.

But Jesus' abrupt opening statement left Nicodemus confused. The religious leaders and the hundreds of denominations and sects professing Christianity today are confused and deceived! Today's religionists put a different twist on it than did Nicodemus, however.

Nicodemus *did* understand clearly what is meant by being *born*. He knew it meant being delivered from his mother's womb. It meant being delivered into the **WORLD!** Today's religious leaders read into it a different meaning! What Nicodemus could not understand was *how* - in what manner - anyone could be born *again!* And of course, being carnal-minded, he could only conceive of a second *physical* birth. But he *knew* what being *born* meant!

Born Human a Second Time?

Puzzled, he asked, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" He was not confused about what is meant by being **BORN**. What Nicodemus could not understand was a

second birth. He thought Jesus was talking about a second *human* birth.

He was unable to conceive of any but a second *physical* birth. His mind could not *grasp* spiritual things.

Now Jesus had made clear that the kingdom of God is something that can be seen - but not until or **UNLESS** one is "born again." Not during his physical *lifetime!* Also, verse 5, the kingdom of God is something a man may *enter into* - but not until after he is born **AGAIN** - another and entirely different birth.

Here is the crux point that explains it all: Jesus said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is *spirit*."

Man is now flesh - human. He is **MATERIAL SUBSTANCE**. "Dust thou art," said God to Adam, "and unto dust shalt thou return." Again, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 3:19; 2:7).

Those Born Again to BE Spirit

But, said Jesus plainly, when one is born of the spirit **HE WILL BE SPIRIT!** Look at it! Read it in your own Bible.

The kingdom of God will be composed of **SPIRIT BEINGS** - not of humans!

At birth of human flesh, one is delivered from his mother's womb into *this* world. When born of the spirit, one will be delivered from the **CHURCH** of God (physical) into the **KINGDOM** of God (a kingdom of **SPIRIT BEINGS**).

Man is now **COMPOSED** of flesh - material substance - matter. When **BORN AGAIN**, he will **BE SPIRIT** - a **SPIRIT BEING**, no longer human. He will be **COMPOSED** of spirit - of spirit composition - with life inherent - with self-containing life - not then existing by the breath of air and the circulation of blood.

Of the next age when the kingdom of God will rule the world - the life after death - the next **LIFE** -

Jesus said, "They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God..." (Matt. 22:30). Marriage is a physical, fleshly union. In the age of God's kingdom, when "born again" we

shall **BE SPIRIT** - not flesh. Born of God as **SPIRIT BEINGS**, no longer human. Angels are spirits - composed of spirit (Heb. 1:7). Jesus did not say we shall then *be* angels - but as the angels - sexless and composed of **SPIRIT**. Angels are spirit beings - created as such - but not begotten and **BORN** of God as God's own born children. We therefore shall be greater than angels!

Jesus explained this further to Nicodemus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8).

You cannot see wind. Wind is compared to spirit. It is **INVISIBLE**. That's why mortal **FLESH**, as we now are, cannot **SEE** the kingdom of God. Those who inherit it will *be* spirit - normally invisible to eyes still human.

Not While Flesh and Blood

The apostle Paul made clear that the kingdom of God is something a human may **INHERIT**, but not in **THIS AGE** - not while he is composed of material flesh.

"The first man is of the earth, earthy [human]; the second man is the Lord from heaven [a divine God being]" (1 Cor. 15:47).

This is what Jesus was saying to Nicodemus. He was of the earth, earthy - human. He was flesh, not spirit. He was born of the flesh, so that's what he was - **FLESH**. When one is born of the spirit, he will *be* spirit. Paul is here explaining the same truth.

But we cannot **BE SPIRIT** in this present age.

THERE IS A TIME ELEMENT CONCERNED WITH BEING BORN AGAIN INTO GOD'S KINGDOM.

Continue, now, in 1 Corinthians 15:49: "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall [future - resurrection] also bear the image of [the heavenly]" (verse 49). As we are now flesh, we shall be **SPIRIT** at the resurrection; that is, when we shall be "**BORN AGAIN**" - when we shall *see*, enter into, the kingdom of God - when we *are* spirit - at the resurrection!

