

the

PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

APRIL 1978

WHO INVENTED SEX?

FROM TRADE WAR TO HOT WAR?
ON BECOMING AN ADDICT
HOW TO HELP YOUR CHILD SUCCEED

the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

Vol. XLIII, No. 4

April 1978

ARTICLES

What Do You Mean . . . Salvation?	2
Is Man Alone?	4
From Trade War to Hot War	7
The Me Decade	13
Who Invented Sex?	16
The Energy Crisis: Facing Up to Cold Reality	20
On Becoming an Addict	23
A Lighthearted Look at the "Going to Heaven" Idea	26
What's the Word for Today?	28
How to Help Your Child Succeed	30
Why Believe the Bible? Operating Manual for Planet Earth	32

FEATURES

Personal from Herbert W. Armstrong	1
Why Not?	33
Questions and Answers	34
TV Log	36
Garner Ted Armstrong Speaks Out!	38
Letters: Orchids and Onions	45

Cover photo: Edward L. Simpson

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

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

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

The Plain Truth — SUPPORTED BY YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS

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

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn

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

Managing Editor: Brian W. Knowles

Assistant Managing Editors: Dexter H. Faulkner, John R. Schroeder

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

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

Women's Consultant: Carole Ritter

Editorial Staff: Cheryl Graunke, Janet Halvorson, Linda Martens, Ronald B. Nelson, Janet Schroeder, Lesley Van Patten

Copy Editors: Ron Beideck, Peter Moore, Clayton Steep
Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lipross

News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg

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

Art Director: Greg S. Smith

Art Staff: Randall Cole, Ronald Grove, Gene Tikasingh
Photography: *Photo Services Director:* Warren Watson; *Staff:* David Armstrong, Charles Buschmann, Ken Evans, Joyce Hedlund, Alfred Hennig
Photo Files: *Manager:* Alan Leiter; *Kristy Woodbridge*

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

Business Manager: Raymond L. Wright

Director of Pastoral Administration: Ronald L. Dart

International Division: Leslie McCullough

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

Offices: *Auckland, New Zealand:* Robert Morton; *Bonn, West Germany:* Frank Schnee; *St. Albans, England:* Frank Brown; *Burleigh Heads, Australia:* Dean Wilson; *Geneva, Switzerland:* Bernard Andrist; *Johannesburg, South Africa:* Robert Fahey; *Manila, Philippines:* Colin Adair; *Utrecht, The Netherlands:* Roy McCarthy; *Vancouver, B.C., Canada:* C. Wayne Cole; *Oslo, Norway:* Stuart Powell

Founder, President and Publisher: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Executive Vice-President and Co-Publisher: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Associate Publishers: Stanley R. Rader, Robert L. Kuhn



Personal from...

The One Great Goal in Life

A United States senator preached a sermon in a Methodist pulpit in Los Angeles. Of all things, imagine a well-known senator saying that patriotism is a false god to many people! And he is right.

“Love of country can transcend the love of God,” he said, “and we must, in time of stress, avoid making patriotism a religion.”

He said a number of other things I might have said myself. Among the idols professing Christians worship, he cited prosperity, science, patriotism, peace—and some people actually make an idol of the Bible, strange as that may sound. Some, he said, worship the Bible for itself, instead of valuing it for the information it contains: truths necessary for salvation, but also truths which guide to a complete way of life.

What is your idol? What are you really dedicated to? Is it earning a living—making money? What absorbs your mind, your thoughts, your time—what are you really devoted to? Is it God—above all else? Or is it your hobby, your wife or husband, your children, your home, your sports—or amusements and entertainments? What do you keep your mind on most of the time? What most occupies your interest? Is it friends—society? Is it people—or is it things?

It surely couldn't be God, could it? Probably not. And, if not, then it is an idol. You are breaking the first commandment. You have this other god before Him.

Just what is religion?

Is it merely an incidental interest, secondary to many other things, such as earning a living, your home, your family, your friends, hobbies, sports, entertainments? Possibly secondary to TV or movies?

Religion is your connection with God—your relationship with Him. Religion is realizing the PURPOSE of your life—the reason why God had you to be born, the reason you draw breath and exist, the purpose or ultimate goal of your life—and how to live that life so as to arrive there.

I have written of the seven laws of success. You may have the free booklet *The Seven Laws of Success* by

writing our office nearest you. They are really the seven laws of LIFE. They are the seven laws of RELIGION. Yet most people do not know, or practice, or apply, a single one of them.

The first is to have the RIGHT GOAL.

That goal—God's purpose for having put the breath of life in you—is that you be born of God, to share with Him the glory of creation, to inherit His divine nature, to be like Him—to do what He does, to accomplish what He accomplishes, enjoy what He enjoys—peace, happiness, joy, resplendent glory in life everlasting.

No other goal could be as great. It is superlative.

But what are you, now? Just a mass of matter, put together like a machine. Your present existence has to be constantly sustained. You have to keep drawing a breath of air into your lungs about every two or three seconds. You have to eat food on the average of three times every day. You have to take care of eliminating the wastes from digested food, and of bathing and cleansing your body. You have to maintain and sustain your physical body to keep on existing—and even then you are aging and degenerating every day and every year; the most certain thing in this existence we call “life” is that your machine is going to run down—you are going to die.

Actually, we have to simply keep pumping life into ourselves constantly—daily—to continue existing—to continue consciousness.

Yet most people keep on, day after day, year after year, pumping that existence into themselves, with no more purpose than to try to be comfortable, free from pain, and to please the five senses—with their minds on the passing physical and material things of the moment—things that are not lasting, and are soon gone.

Unless God's own CHARACTER is being formed and developed in your mind and your life, replacing the carnality that is there now, you shall have missed your goal. God's purpose is to create within you, during this life, a new and perfect character, so that you may be given eternal life—self-containing, inherent life.

If you are converted—that is, if you do once establish actual contact with God—He (Continued on page 40)

What Do You Mean... SALVATION?

Do you realize not one in a hundred knows what it is, how to get it, when you receive it? Don't be too sure you do! Here, once and for all, is the truth made so plain you will really understand it!

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Could you, yourself, answer these questions? If someone asked you to open your Bible and show him exactly where the Bible says salvation means going to heaven, could you do it?

Is salvation a place, a destination, a condition, a reward—or what? And where would you turn in your Bible to find it? Are you sure?

Could you open your Bible and show a questioner where it tells you *when* you receive salvation? Do you actually get it now, or when you die, or when Christ returns—or at some other time? This article will show you plainly.

Are you, at conversion, an inheritor, or a future heir—and just what do you inherit?

Religious people talk about “getting saved.” Yet even most religious

people understand no more of what the Bible teaches about salvation—the real meaning of the word “salvation”—than a certain young man did about another religious expression.

He said to me, “I gave my heart to the Lord at the revival meeting last night.”

“Well,” I said, “just what do you mean—you gave your heart to the Lord? Just how did you do that? Did you reach in your hand, take your heart out, and actually hand it to the Lord—and was He really right there, in person?”

“Well, uh . . . uh . . .,” he stammered, confused, “uh—well, no I didn't do that.”

“Then just what did you do? How did you give your heart to the Lord?” He stammered some more, then guessed he didn't know.

That's the way it is with a lot of people who say, “I got saved.” They don't really know what they mean by “getting saved.”

Do you know what the Bible teaches about salvation? Millions of sincere people have supposed they knew—yet have been deceived into accepting a false salvation.

I'm going to make it plain—from your Bible! So prepare yourself for a shock! And don't believe me—believe the Bible!