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the

kingdom of God: neither doth corruption inherit incorruption: Behold, I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep [be dead], but we shall all be *changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [the then living] shall be *changed*" (verses 50-52). *There is the TIME when we may be born again - when we may see, enter into, and inherit the kingdom - when "BORN AGAIN," and NOT BEFORE!*

How shall we be changed? The next words answer! "For this corruptible [flesh, as we now are] must put on incorruption [spirit - that which is born of God is spirit], and this mortal must put on immortality" - be changed from material flesh to spirit!

Until born again, we cannot see the kingdom of God - Jesus to Nicodemus, John 3:3.

Until born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom of God - Jesus to Nicodemus, John 3:5.

Until no longer flesh, but changed into SPIRIT, we cannot enter into the kingdom of God - Jesus to Nicodemus, John 3:6-8.

While still flesh and blood (as Nicodemus was and we are) we cannot *inherit* the kingdom of God - Paul to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 15:50.

Until the resurrection, at Christ's coming, we shall not be changed from corruptible flesh into incorruptible SPIRIT. Paul, 1 Cor. 15:50-53 and verses 22-23.

Until the resurrection, therefore, we cannot see, enter into, or inherit the kingdom of God: We cannot BE BORN AGAIN UNTIL THE RESURRECTION!

Now Heirs - Not Yet Inheritors

While in our present status, born of the flesh and composed of flesh, we cannot see, enter into, or inherit the kingdom of God. Notice, now, the status of the truly converted Christian, in this life - this world:

"Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). Unless one has received the holy spirit, and this spirit is dwelling in him, he is not a Christian. Joining a church does not

The tremendous message that Jesus brought was advance news of an almost unbelievable utopian world tomorrow. It was news of life after death. And it was news that we may be born again!

make one: a Christian. Receiving and following God's spirit does!

Spiritual Birth Process Compares to Physical

But now see how God's spirit entering and dwelling in one compares to the physical sperm impregnating the ovum - the imparting of eternal SPIRIT life, later to produce a SPIRIT PERSON! A fertilized ovum - an embryo - is NOT a *born* human person. Life from the father has been imparted to it. He has begotten it, but neither embryo nor fetus is YET a *born* person. In the same manner the spirit-begotten human is not, yet, a SPIRIT PERSON or BEING, as Jesus said he shall be *when* born again!

Continue: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (verse 11).

UNDERSTAND THIS! There is a direct comparison between "having been born of the flesh and being born AGAIN of God. Jesus said that which is born of the flesh is flesh - a born *human*. That which is born of the spirit (God) is spirit - a born SPIRIT PERSON!

A mortal human life starts when a sperm cell from the body of the father impregnates - imparts physical LIFE to - an ovum (egg cell) in the mother. At this point the father begets, sires. He does not "bring forth." The mother does that, later. His part in the PROCESS leading to final birth is then *done*. BUT THERE IS A TIME ELEMENT. AT THE TIME of begetting, birth (parturition) has not YET occurred

It is necessary to give this ex-

planation, at this point, because the popular deception of a deceived traditional "Christianity" is to claim, that when one "receives Christ," "accepts Christ," "professes Christ," or first receives God's holy spirit to dwell in him, he is already "BORN AGAIN."

First, then, notice the physical type and comparison.

The TIME Element

In human physical reproduction, there is a TIME ELEMENT. From impregnation - *begetting* on the part of the father - having *conceived* on the part of the mother - to BIRTH, or *parturition*, or being delivered from the mother's womb is a TIME ELEMENT of nine months.

That nine-month period is called *gestation*. Upon conception, the now fertilized *ovum* is called an *embryo*. A few months later, it is called a fetus. But *during* this nine-month period of *gestation*, we do not speak of the embryo-fetus as having been *born*. It is in the PROCESS toward birth. It is the child of its parents. But it is then the *unborn* child of its parents. The father has already begotten it - sired it. But the mother has not yet given *birth* to it. Yet it is, during the gestation period, the *unborn* child of its parents.

Now in being "born again," the PROCESS of this birth begins when GOD'S divine SPIRIT-LIFE is imparted to us by the holy spirit, from His very PERSON, entering to dwell within us. Repeat, from Romans 8: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken [change to immortal spirit] your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (verse 11). This is describing the very same thing explained in 1 Corinthians 15:50-53, the resurrection.

I want to make this crystal clear. Millions of sincere professing Christians believe that when they profess Christ (or receive His holy spirit) they are "born again." What actually happens is this:

The Church, Our Mother

When one, after repentance, faith, and baptism receives the holy spirit, the spirit of God puts him into

baptizes him into God's church. The church is called the body of Christ. So we read: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13).

Again, the church is called "Jerusalem above" or "the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22-23). Now notice, in Galatians 4:26: "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

The analogy is this: When begotten by God the Father by receiving His holy spirit, we are put into the church, which during this gestation period is our MOTHER.

The human mother of the fetus within her womb serves the function of feeding her unborn child with physical food, so that it may develop and grow physically. And also she carries it where she may best protect it from physical injury or harm, until parturition—delivery from her womb.

The spiritual mother—the church—is commissioned to "feed the flock" (1 Pet. 5:2) through the ministry which God has set in the church "for the perfecting of the saints . . . for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man . . ." (Eph. 4:11-13). Just as the human fetus develops and grows physically during the PRE-birth gestation period, so we, after begetting by God's spirit, develop and grow SPIRITUALLY in PRE-birth state.

Human life starts with what the Bible terms "corruptible seed"—physical male sperm. Divine life starts with that which is *not* corruptible—the holy spirit of God entering the human person. But as the human embryo must grow till it becomes a fetus, which must grow to the point of being born into the human family, so the Christian in whom divine life has been started by the gift of God's *incorruptible* spirit must grow toward perfection to be born into the God family. He will *then* be perfect, unable to sin.

But not only is the church to feed the members on the Word of God—spiritual food—but also to protect these conceived but yet unborn children of God from spiritual harm, as

When a person is born again, he will be a spirit being, not a human being. He will be composed of spirit with life inherent—not then existing by the breath of air and the circulation of blood.

the very next verse shows: "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive . . ." (Eph. 4:14).

Then, at the time of the resurrection, we in the church—the spiritual mother—shall be DELIVERED from her, and born into—brought forth into—the kingdom, the spirit-composed FAMILY of God.

Sons of God NOW

Now, further: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). The unborn child in his mother's womb is the child of his father and mother, though not yet born—delivered from the womb. So are we, if God's spirit dwells in us—if we are being led by God's spirit—children of God. Yet, at *this time*, we are in the gestation state, not yet that parturition! And only HEIRS, not inheritors!

Continue: "And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be [future—at resurrection] also glorified together" (verse 17).

Now see how this passage designates the resurrection into GLORY, when we shall BE SPIRIT as a BIRTH!

"For the earliest expectation of the creature [creation] waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God"—that is the *time* of Christ's coming to RIGHTS and of the resurrection to SPIRIT composition.

"... because the creature [creation] itself also shall be delivered [a birth] from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole

creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (verses 19-22).

Here is another comparison. We shall be delivered from *this world* (the church is *in*, though not *of* this world) into the glorious WORLD TOMORROW and the kingdom, which shall rule it.

The CREATION is waiting for this time of Christ's coming, the resurrection, and the kingdom of God, because the creation shall be DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption. It is not now delivered. IT SHALL BE at the resurrection. Although this is not referring directly to *our* being born again, it is a direct comparison to the BIRTH of a child: being DELIVERED from its mother's womb.

The resurrection, the time when we are changed to *in* spirit and to *inherit* the kingdom, will be a time of DELIVERY FROM the bondage of corruptible flesh and from this world of SIN—A REAL BIRTH!

Christ Born a Second Time - By the Resurrection

Continue in Romans 8: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he [Jesus] might be the firstborn among many brethren" (verse 29).

Now compare with Romans 1:3-4: "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God . . . by the resurrection from the dead."

Jesus was, in the human flesh His first birth—a descendant of David. But, by the resurrection from the dead (born AGAIN), Jesus became the born Son of God, now no longer human, but composed of SPIRIT—a spirit being. He thus became the FIRST SO BORN of many brethren who shall be BORN AGAIN at the time of the resurrection of those who are Christ's.