What Salvation Is

While the real truth must come from the Bible, the dictionary definition may help a little. Webster defines “salvation” as: “1. The saving of man from the spiritual consequences of sin; especially deliverance from sin and eternal

damnation. . . . 2. Preservation from destruction, failure, or other evil.”

Now we need to learn the Bible definition of sin, and to see what the Bible reveals the spiritual consequences to be. Whatever the consequences, Webster says salvation is to save you from them—and in this the Bible confirms the dictionary definition. Also salvation means preservation—and in this also, we shall see the Bible affirms the definition.

But why would you *need* to be saved from the spiritual consequences of sin? And why, if you are an immortal soul, do you need preservation from destruction?

What has this to do with you?

Suppose you say, “Look, I don’t go to church. I don’t pretend to be religious. Why should I be concerned with all these religious words like ‘sin’ and ‘salvation’ and ‘spiritual consequences’?”

Does this concern only religious people?

Why You Are Concerned

God Almighty, who designed, created, and sustains human life—including yours—says this: “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23).

That involves you!

Right now you probably have no conception of what is meant by “the glory of God” you have come short of. You’ll really open your eyes in astonishment when that is made plain to you.

But, whatever sin is, you have sinned. All humans have! Christ only is excepted. You are involved. And since salvation is saving man from the consequences of sin (and the Bible affirms this, as we shall see), let God’s Word tell you what the consequences are.

It is plain and simple. Here it is: “The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 6:23).

But why have you heard—and possibly believed—just the opposite? Look at that—read it in your own Bible! Notice! The wages you are going to be paid for having sinned—the consequence of sin—is death! Then why do so many religious

people teach exactly the opposite of the Bible: Why do they teach that the wages of sin is eternal life in hell?

Look at that again, in your Bible! On the one hand, the penalty is death. On the other hand, the gift is eternal life. The two are contrasted; it is one or the other—death, or eternal life.

Right here let me make very plain one thing the Bible teaches. A few persecutors have accused us of teaching “a salvation by works”—that is, that our “works” earn salvation. Let it be made clear and plain right here that your “works”—your evil works—do earn something, but it is not salvation. What they earn—the wages they earn—is death, and not salvation!

Further, let’s get this point straight and plain right here: Eternal life is not something you can earn; it is God’s *gift* through Christ!

But do you know that many actually deny that eternal life comes only as God’s gift by grace and through Christ? They say you already have eternal life. They say you are an “immortal soul”!

This is important! This is the crux of the whole question—of life, of the reason for existence! If you have an immortal soul—if you already have eternal life—then the Bible is not true when it says plainly eternal life is a gift from God. According to the Bible, what the “saved” receive as God’s gift through Jesus Christ is eternal life. Salvation then actually is the receiving of something you don’t now have: eternal life.

Yet a very popular teaching deceives people into believing they do not need to be saved from death by Christ’s free grace—by His shed blood. They say you do not need saving from death at all. They say, as Satan deceived mother Eve, that you will not surely die, that you are—or have—an immortal soul!

Why You Are Helpless

Why is it that religious people speak continually about “your immortal soul,” about “going to heaven,” about dead loved ones being now “with the Lord” and many other such things supposed to be the basic

beliefs of Christianity, and yet never once show you any such teaching in the Bible? They talk of these teachings as if they were true. They lead you to take these teachings for granted—to suppose they came from the Bible.

What does the Bible teach about the soul? Will you read it in your own Bible? Don’t take my word for it. Don’t believe me—believe God!

Read it in Ezekiel 18:4: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” Yes, again, the wages of sin is death—that soul that sins shall die!

That truth about the soul is so important God caused it to be written twice. Turn now to Ezekiel 18:20: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” Souls are not immortal. Your Bible says they can die!


But one who is deceived may say: “That doesn’t count because it’s in the Old Testament.” But read in the New Testament that all Scripture—all that Timothy had known from youth, which was the Old Testament—is given by inspiration of God (II Tim. 3:15-16).

Again, in the New Testament, Jesus Christ Himself said you should “fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell [gehenna]”—a fire that will burn them up, cause them to die, destroy what is burned! Oh, yes, the Bible does teach that kind of hellfire—but not the kind where one burns forever and yet never burns up (Matt. 10:28). Let’s believe Jesus Christ when He says souls can be destroyed! They are not immortal!

What is a soul? Notice Genesis 2:7: “The Eternal God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” Man *is* a soul. What was made of the dust of the ground became a soul. The soul was formed out of matter. The soul is not spirit. It is material, and can die.

This may come as a surprise: not only is it true that there is no such expression anywhere in the Bible as “immortal soul,” but the word “immortal” occurs only once in all the Bible—in I Timothy 1:17, where it refers to God. Further, the word

(Continued on page 43)



For thousands of years man has marveled at the mysteries of the starry heavens. Today he scans the universe, awestruck by its fathomlessness—yearning as never before to understand where he fits in the cosmos. What secrets lie beyond the distant realm of the spiral nebulae? Is there life out there? Or is life unique to our own planet Earth?


IS MAN ALONE

A patch of flat ground, a clear sky overhead and two good eyes. For millennia these were the only tools of astronomy available to our ancestors. Their awareness of the universe was limited to about 1,000 luminous objects in the night sky that were visible to the naked eye. Many long-dead civilizations



Courtesy Columbia Pictures

conceived of the earth as being flat and of the sky as an inverted bowl composed of a solid substance that shielded the earth. Most people have lived and died with scant knowledge of the awesome proportions of our universe. Indeed, they were usually more worried about the prospects of falling off the end of a flat earth. Concepts like “no end,” or “forever,” or



“endless” were beyond the comprehension of our forebears. Man appeared to live in a bowl-like universe with the sky as a domed roof and the earth as a flat bottom. Finally by 350 B.C., truly educated men knew that the earth was spherical in shape. But it took another 2,000 years to fathom its true size. Without what you’ve learned about modern astronomy, you would

be little better off than an ancient Israelite scanning the skies in the days of Moses. Even on a clear night you couldn't count any more stars than he did. Casual observation is of little help in comprehending the dimensions of outer space.

Of course, you couldn't help but be inspired by the Milky Way appearing like a star-studded ribbon across the sky, or by Orion and the Big Dipper. But you would still be baffled as to their size and their distance from the earth.

However, some men have always looked at the starry heavens with intelligent eyes. They began to notice that a few of the heavenly bodies moved in relation to the stars and were closer to different stars at different times. These wandering celestial bodies were termed *planetes* by the Greeks. We call them "planets" today.

Still men conceived of the earth as the real center of the universe. That is, until the research of Nicolaus Copernicus in the sixteenth century. Knowing that the earth, in fact, circled the sun, he postulated that the sun was the probable center of the universe.

Today knowledge about the universe is exploding at a fantastic, unimaginable rate. Sophisticated spacecraft and highly sensitive radio telescopes have revolutionized astronomy and increased our desire to solve the haunting question of whether intelligent beings exist on other worlds.

The fairly recent discovery of pulsars and quasars revealed that the heavens are much more exciting, mysterious and violent than we previously imagined in our wildest dreams. Questions of origin and eternity are intriguing man as never before. He wonders why there is no solid evidence of life on other planets. Mathematically speaking, the odds often seem in its favor.

The Known Evidence

The recent Viking expedition to Mars is just one more example of man's intense interest in the possible discovery of life beyond the confines of the earth. In the summer of 1976, American scientists sent two highly sophisticated spacecraft to the mysterious red planet. Shortly after touchdown,

the Viking lander sent stunningly clear pictures of the Martian surface to radio telescopes on earth. Picture after picture showed a stark, rock-strewn surface which looked remarkably like a desert scene in the American Southwest.