Of course we understand, and so did Paul in writing the above, that Jesus was also the Son of God while in the human flesh. Though born of a human woman, He was sired by God. But this is comparing the two births: the one from the human Mary, as descended from the

human David, and the other, by His resurrection to glory, as Son of God.

Emphatically this does NOT imply that Jesus was a sinner needing salvation. He was the pioneer, setting us the example, that we, too, may be BORN of God.

When Born Again What Shall We Be Like?

When we are born again, what shall we be like? The Bible gives us the answer: "For our conversation [citizenship] is in heaven; *from whence* also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change* our vile body [FLESH], that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body..." (Phil. 3:20-21).

Now notice a scripture in the 3rd chapter of I John. Here it plainly says that "WE" meaning begotten, converted Christians are now, already, the SONS of God, as was explained earlier. Next, this scripture reveals that "it doth not yet appear WHAT WE SHALL BE." We are, later, to be something different. As Jesus explained to Nicodemus, we SHALL BE immortal spirit. That is, what we shall later be.

"But," this scripture continues — read it — understand this WONDERFUL TRUTH — "we know that, when he [Christ] shall appear [at His second coming to earth] WE SHALL BE LIKE HIM..." We shall look like Christ!

What does the GLORIFIED Christ look like? His eyes blaze forth like flames of fire! His feet glow like finely burghished brass. His face shines like the SUN, in FULL STRENGTH — so bright it would blind your eyes if He were visible to you now! (Rev. 1:14-16; 19:12; Matt. 17:2)

And THAT is the way YOU and I shall look if and when we are finally BORN of GOD!

Our Transcendent Potential

There is another passage, understood by almost none, that reveals our astonishing *transcendent* potential! It begins in Hebrews 2:6: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?"

Yes, why should the great God be concerned about us mortals? WHY did He put us here on earth? What is the PURPOSE of life? What is our

transcendent potential? It is so far above and beyond anything you have thought or imagined, it seems shockingly incredible!

Can you believe it? Are you willing to believe what is now plainly stated? Here comes the astonishing answer, beginning verse 7:

"Thou madest him a little lower than the angels." Some translations have it, "for a little while lower than the angels." Continue: "Thou crownedst him [kingship] with GLORY and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands..." that is, God's creation.

NOT Yet the Universe!

"Thou hast put ALL THINGS [Moffatt: the universe] in subjection under his feet. For in that he put ALL in subjection under him, he left *nothing* that is not put under him..." Can you grasp that? The entire, vast, endless UNIVERSE! But that is for BORN sons of God. Man is not yet BORN — except Christ only! Continue: Here comes the answer:

"But *now* [in this present gestation state] we see NOT YET all things [the universe] put under him" (verse 8).

But what do we see, NOW?

"But we see JESUS... crowned with glory and honour" (verse 9). Yes, Jesus has already been given the executive administration of God's government — the KINGDOM of GOD — over the entire UNIVERSE! Only, *until* our time to inherit and possess the government of EARTH, at Christ's return. He is allowing Satan to continue on this earth his work of deception. Now continue:

"For it became him [Jesus], for whom are all things, and by whom ~~are~~ all things, in bringing many sons unto ~~glory~~, to make the captain [margin — leader, forerunner, or pioneer — the one who has gone on before us, as we are to follow] of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*" (verses 10-11).

Christ Our Elder Brother

We are, as quoted before, heirs of God, and joint-heirs — as BRETHREN — with Christ. He has gone on

ahead, through a resurrection, to GLORY as the pioneer!

He is the firstborn of many brethren! He has INHERITED "all things" — the UNIVERSE! We are still heirs — still in the gestation stage of the process of being BORN of God. Jesus is now our elder brother and high priest, supervising our spiritual development — preparing us to be kings and priests, reigning *with* Him!

The first thousand years we shall reign ON THE EARTH. For He shall have "made them kings and priests: and they shall reign on the earth" (Rev. 5:10, RSV).

Ruling With Christ

For that first thousand years, Jesus is to reign on the throne of His earthly ancestor DAVID in Jerusalem (Isa. 9:6-7). And "he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron..." (Rev. 2:26-27). But how and from where shall we rule?