One of our *Plain Truth* editors talked with Dr. Gerald A. Soffen, chief project scientist for the Viking mission to Mars. When asked about the chances for life on Mars, Dr. Soffen said that odds were small, but not zero. Though scientists are still debating the data from the Viking project, one did say that so far nothing has been detected that really could be considered biological life. He concluded that Mars, like the moon, Venus and Mercury, is a very, very dead place.

Based on recent findings, scien-

**Astronomers
have probed the
universe to a distance
of about 100,000 billion
billion miles.
Yet they have been
unable to find the
edge of the universe.**

tists have speculated (and not without evidence) that Mars once had an earthlike atmosphere. They had long suspected that the Martian surface was the best locale to look for life in our solar system. But notwithstanding the fact that Mars is both geologically and meteorologically active, the evidence for biological life is negative. And if there is no life on the red planet, the chances are virtually nil for life on Venus, Mercury, Saturn, Jupiter, and Pluto.

Life Beyond Our Solar System?

But what about life in the far-flung "limits" of outer space?

In 1972 man's first attempt at written communication with alien intelligence occurred when a special aluminum plaque was attached to the Pioneer 10 space probe. This plaque symbolically describes the origin of the spacecraft as well as graphically portraying a man and a woman.

The more recent Voyager probes, now on their way to the outer limits of our solar system, also carry recordings of earth sounds. It is hoped that extraterrestrial beings will someday find these tiny spacecraft and listen to our message.

But space probes are far less likely to communicate with extraterrestrial life than radio telescopes right here on earth. One good example is the Goldstone radio telescope near Barstow, California. Here radio signals from sources in outer space are being monitored by means of a giant, steerable 210-foot antenna. This awesome antenna has actually communicated with the Viking lander at a distance of over 200 million miles.

Incredible as it may seem, radio telescopes can detect radio signals from over ten million million billion miles away. So scientists are constantly listening for intelligible signals emanating from other galaxies deep in the far-flung expanse of the universe. Astronomers have been hoping to detect such signals since 1960 when Frank Drake first used a giant radio telescope to monitor radio waves from nearby stars.

Since then the sensitivity of such equipment has grown enormously. Astronomer Gerrit Verschuur recently scanned ten nearby stars for signs of life. His apparatus was so sensitive that it could find in five minutes what Drake's equipment required twenty days to detect.


Yet up to this time, no unexpected signals from outer space have ever been detected!

Still, man persists in probing the universe with giant telescopes like the one on Mount Wilson in Southern California. So far, using the largest and most sophisticated telescopes, astronomers have probed the universe to a distance of about 100,000 billion billion miles. Yet astronomers have been unable to find the edge of the universe. Perhaps it is endless; no one knows.

The Fortunate Generation

Our fascination with the mysteries of the heavens is exceeded only by our never-ending desire to understand the fundamental question of what this human experience is all

(Continued on page 41)



FROM TRADE WAR TO HOT WAR?

by Gene H. Hogberg

In January, the governments of Japan and the United States reached a temporary truce in what was building up to be the most serious trade dispute since before the Second World War. Special U.S. trade negotiator Robert S. Strauss called the agreement a “farther-reaching result than we had anticipated.” The Japanese agreed to significant concessions demanded by the U.S., among them advance tariff reductions on \$2 billion of imports, removal of a number of quota controls and steep increases in U.S. sales to Japan of high quality beef and citrus products.

The Japanese agreed to work toward reducing their nation’s huge trade surplus in 1978 through boosting domestic demand as well as by trying to bring Japan’s external trade account into rough balance by fiscal 1979.

The agreement reached in Tokyo on January

13—if its provisions can be attained—will have gone a long way toward reducing immediate U.S.-Japanese frictions which had already entered the realm of acrimonious accusations. It was very clear that the Japanese had thought long and hard about negative American reactions to the outcome of the first U.S.-Japanese trade talks held only a month previously—negotiations which Mr. Strauss termed “far short of our expectation.”

However, the breakthrough in Tokyo may only prove to be a step-back-from-the-brink situation. Mr. Strauss admits the agreement is still one of words only; that it will be some time yet before any tangible results can be measured. Not reassuring are the estimates by some experts that Japan may be unable to avoid sizable surpluses for the next eight to nine years. And elsewhere, all is not well for the free world’s

economic structure. The U.S. dollar has been eroding steadily for over a year. By the end of 1977 it broke through another downward barrier, falling below 240 Japanese yen to the dollar. Only five months before, the dollar was worth between 265 and 270 yen.

In Europe, the dollar during its 1977 skid dropped perilously close to another milestone of decline: a ratio of two German marks to the dollar. At the beginning of this decade the dollar was worth four marks.

Massive Trade Deficit

Concurrent with the dollar slide, the imbalance in America's foreign trade account has reached an alarming level. The U.S. trade deficit—imports of goods and services over exports—reached a staggering \$26.7 billion for 1977.

The burdensome cost of imported fuel—\$44 billion a year—accounted for most of America's trade shortfall. On his trip to several foreign capitals in January, President Carter was urged by the leaders of Saudi Arabia to take urgent measures to prop up the sagging dollar—which was threatening the value of the \$60 billion the Saudis have tied up in U.S. reserves.

Significantly enough, Carter announced a support plan the day after his talks with King Khalid and Crown Prince Fahd. The dollar immediately rebounded in a technical rally. But all experts agree the plan—to borrow huge amounts of foreign currencies with which to sop up unwanted dollars—was, at best, a temporary measure. The only real answer, as the Shah of Iran lectured Mr. Carter on the same trip, is for America to conserve energy, to buy far less imported fuel. However, the President's energy program remains logjammed in Congress, its critics claiming it does little to encourage the further recovery of domestic fuel sources.


Protectionism on the Rise

The imported fuel problem is critical enough, but it is by no means the entire story.

A sizable chunk of the U.S. trade deficit for 1977—\$8.5 billion—was with one country: Japan. Japan reg-

istered a trade surplus for 1977 of around \$17.5 billion, meaning the U.S. deficit in Japan-U.S. trade accounted for nearly half of the Asian nation's surplus.

American officials warned the Japanese after the inconclusive De-



UPI

ember 1977 trade negotiations that unless they came forth with a substantial new set of proposals the rising chorus of protectionism in the United States would become a discordant roar. And the crescendo of protest comes not only from America. The Common Market countries are also wrestling with a huge \$5 billion annual trade deficit with Japan. And in the Australasia area, New Zealand's Prime Minister Robert Muldoon warns that if Japan will not open its doors to more New Zealand beef and dairy products, his government will not continue to issue fishing licenses to Japanese ships to operate in its offshore waters.

In words that reveal the at times acrid tone of the simmering international trade fight, Muldoon warns: "It is time that Japan is dragged, kicking and screaming if necessary, into the modern international trade community."

The Protectionist Momentum

Members of the U.S. Congress are coming under increased pressure to do something about the loss of jobs in industry after industry due to the impact of lower-cost imported goods. Administration free traders are losing friends in Congress and the labor movement at an alarming rate, according to a report in the December 19, 1977, *Business Week*. Seen instead is a renewed drive for a whole grab bag of tariffs and import quotas.

"The uneasy mood is most apparent on the Hill," reports the magazine. "Congressmen, reacting to pressures from constituencies, are besieging the office of Robert S. Strauss . . . with telephone calls seeking help for one industry or another. And the impatience is growing."

Shoes, steel, textiles, television sets, sugar: The list is long and the pressure is intense. "Even more disturbing to the Administration," adds *Business Week*, "is the defection of liberal trade unions. . . . In fact the last major union still supporting traditional free-trade principles is the United Auto Workers. 'Trade provides competition and competition holds down prices,' said the UAW's President Douglas Fraser last week. 'We tried protectionism once before. We got Smoot-Hawley, the Depression, Hitler, and World War II.'"

Worldwide Steel Slowdown

The Administration policy currently consists of trying to stamp out one brushfire at a time. An example of this piecemeal approach is the recently engineered "trigger-price" system which bars sales of imported steel below certain set prices based on a formula assessing Japanese production costs.

Washington was under intense pressure to shore up the American steel industry because imports had increased by almost 50 percent since

1975, capturing 20 percent of the U.S. market. Ultramodern steel plants in Japan, Korea, Western Europe and elsewhere were undercutting American prices badly. Executives here, noting many instances of excess plant capacity overseas, claimed the imported steel was being "dumped" at below cost. Whether completely true or not, over 60,000 American steelworkers lost their jobs because of imports in 1977 alone. Industry specialists asserted that another 96,000 jobs would go if imports were permitted to capture another 10 percent of the market. Hence the new "trigger-price" formula.

But the American steel slowdown is far from unique. European officials have been quick to echo President Carter's assertion that the steel crisis is really a worldwide one.

In the past two decades one underdeveloped country after another has created its own prestige steel industry, walling off traditional export markets plus adding more capacity to an increasingly glutted market. As a result, European mills are running at greater excess capacity than American ones, and many similar problems are being encountered.

Steel industry jobs in West Germany—the economic "locomotive" of the Common Market—are now at the lowest level since 1961. During 1977, 10,000 steelworkers were laid off in Germany and an additional 30,000 were put on short-time work.

Unlike the American steel market, which had a boom time in early 1976, the European steel crisis has dragged on for two years.

Quotas by Any Other Name

The compromise steel proposal ("trigger-price" formula) follows a pattern set earlier this year when the United States engineered so-called "orderly marketing agreements"—a euphemism for what are essentially quotas—to protect the domestic shoe and color-television industries.

So, while President Carter remains officially committed to furthering free trade and a new round of tariff cuts in the next General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

(GATT) talks, pressures to go the opposite direction are building up steam in Congress. According to one Congressman: "Constituencies aren't built on free trade—they're built on protectionism." The benefits of free trade are diffuse and dif-



"It is deplorable. The poison of protectionism is especially gaining ground in the United States, including parts of the trade-union movement."

Willy Brandt

UPI

ficult to tally. In the emotion of the moment, the pleas of economists that imported goods help hold down prices of domestically produced goods and thus help dampen inflation usually go unnoticed. The closing of a shoe factory, on the other hand, can send both union leaders and industry representatives rushing off to Washington for an emergency meeting with the area Congressman.

The \$12,000 Mustang

Not helping matters much are well-known facts and figures detailing restrictive trade practices in other countries which act as barriers to free trade. Protectionism is so built

into Japan's foreign-trade approach, for example, that experts believe it will take years to overhaul it, even given the concessions made by the Japanese in January.

Japanese agriculture is heavily protected against outside competition. Japanese farmers, moreover, have such an influential role in national politics that they have been successful in pressuring their government to erect an unbelievable array of quotas, quarantines and artificially high import price barriers. Beef import quotas are controlled by a cartel that sets prices up to ten times the world price. Medium-grade hamburger retails in Tokyo for about \$7 a pound.

Japanese officials and businessmen deny that they restrict imports. They argue that U.S. producers simply don't try hard enough to understand and penetrate the Japanese market. But Americans who have tried to buck the Japanese system confront a seemingly endless entanglement of interests among industry, banks and government. One notorious example of how costs are added on to U.S. imports: By the time a Mustang II automobile travels its prescribed route through red tape and countless middlemen, it winds up with a \$12,000 price tag!

Free Trade vs. Fair Trade

Little wonder the entire philosophy of free trade has come under attack. At the recent AFL-CIO meeting in Los Angeles, President George Meany referred to the "very real possibility" that the AFL-CIO will swing its lobbying machinery for 1978 behind new restrictive legislation. Added the 83-year-old union boss: "A government trade policy predicated on old ideas of free trade is worse than a joke. It is a prescription for disaster. The answer is fair trade; do unto others as they do to us, barrier for barrier, closed door for closed door."

Mr. Meany apparently is not at all worried about a trade war. "We would do quite well for one simple fact: We have the market," he says. "We have the greatest market in the world right in this country."

Mr. Meany's casual dismissal of a trade war, or at least the effect it would have on the United States, is

quite chilling. And certainly it is of little comfort to America's trading partners who depend upon sales to the huge U.S. market—and who can logically be expected to restrict their markets to American goods if things get out of hand. Mr. Meany did not refer to the fact that nine million Americans—about 10 percent of the U.S. labor force—earn their living one way or another from imports. What would happen to their jobs in an all-out trade war?

“Jap-bashing”

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, the Japanese have become increasingly sensitive about being cast as the villains in the growing trade brouhaha. Says the New York financial daily: “There are indications that many Japanese are becoming resentful of what they consider unwarranted, ill-conceived and hypocritical attacks on their national integrity. The attacks were described in a recent London *Sunday Times* article as ‘Jap-bashing.’”

The *Journal* further reports a senior adviser to the Japanese government as saying: “We were pushed into a corner 40 years ago. It isn't good to see similar unfortunate and dangerous pressure being placed on us again.”


The Japanese insist that, despite their admittedly stiff import restrictions, now is not the time—politically—that they can afford to throw open the doors to American products and endanger the markets of domestic manufacturers. The Japanese economy is in the throes of a four-year-long recession. Bankruptcies are running at record levels. More than one million Japanese are out of work. At least another million are “underemployed”—kept on company payrolls performing trivial functions. (Japan's unemployment rate is only two percent, which, by Japanese standards, is high in a country where a lifetime job with a company is taken for granted.)

Increase Japan's Military Spending?

Some Japanese officials are seriously concerned about the outcome of continued U.S. resentment toward Japanese trade policies. A senior member of Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP),

Eiichi Nakao, said Japan's relations with the United States had worsened to the extent that, given a similar situation in the past, it could have precipitated a war.

Pressure by the United States upon Japan in the months ahead,



“It is time that Japan is dragged, kicking and screaming if necessary, into the modern international trade community.”

New Zealand Prime Minister Robert Muldoon

UPI

especially if the trade imbalance does not right itself as expected, could lead to potentially undesirable results.

Tadae Takubo, foreign editor of the government-affiliated *Jiji Press*, expresses fears about such dangerous side effects: “I am pessimistic about the future of U.S.-Japan relations,” he says. “Many problems plague our dealings—the trade imbalance, fishery and air negotiations, and of course the issue of reprocessing nuclear material.

“What I am very worried about is military expenditures. Dissatisfaction that Japan is spending less than one percent of its gross national product on defense has been smol-

dering in the U.S. One way to reduce U.S. economic difficulties, according to American officials, is to ask Japan, first, to improve its defense capability; second, to share the expense of running overseas military installations; and, third, to take over a considerable portion of economic aid to Southeast Asian nations. I suspect that U.S. pressure on Japan to do this will become enormous in the future.”

A militarily strong Japan, of course, could have a profound destabilizing effect upon all of Asia.

In a conversation published in the Tokyo public affairs monthly *Chico Koren* and reprinted in *Atlas World Press Review*, Takubo added: “We have only three ways to survive as a nation. One is to find natural resources in Japan, another is to buy them from others, and the third is to get them, without paying, through violence. What we have been doing is making as much money as we can and buying resources from other countries with that money. But what will we do when we can't do that any longer? It is possible that we will again get emotional. We should not forget that it was the U.S. trade embargo which triggered World War II in the Pacific.”