Jesus said, again, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne [at Jerusalem], even as I also overcame, and am [now] set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. 3:21).

When BORN of God, we shall BE spirit, no longer human flesh and blood. We shall be given POWER!

As Daniel revealed, the saints then shall take the kingdoms of earth's nations and rule them for the first thousand years — establishing WORLD PEACE and divine government under Christ.

And after that? The passage in Hebrews 2 shows that then, again under Christ, we shall be given power to rule over the entire vast universe — literally all things. For that is the power that has been given to Christ and will be ours as joint inheritors with Him!

Yes, there is a LIFE AFTER DEATH for those obedient to God — a spirit life of incredible potential beyond our wildest dreams! Can we humans grasp the awesome portent of these astounding truths? Attaining immortal life should be our all-encompassing goal. For that is the gift and desire of our merciful Father and His son Jesus Christ. □

COMMENTARY

EVENTFUL TRIP TO SOUTH AFRICA

by Stanley R. Rader

The author accompanies Plain Truth Editor-in-Chief Herbert W. Armstrong on his frequent visits with heads of state and other leading international dignitaries

PARIS, July 1, 1976: I arrived here in the French capital only a few days ago, after five eventful weeks in the Republic of South Africa, where Mr. Herbert Armstrong spoke some 30 times before large and intimate audiences in Johannesburg, Capetown, Durban, Port Elizabeth, and South-West Africa. Mr. Armstrong was bringing to South Africa personally, for the first time, his message about the world in crisis, man's incredible human potential, and man's heritage.

While we were in South Africa, it became the center of world attention — giant first-page headlines in every paper around the world — because racial violence literally exploded during the fourth week of our visit. This violence came only a few days after our very meaningful meeting with Prime Minister John Vorster and only a few days before his departure for Europe and his talks in West Germany with U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

By the time the violence had subsided there were some 180 dead, some 1,200 injured, and property damage calculated to be in excess of \$40 million. Clearly, Mr. Vorster's well-earned reputation throughout the world had been damaged, as well as his carefully laid plans for detente and dialogue with the nations of Black Africa.

Mr. Vorster's meeting with Secretary of State Kissinger was af-

fectured by what many people in South Africa feel is only the beginning of more and more racial violence in the nation, unless concessions are made by the South African government to ease the tension that lurks just below the surface in the large black-inhabited townships located outside the major South African cities. This tension, they believe, is produced in no small measure by the government's policy of apartheid.

Mr. Vorster, embarrassed as he might have been on the eve of his talks with Secretary of State Kissinger, remained as firm in his convictions about the cause of the riots as he was about the fundamental reasons behind the worldwide attitudes toward the Republic of South Africa. Mr. Vorster stated in West Germany that there was no doubt that the violence was planned to disturb and disrupt his meeting with the secretary of state and that the disorders were fomented by communist-inspired agitators.

One of the very first questions that Mr. Armstrong asked the prime minister was why there seemed to be such a lack of understanding and knowledge about South Africa in other parts of the world. The prime minister interjected, "It's not a lack of understanding or knowledge! It's bias — bias of 30 years!"

The prime minister proceeded to explain that the Soviet Union, for example, has never forgotten that the Republic of South Africa was the first nation to break off diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. (in 1950) and that Pretoria had subsequently barred communists from belonging to any trade unions and had outlawed the Communist Party in

1953. The prime minister also stressed that his nation had successfully withstood a communist conspiracy to overthrow the government in 1953.

When asked about the lessons of Angola, the prime minister stressed that the whole world learned a lesson: that the Russians wanted to find out how far they could penetrate into southern Africa. What they discovered was that they could go about as far as they wanted to.

To counter any direct threat to South Africa itself, Mr. Vorster explained, his government would welcome help from any outside source but that he had learned that it perhaps would have to go it alone.

When asked about his predictions for the future, the prime minister stated that he felt that people would be able to visit South Africa in years to come, not only to enjoy its amenities, but to learn first-hand how people of different races could live together in peace. We are all hopeful that the prime minister's predictions will soon become a reality.

We are aware that no society is perfect, and we are also aware that a visit of even five weeks could not prepare us to understand fully all of the problems of such a complex society.

As we Americans prepare to celebrate our 200th birthday at home, we are only too well aware of the imperfections in our own society and our own historical development — a history checkered with many of the same issues that have confronted South Africa since the days of its very early settlement in the 17th century. We should therefore not be too quick to judge nor to otherwise condemn before all the facts have been made clear.

We are so concerned about the entire future of South Africa that we are planning a second visit in November of this year, and I am sure that what we find and report will be of great interest to our millions of readers throughout the world.

76 CAMPAIGN

(Continued from page 4)

which holds a conservative "error-free" view of the Bible. Mr. Ford maintains a close relationship with Michigan evangelist Billy Zeoli who acts as the President's spiritual adviser.

Mr. Ford has written his son Michael that "because I've trusted Christ to be my saviour, my life is his." He has said he seeks to heed Proverbs 3:5-6: "Trust in the Lord with all your heart and do not rely on your own insight. In all your ways acknowledge him, and he will make straight your paths" (RSV).

Ronald Reagan. The Republican challenger is a member of the Christian Church Disciples of Christ and attends an evangelically oriented Presbyterian Church in Los Angeles. He has been described by his pastor, Donn Moomaw, as "a knowledgeable Christian" who "really knows doctrine." His wife Nancy says she prays before every major decision; an observation seconded by a campaign aide who notes that "he and Moomaw are pretty close. Sometimes they pray together over tough decisions."

Mr. Reagan told a religious group in Florida that the United States "is in need of, and ready for, a spiritual revival." In a nationally televised campaign address, the former California governor amplified the theme: "Call it mysticism if you will, but I believe God had a divine purpose in placing this land between the two great oceans, to be found by those who have a special love of freedom and the courage to leave the countries of their birth."

Jimmy Carter. Mr. Carter calls himself a "deeply committed Baptist." He has served as a deacon in his Baptist Church in Plains, Georgia, and has worked in various Baptist mission efforts. Mr. Carter says, "I turn to [Christ] in prayer daily and before every decision I have to make which affects the life of others." One published report says that Mr. Carter prays very frequently about twenty-five times a day, and finishes the day by reading the Bible in Spanish.

Mr. Carter says he thinks "the es-

tablishment of Israel... is a fulfillment of biblical prophecy."

Religion as Vote-getter

There are an estimated 40 million evangelical Protestants, reputed to be America's fastest growing religious "configuration." This easily translates into 16 million votes in a presidential election, most of which have, in the past, gone Republican. It is believed, for example, that Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern, the Democratic flag-bearers in 1968 and 1972, got only about a fifth of this sizable vote.

The founding fathers contrived to limit the power of an individual to put his spiritual stamp on the government. They made no provision for "spiritual leadership" in the Constitution.

If Mr. Carter were to do better among the "evangelical" part of the electorate, it could mean a dramatic Democratic landslide because he would be receiving so many nominally Republican votes.

The net effect of religion in the 1976 campaign could be its power to override the mundane, secular considerations upon which Americans have traditionally voted. Political scientists have accumulated a great deal of evidence that "evangelical" voters are normally among the most conservative in the electorate. Yet this year such voters are displaying an amazing tendency to support Mr. Carter, who is much more liberal on the issues than they are, perhaps in the belief that having the same religious convictions will more than make up for any disparity in political convictions.

In the aftermath of Watergate and Congressional sex scandals, such hopes are readily understandable. However, such voters are likely to be disappointed. The American system of government stubbornly resists, indeed, it was designed to resist, any form of

"spiritual regeneration." The founding fathers - most notably James Madison - contrived to limit the power of any individual to put his spiritual stamp on the government. The system of "checks and balances" was specifically designed to prevent individuals from making any dramatic changes in the political or economic spheres of life, much less the religious one.


The authors of the constitution simply took it for granted that political office holders had a strong tendency to be self-seeking. They therefore proceeded to try to "limit the damage" by pitting them and the interests they represent against each other. They made no provision at all for "spiritual leadership" in the American government. To their way of thinking, politicians should never step into the realm reserved for ministers and preachers.

When a clergyman confronted Alexander Hamilton on the street and demanded to know why there were no references to God in the constitution, Hamilton's terse and somewhat disdainful answer was: "We forgot." It wasn't that Hamilton and his compatriots were antireligious, but rather they wanted to draw a hard line between the religious and political realms of life.