In the same article, Takashi Hosom, an adviser to the Industrial Bank of Japan, added: “Japan's pacifism is not deeply ingrained. There is always a danger that emotionalism can swing in the other direction.”

Japan Can Change Fast!

Americans have come to take modern Japan for granted. At the end of the Second World War the Japanese forswore militarism, even to the point of outlawing war as a recourse of the state in its own constitution.

Instead the Japanese nation placed the totality of its efforts at national reconstruction in the egg basket of world trade. The goal was to become the world's number one trading nation; to become an economic, not a military, superpower. The nation's military defense was committed almost entirely into the province of the very nation which had brought the Japanese Empire to atomic submission, the United States.

But as Japan changed course 180 degrees by common consensus 32 years ago, it could, because of its unique homogeneity, change almost overnight again should the structure of world trade, its chosen path to world-power status, collapse.

To push Japan too far, too fast could, in the words of Minister for External Economic Affairs Nobuhiko Ushiba, "be fatal to the rule of the [business-supported] pro-American, free trade Liberal Democratic Party."

Europe in Trouble Also

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has just issued a sobering analysis of the free world's economic problems. Its 24 member countries make up just about the whole of the non-Communist industrial world.

According to the OECD, the biggest trouble spot is not Japan, not the U.S., but Europe. In Europe's four largest economies—those of West Germany, France, Britain and Italy—growth averaged only two percent last year, exactly half the figure of 1976.


Prospects for 1978 are not encouraging. The OECD sees growth of perhaps as little as 2.5 percent for Western Europe. Helping dampen economic prospects are threats by the huge Communist parties of Italy and France to nationalize major segments of those nation's economies if they gain increased political leverage.

The slowdown in world trade is a far more serious situation for the countries of Western Europe than for the United States. Both France and West Germany count about 25 percent of their gross national products in external dealings. For a smaller country, such as the Netherlands, foreign trade may account for more than half of all economic activity.

Any step or hint of a step by the U.S. to guard its own industries—even though the Europeans are resorting to restrictive measures of their own in dealing with their "Japanese problem"—stirs cries from Europeans who fear that American restraints will become the pretext for nations around the world to

erect similar trade barriers against European exports.

Europeans, and especially the West Germans, are deeply worried about the sinking value of the U.S. dollar. Until President Carter took some remedial steps in January to



"We tried protectionism once before. We got Smoot-Hawley, the Depression, Hitler, and World War II."

**UAW President
Douglas Fraser**

halt the dollar's skid, German bankers were charging that the Carter Administration had switched from "benign neglect" of the dollar to "malign neglect." Before Washington decided to act, the Europeans had laid out the equivalent of \$30 billion in a largely vain attempt to halt the dollar's slide. By contrast, the U.S. itself had spent less than \$500 million.

The Europeans charged the U.S. purposely failed to intervene in the knowledge that a cheaper dollar means the possibility of increased American exports to the continent. But it has its dangerous side effects as well. As the *Wall Street Journal* of December 19, 1977 reported

from Bonn: "The dollar has a strong psychological as well as strictly economic impact on Europeans. A slumping dollar stirs doubt about the Carter Administration's commitment to Western Europe and about America's ability to help the economies of the non-Communist world."

Earlier Warnings

So what is the situation now? For the moment it seems that the U.S. and Japan might temporarily keep from going for each other's economic jugular over protectionism.

Nevertheless, in the absence of an effective energy policy, the United States continues to gulp vast amounts of foreign oil. The world's economy shows little sign of growth for the immediate future. And everywhere, nations are worried about the politically disruptive effects of growing unemployment. Pressure is increasing everywhere to save jobs by walling off domestic markets.

Willy Brandt, West German Socialist leader and former chancellor, recently warned that unless the developed countries give up their trade protectionist policies, the world may be plunged into a depression as severe as the one in the 1930s.

Mr. Brandt said: "It is deplorable. The poison of protectionism is especially gaining ground in the United States, including parts of the trade-union movement. I can see similar signs in other parts of Europe."


This should come as no surprise to longtime *Plain Truth* readers: Since the early 1950s, the editors of this magazine have warned that a devastating trade war would erupt among the free-world economies; that, as a result of the breakdown of international commerce and the real possibility of a worldwide economic depression, the very fabric of the post-World War II alliance structure would be ripped apart.

We have warned of the likelihood of both a remilitarized Japan and a powerful United Europe, under German domination, that would ultimately stand apart from—and in opposition to—the United States.

The stage is being set for these occurrences right now! □



Obsession with the self is the outstanding characteristic of much of modern American culture. This article explains why the 1970s have been called . . .



by Jeff Calkins

The banquet hall of the large hotel in downtown Los Angeles is filled with a certain tension: 249 anxious souls are taking their turns marching up to the microphone and telling the others the one thing in their lives they would most like to eliminate. Each one is lost in his own deep, private inner space, concentrating on his particular problem: husband, wife, weaknesses, craven fears, impotence, frigidity, grim habits, primordial horrors. The most private, intimate details of 249 individual lives are reverberating over the loudspeaker! For one delicious moment, each person attending this mass confession gets to be the object of everyone's attention. After concentrating on their own lives, they get to bathe in the intense glow of the psychological spotlight.

The above scene, an Erhard Seminar Training (est) meeting, is described in more vivid detail by journalist Tom Wolfe in his book *Mauve Gloves and Madmen, Clutter and Vine*. As the title of his book indicates, Mr. Wolfe has a keen eye for what is culturally avant-garde; as a novelist he has specialized in the stylistic trends that mark modern society. He chronicles the fashionable styles and trends which begin with the "Beautiful People," are taken up by the affluent, upper-middle class, and eventually filter on down to the rest of us. Mr. Wolfe is a specialist in what's "in." And what's "in," says Mr. Wolfe, is self. We are living, he says, in the "Me Decade." The 1970s is a decade in which everyone is "shut deep in their own private space," a decade where everyone is consumed with one solitary notion: "Let's talk about me," an era dedicated to the cultivation of self.

Mr. Wolfe's characterization has not escaped other observers either. Other writers have taken note of the "New Narcissism," and the "Great Turning Inward." The magazines which cater to the affluent upper-middle class, largely because they themselves must stay on top of "fashion," are also preoccupied with the discovery that the aspect most peculiar to American culture in the 1970s is selfishness. The staff of *Time*, for example, writes about the self-idolization inherent in the current crop of "get-ahead" books, and Henry Farlie in the *New Republic* traces all the seven deadly sins, which are so characteristic of our time, back to our vaunting of the solitary self. To

take the pulse of the modern age, consider another phenomenon perhaps even more revealing than 249 people publicly airing the most private details of their lives. The most powerful man in the world, the President of the United States, conducts a nationwide phone-in. Now, the future of the Western world hinges on such things as the President's decisions regarding disarmament, peace in the Middle East, and the military balance. Forty-two Americans get a chance to put their questions to the President, and we hear: "Mr. President, what's holding up my check from the Veteran's Administration?" The questions, with some exceptions of course, are related to the immediate self. People want the President to help them with filling out their income tax forms, or with getting their welfare check, or with getting a job. The great issues—the issues which transcend our "private space"—are ignored. While the future of mankind rides on the SALT talks, it is: "Mr. President, can you help me get a job?"

Best-Sellers Sell Self

But the prime bit of evidence that our culture has suddenly legitimized primordial human selfishness is the crop of get-ahead-by-intimidating-thy-neighbor self-help books. They promise "Power!" and "Success!" They tell us how to "look out for Number One." They tell us that it is OK to be dishonest, selfish, scheming: just don't get caught. One discovers *How To Be Your Own Best Friend*, or is advised on *Winning Through Intimidation*.

These books are monuments to the sovereign, unfettered self: a self which will brook no repression, which will not subordinate itself to anyone or anything, a self which will be its own ultimate ruler, which would, if it had the power, ascend into heaven to displace God from His throne, for it alone will be Number One.

To be fair, of course, God does not exist in the conceptual universe of the get-ahead books. The theology of *Winning Through Intimidation* is summed up succinctly by the author at its conclusion: "No

matter what your feeling is about the rest of my philosophy, you salvaged something from this book if you can first face the reality that nothing you do is going to matter 50 billion years from now, anyway. Relax. Cool it."

Life, to these authors, is a zero-sum game: It has all the significance of fighting over who will get the bigger piece of candy. It is the fight of the solitary ego against other solitary egos, a fight which calls out all the instincts of the jungle fighters. Novelist D. Keith Mano describes the general attitude: People are being told to become "psychological jocks out to get a black belt in nasty."

The Great Turning Inward

Perhaps the cause of our egocentric mind-set has something to do with the current interests of the baby-boom generation, that great swollen lump moving through the age statistics, that group of people who were born between 1945 and 1958 when everybody, it seemed, was having large families. Thus the 1950s culture was preoccupied with Dr. Spock and child-rearing. In the 1960s, culture revolved around teenagers. We now call the 1960s the Youth Culture. And the 1970s have brought us the settling-down insularity of young adulthood. Also, in part, there is the great reaction to the frenetic 1960s which were characterized by youthful idealism. We are now all hardened cynics. Certainly the great passions that gripped the campuses only eight or nine years ago seem lost in the dust-bin of history.

And so the signs of turning inward are all around us. The best-seller lists. The self-realization therapists, the psychological snake-oil peddlers. The quickening divorce rate. Yes, there is voluntarism; there are many selfless volunteers. Blood is still being donated. People still help each other. But the fact remains that the Great Turning Inward is a special cultural characteristic of America in the 1970s. Let's face it: *Looking Out for Number One* would never have made the best-seller list even six or seven years ago.

The apex of the trend is found in

our approach to psychology. It is psychology which is at the very frontiers of a culture, at its vanguard. You don't have to be a weatherman to know which way the wind blows; it is blowing in the direction in which modern psychology is leading.

And where is it leading? In the direction of self-realization, self-actualization. Is there anything wrong with realizing one's abilities and employing one's talents to the full? Of course not. But the Untrammelled Self has become the focal point of many of these movements. There are the Erhard Seminar Training sessions described earlier. There is Transcendental Meditation, assertiveness training, transactional analysis. All are devoted to helping the ego get its act together.

Modern man is like the mythological Narcissus, staring at his reflection in a pool, adoring himself. Or he is a yogi, chanting his mantra, gazing at his abdomen, and, we are led to believe, achieving the greatest heights of self-realization—all the while shut up in his own inner space. Modern man is enamored with the there-is-a-hidden-genius-inside-every-person theory of self. It could also be described as the "Great Pearl" theory of self: Somewhere "in there" is a Great Person who must be liberated, and if only we can unearth enough of one's innermost psyche, the Great Person will blossom forth.

The Incontinent Ego

Another weathervane which points to increasing preoccupation with self is our attitude toward sex. It has almost come to the point where chastity, as one writer put it, is considered a sign of an unhealthy preoccupation with sex. Marriage ceremonies now stress not interfering with the "growth" of either partner. Television sit-com characters now promise, when they get married, to be faithful only "as long as we both shall love." And, after a season, the need to up the Nielsen ratings precipitates a divorce. We are not willing to surrender enough of our impregnable psyches to make a marriage work. Each partner is off fulfilling himself. What was once a

unit has become an alliance of two self-contained egos who will be faithful only as long as the terms of the "treaty" remain advantageous.

And since we cherish our singularity, we flee commitment. We believe it is better to live together without benefit of clergy—that way, no one really has to give up anything. As psychoanalyst Herbert Henden has said, our culture has made caring seem like losing. And so couples live together unmarried. It is the way to enjoy a readily accessible sex partner without having to surrender any of one's individual sovereignty. And none dare call it "fornication," to our ears a slightly antiquated word which suggests a time when people looked outside themselves for their moral standards. Other ages saw sex in terms of a transcendent morality. Today, we make hobgoblins out of "repression" and "inhibition"; they are our hobgoblins because they cause us to restrain ourselves.

Sex, for us moderns, has been reduced to so many neurons firing in the brain: an affair of the nervous system, not of the heart and emotions. Consider the modern sex manuals. They are mostly written without consideration of what in other times was called (here is another quaint phrase) the "sanctity of marriage." Rather they are written for "sex partners." And sex is presented as technique. A workout. A set of gymnastic exercises to be learned much like a quarterback manages football plays. But sex is not considered to be an expression of love, the prototype of God's love for His people.

No, that's all syrupy Victorian drivel. We moderns are interested in getting our neurons to fire at the right time. Sex is the relief of tension. But it is not love. And no one—including God—is going to put a crimp in our sexual style.

Or consider another best-seller, the *Hite Report*. It is a hymn to masturbation. Why, it asks, should a woman worry about sexual fulfillment with her "partner" when she can do it all herself? Why indeed. Ours is an age which does not simply tolerate masturbation, it glorifies it. Indeed, such a glorification

is the logical extension of our preoccupation with the solitary, unrestrained self.

Moderation in All Things

So what's wrong with our culture's glorification of the self?

It is a problem of balance. Mao's China, where individuality was systematically expunged and the self was made to merge into a kind of collectivist mud, obviously does not embody the good life. We are worth something in ourselves, because it is true that in one sense our selves are all we've got. But much more than that, we are worth something because we are made in the image of God. And that is the error that our modern culture—at least this phase of it—has made. God is shut out of the how-to-get-power universe. He is not part of the intimidate-your-way-to-success books. He is excluded from the joy-of-sex manuals.

The psychological reason God is excluded from the modern mind-set is that God is incompatible with our personal sovereignty. God has authority, legitimate authority: When we acknowledge God, we acknowledge we are not the masters of the universe.

C. S. Lewis describes the attitude we get into in wanting to uphold the sovereignty of the overweening self. In his autobiography, Lewis tells us why, as a onetime atheist, it was so important to him that God not be acknowledged as part of reality: "What mattered most of all was my deep-seated hatred of authority, my monstrous individualism, my lawlessness. No word in my vocabulary expressed deeper hatred than the word *interference*. But Christianity placed at the center what then seemed to me a transcendental Interferer" (*Surprised by Joy*, p. 172).

But our self-seeking is ultimately counterproductive. Happiness cannot be directly made its own end. And yet happiness is the proper end of all our activity. Are we caught in some monstrous cosmic paradox, condemned by some malevolent God to misery because we seek our own happiness and are thereby barred from it?

Fortunately, the universe has not

been contrived by a malevolent God; rather by a loving Creator who has ordained that man should indeed be happy. But that ultimate happiness can only come from doing the will of the Creator.