Solution Transcends Politics

The New Testament clearly differentiates between what is Caesar's and what is God's. It speaks of this "present imperfect world" and of the need for the kingdom - or government - of God to ultimately replace the government of man.

Many observers, as well as the candidates themselves, agree that America faces many deep-seated and pervasive moral problems, and the growing awareness of the moral and spiritual climate in the country is a hopeful sign. The solution to those problems, however, will have to transcend human politics, if only because the design of the American government doesn't allow for *politically inspired* moral and spiritual regeneration. While it appears almost certain that the next President will have some strong religious convictions, it will take more than that to produce a repentant, revitalized Christian America. □



Garner Ted Armstrong SPEAKS OUT!

Be Alert—and Watch!

Did you ever notice how politicians, military leaders, and statesmen increasingly are borrowing terms from the pages of the Bible in order to describe current world conditions?

Military spokesmen talk about "the handwriting on the wall" and use such words and phrases as "apocalyptic," "our Armageddon," "the four horsemen of the apocalypse," being weighed in the balance, and similar biblical terminology.

A whole new group of scientists are being called the "Jeremiahs." They deliver statements labeled "Jeremiads" in which they describe a wide-ranging compendium of man-caused crises — the population explosion, the global ecological breakdown and the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology.

All of this goes to show that the Bible is relevant to our nuclear space age where the potential for

human annihilation is a terrible reality.

A credible, reliable basis is needed now, more than ever before, to properly assess and appraise the complexity of the multifaceted problems plaguing society in this rapid-paced, topsyturvy world of ours. The Old and New Testament documents of the Bible, believe it or not, comprise that standard Jesus Christ of Nazareth — the central figure in the biblical revelation — was very concerned with future world happenings. So much so that he foretold in advance the chaotic conditions that currently envelop the earth. In addition, he gave his future disciples in all ages some very sage advice.

He said, "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of man." (Luke 21:36)

But watch what? Simply the glo-

bal series of crises outlined in previous verses — not minor, parochial, localized, day-to-day events just where you happen to live, but such major world developments as wars, famines, disease epidemics, and the economic struggles between nations and trading blocs.

In his famous Olivet prophecy (Matt 24, Mark 13, Luke 21) Jesus was describing long-range world developments which would lead up to his coming rule on this earth. Continually he told those who would be his disciples to be alert to what was happening.

Jesus told his generation, as well as ours, to be aware of impending national destruction — which *did* occur to them nearly 40 years later. He knew that the destruction of the Second Temple was just around the corner. And true to his words, just a few decades later the Romans impaled thousands in Judea, many died by sword, spear, and dagger, others had to flee for their lives, some wound up in a harsh captivity.

The news is much more than a five-minute glance at the morning newspaper over your second cup of coffee. You have to take time to sit down and seriously consider the national and global significance of current events. In an age of incredible public inattention and outright apathy — paradoxically at a time when news and information travels at the speed of light — the following biblical maxim found in 1 Thessalonians 5:6 was never more appropriate: "Let us not sleep as others do, but let us watch and be sober."

FRANK AND ERNEST

By Bob Thaves



The PLANET, Aug 1st 1976

© 1976, M.A. INC. TM REG. U.S. PAT. OFF.
Reprinted by permission from NEA

Garner Ted Armstrong

MAKES THE NEWS MAKE SENSE



What makes the Garner Ted Armstrong radio and television programs unique? His programs go beyond a mere reporting of events. Of course, it's all there — interviews, news analysis, "on location" segments, and lucid commentary. But, Garner Ted Armstrong goes further to give you an understanding of the significance of major trends and what they portend for the future.

How? By expertly analyzing the startling world events happening around you in the light of our current understanding of Bible prophecy. Add to this a liberal sprinkling of insightful, sometime humorous, and always interesting commentary on man and his society, and you have a program that's one of a kind. Why not let Garner Ted Armstrong bring your world into sharper focus?

Chances are the program is available on a station near you, or will be soon. (For a listing of stations, see the TV-Radio Log in this magazine or write the editor.)



MOVING?