We can better understand the reason for this principle if we consider what Lewis says later on in his autobiography about not being able to achieve happiness by seeking it directly. Lewis relates how he finally learned the principle that we cannot "enjoy" something while we are at the same time "contemplating" it: "It seemed to me self-evident that one essential property of love, hate, fear, hope, or desire was attention to their object. To cease thinking about or attending to [a person with whom one is in love] is, so far, to cease loving; to cease thinking about or attending to the dreaded thing is, so far, to cease being afraid. But to attend to your own love or fear is to cease attending to the loved or dreaded object. In other words the enjoyment and contemplation of our inner activities are incompatible. You cannot hope and also think about hoping at the same moment, for in hope we look to hope's object and we interrupt this by (so to speak) turning around to look at the hope itself" (*Surprised by Joy*, p. 218).

Lewis seems to be saying that we cannot be happy if our attention is directed to our own happiness. What might at first appear to be a paradox is really simply the way the human mind works.

But it is a lesson at least temporarily lost on America in the 1970s. We shall continue our pursuit of the wind: the vain emptiness of trying to attain happiness by concentrating on our own happiness itself, instead of seeking it in the service of God. The words of Christ may stick in our throats; we may hide from them, seek to bury them, banish them to the nether worlds of our consciousness, but they are nonetheless true:

"Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit. He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life." □



Who Invented SEX?

by Robert A. Ginskey

We live in a society seemingly obsessed with sex. Sex permeates much of our radio and television programming; books, films, newspapers, and magazines continually delve into every facet of this fascinating subject. No doubt about it: Sex sells.

But what is the origin of sex? Who—or what—invented it? Is sex the result of evolutionary time and chance? Of mutated bacteria? Of lovesick amoeba? Or is sex the product of the inventive genius of a Creator God?

Consider the evolutionary ex-

“Male and female created he them.” An ancient myth promulgated by primitive peoples unfamiliar with the evidence for evolution? Or an inescapable truth revealed by Scripture and supported by scientific fact?

planation usually given for the origin of sex. Based on the fossil record, paleontologists believe that nonsexual methods of reproduction (such as binary fission) have been present on earth for some 3 billion

years among species like bacteria and blue-green algae. But sexual reproduction, again according to the fossil record, has been present for “only” about 600 million years. Thus current evolutionary theory asserts that sexual organisms must have originally arisen from “primitive” nonsexual creatures, and that simple sexual organisms in turn gave rise to more complex sexual species.

True, it is possible to line up currently existing organisms and show an apparent progression from the simple asexual reproduction of an amoeba to the more complex sexual

Illustrations by Terry Smith

patterns of insects and fish, to the incredibly intricate sexual organs and behavior patterns of birds, mammals, and man himself. But such a "lineup" really proves very little. It certainly does not prove that more complex organisms are the descendants of simpler ones. In fact, even simple creatures are often unbelievably sophisticated in their sex habits.


Is Sex Necessary?

Evolutionary biologists contend that sex—the combination of characteristics from two similar but genetically distinct parents—is absolutely essential for the significant variation in offspring needed for evolutionary "advancement." Nonsexual reproduction simply does not have enough potential for creating new characteristics. "Asexual reproduction makes identical copies of parental cells, unless a new mutation intervenes to yield a minor change," states Harvard professor Stephen Jay Gould. "But new mutation is infrequent and asexual species do not maintain enough variability for significant evolutionary change." This is why evolutionists look to sex to provide the raw material for natural selection and evolutionary innovation.

But even with sex, the laws of heredity set definite limits on how far the variations in progeny can go. Cats produce only cats. Dogs, though differing greatly, engender only dogs—not pigs, bears, or horses. So, contrary to the claims of evolutionists, sex cannot be invoked as the source of the large-scale changes needed for evolution to occur.

Nor does a theoretical "need" for sex explain the origin of sex. And therein lies one of the greatest evolutionary paradoxes of all: If all higher organisms evolved from unicellular life forms, and if these original unicellular forms were asexual, and if cell division of these primordial protozoa produced little or no variability in subsequent generations (all the above are basic tenets of modern evolutionary theory), then how could such sexless forms of life ever give rise to higher sexual organisms?

And why, if asexual reproduction can produce viable offspring, was it



A Curious Twist— The Sex Life of the Mosquito

To most people, the mosquito is a bothersome pest with an irritating proclivity for drawing blood. But the sex life of the mosquito is a fascinating study in the hidden intricacies of what is usually considered a "simple" organism. Indeed, the structures of the sexual apparatuses of the male and female mosquito are incredibly complex, and the sexual behavior patterns of the mosquito are surprisingly elaborate.

Since space does not permit us to describe all the mysteries and complexities surrounding the sex life of the mosquito, let us focus on only one specific aspect: the baffling change in male anatomy required for the mating of mosquitoes of the species *Aedes Aegypti*.

What is this mysterious anatomical change? Shortly after a male mosquito emerges as an adult, his rear end undergoes a remarkable rotation. The last two segments of the abdomen begin to rotate until, over a period of 20 hours, they have made a full turn of 180 degrees. In other words, the male's posterior turns upside down—permanently. The female abdomen, by contrast, always remains in its original position.

This curious twist is absolutely essential for mating to occur, since the male must clasp the female in a very complicated fashion to ensure fertilization. A partial twist—

say 90 degrees—will not do the job. According to Dr. Jack C. Jones, an entomologist who has conducted extensive research on the amazing reproductive systems of the mosquito, the mechanism responsible for the strange posterior rotation is not known. Jones' studies indicate that the muscles of the body wall do not cause the rotation.

But whatever the mechanism, how could such a revolutionary rotation have evolved? According to evolutionary theory, changes in organisms accumulate over long periods of time, eventually resulting in a superior creature. In the case of longer legs, or bigger horns, such a concept might make sense. But can you imagine male mosquitoes slowly learning, over millions of years, to completely rotate their hind ends so that they could mate with a female? Unless the male mosquito had the ability to effect an essentially complete rotation from the very beginning, the mosquito could not successfully mate, and would now be extinct. Yet mosquitoes quite obviously exist today. And remember, the posterior flip of the male mosquito is only one of a series of spectacular changes and transformations that are vital for mosquito mating and reproduction.

The curious twist in the sex life of the mosquito would seem to provide strong and compelling evidence for the unfathomable inventive genius of God.



Sex by the Clock

On certain nights during the spring and summer months, sandy California beaches are the scene of a spectacular display put on by small silvery fish called grunion. By the thousands these fish come out of the ocean to lay their eggs in the wet beach sand, in accordance with a most amazing and uncanny built-in clock. Indeed, a keen sense of timing is absolutely essential for their survival.

Of all the varieties of fish in the world, only the grunion show such spawning habits.

To understand some of the reasons why the sex life of the grunion is such a remarkable example of a "living clock," we need to consider some facts about ocean tides. First, there are two low tides and two high tides roughly every 25 hours. Second, the highest tides occur at the time of the full moon and at the time of the new moon (at intervals of about two weeks).

The grunion, with little variation, spawn at high tide on the second, third, and fourth nights after the full moon and after the new moon. This means that they are spawning after the time of the highest tides of the month (at a time when the high tides are declining).

Sand is carried away from beaches when tides are increasing, so the grunion spawn on nights and at that time of night when tides are declining and their eggs will be covered by sand. If they spawned at that time of the month or at that time of night when tides were getting higher, their eggs would be washed away by succeeding tides and grunion would become extinct.

Moreover, since it takes about nine days for their eggs to develop, they must spawn at a time when their eggs will have nine days in the sand before they are washed free. Eggs which are laid on the second, third, and fourth nights following the highest tides will usually hatch from one to three nights before the next highest tide. But if the grunion were to spawn later than these three nights, their eggs would be washed out before they were ready to hatch.

Finally, it is essential that the eggs hatch within a few minutes after they are agitated, but not until they are agitated. If the eggs hatched as soon as they got wet, they would probably hatch prematurely and the baby grunion would die. In nature, the vital agitation comes when the eggs are

washed free from the sand by waves of rising tides.

Thus the grunion must take a multitude of factors into account in order to reproduce. No one knows the exact mechanism controlling the precise timing of the grunion, but precise it is. Without this timing, they would have little chance of survival as a species.

Yet how did the grunion acquire their incredible built-in clock? If they "evolved" their sense of timing over thousands or millions of years, the grunion would have long ago become extinct! Remember, the timing must be almost perfect; the eggs must be laid at just the right time—just after the highest tide for that month—otherwise the eggs would be washed away before they could develop. And the eggs must develop in nine days so they will be ready to hatch when the next highest monthly tide comes in. If they aren't ready to hatch, the tide will take them away and they will die.

Truly the clockwork-like sex life of the grunion is an awesome spectacle. The grunion's incredible and intricate sense of timing is a powerful testimony to the handiwork of the Creator.

necessary to turn to the much more complicated sexual method?

Sex Vs. No Sex

Indeed, the great advantage of asexual reproduction is its reliability and simplicity. For one-celled creatures, simple division is all that is necessary. On the other hand, sexual reproduction requires two individuals to find each other and to mate in order to let their gametes—sperm and egg—fuse and then divide to create another organism like themselves. Asexual reproduction can also proceed more rapidly and allow populations to build up much more quickly than sexual reproduction.


Since asexual reproduction has so many advantages, it is difficult to see why nonsexual creatures would ever turn to sex; they obviously survive quite well without it. Witness three billion years of asexual bacterial reproduction with no significant changes.

Of course, sex might produce a greater variety of offspring, which could perhaps better adapt to changing environments. But no nonsexual creature could be expected to “know” that sex is better, and considering the intricate difficulties in changing from nonsex to sex, it is not surprising that evolutionary theory is extremely hard pressed to explain how sex arose.

Take the common dandelion, surely an example of a prospering flowering plant (ask any gardener). Dandelions are presumably the result of millions of years of sexual variation. But in actual fact the dandelion produces seeds by asexual means! Every seed is a genetic duplicate of the parent. Biologists therefore conclude that the dandelion has “abandoned” sex and is thus extremely unlikely to ever show any significant change.

Which again emphasizes the basic paradox of sex. A sexless world—whether of single- or multiple-celled organisms—would be a world with little hope of evolutionary modification. But for sexless forms of life to ever evolve by mere mutations into sexual forms would seem to be utterly impossible.

Sex, in all its many variations, cannot be the result of chance mutations. Sex must be the product of a Great Designer and Creator. □



Evolution, Sex and the Ant

Surprising as it may seem, the tiny ant poses one of the biggest challenges to the belief that sex is a product of evolution and the survival of the fittest, or, on the other hand, that evolution is the natural result of sexual reproduction. One problem lies in the existence of sterile female workers in the ant community. Indeed, Charles Darwin, the father of the theory of evolution, was concerned that such neuter worker ants could be “actually fatal to the whole theory.” In his 1859 book *Origin of Species*, Darwin stated: “With the working ant we have an insect differing greatly from its parents, yet absolutely sterile; so that it could never have transmitted successively acquired modifications of structure or instinct to its progeny. . . . It may well be asked, how is it possible to reconcile this case with the theory of natural selection?”

And that’s precisely the point: These highly specialized workers differ greatly from their mother, father, and even from each other. Darwin observed that they differed by “an almost incredible degree.” So one might assume they became specialized by evolution and natural selection over millions of years. But they’re sterile! So they couldn’t possibly have


evolved by passing on characteristics to their offspring.

But could the queen ant, the mother of the neuter workers, be the source of their “evolution”? Modern-day evolutionists speculate that perhaps fortuitous mutations or sexual recombinations in the genes of ant queens gave rise to the remarkable variety of highly adapted workers we now find in ant colonies. After all, unlike the workers, queen ants are sexual creatures. Therefore, according to evolutionary theory, they might be expected to more readily evolve, introducing a wide variety of innovations in their offspring.

But the evidence simply does not support such speculation. Fossilized ants—males, females, and workers dated some 70 million years old—are apparently identical with species now living! Queen ants are a result of sexual reproduction. Yet the enigma is that sex, the presumed source of great evolutionary variety and change, has seemingly failed to effect any significant changes since the time of the fossilized ants. Sex or no sex, the evidence is that for millions of years the ant has not evolved.

Surely the tiny ant provides a major challenge to Darwinian concepts of evolution.

THE ENERGY CRISIS: FACING UP TO



by George Ritter

While most people endorse the virtues of energy conservation, few seem willing to do anything about it. It's always the "other guy" who needs to save energy. As this article will show, too many people in our society have too big a vested interest in energy waste to want to give it up.

Energy!" "Conservation!" "Diminishing resources!"

"Hogwash! Those aren't the real problems. What we really need is a good healthy dose of increased productivity and profits."

"All this talk about zero growth smacks of economic heresy. It's tantamount to saying depression!"

"The way to put out a fire is with more fire. Never mind that the water in the fire hose is down to a trickle."

Absurd, preposterous, you say. No one could rationally hold such positions.

Nobody that is except: 1) many corporate executives; 2) numerous labor leaders; 3) countless legislators and officials in federal, state and local government.

If you think this assessment is too harsh, consider the actions of some of America's enlightened leaders—both public and private—since the Arab oil embargo in 1973.

Detroit, Michigan, 1974-1975: United Auto Workers' leader Leonard Woodcock calls for restrictions on imported cars.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1975: Research scientists charge Ford and Exxon corporations with deliberately withdrawing funds from methanol research. Methanol added to gasoline has been conclusively shown to reduce automotive fuel consumption. *Fortune* magazine reports that most oil companies "greet the idea icily, warning of new marketing complications and other problems." Yet a methanol-gasoline mixture is presently being used by some drivers who already seem to have surmounted these "problems."

Washington, D.C., 1975: Congress considers imposing an energy tax on large cars in order to encourage fuel conservation. The chairman of General Motors notifies the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee that such a measure would cause workers in the automobile industry "intense hardship." The measure is quickly dropped.

Washington, D.C., 1975: President Ford proposes diverting a major portion of the \$6.5 billion annual highway trust fund for development of rapid transit systems. Immediate opposition is voiced by the Highway User's Federation, a Washington lobby with a \$3.3 million annual budget. Heavy monetary contributors to the Federation include Exxon, U.S. Steel, General Motors, and Allstate Insurance.

Pumping for More Production

Overconsumptive energy habits, as the examples above illustrate, are deeply ingrained in America's national psyche. And the rationale used to support their perpetuation often borders on the absurd. For instance, here's how one prominent California legislator defended an expanded highway construction program—not in 1957, but in 1977: "... Since 97 percent of all the goods in transit in California use streets or highways," he wrote, "it is essential that the bulk of any revenue from an increase in the gas tax go to road construction. California's existing highway network must be completed and maintained at a level that is both efficient and safe."

Title Art by Randall Cole

We ought to build more highways, the reasoning goes, because they are already carrying the bulk of the transportation load. It's just another way of saying, "Let's maintain the status quo." What the legislator actually did was make the classic error of confusing the effect with the cause. He neglected to mention that one of the major reasons 97 percent of all goods and people travel by highways is precisely because the government poured so much money into them in the first place.

Perhaps the statement of a prominent oil company executive gets closer to the heart of the problem. Reacting against a Ford Foundation study that called for extensive energy conservation measures, he wrote: "We agree that waste of energy should be eliminated [who can oppose mom, flag and country?]; but even when wastage is taken out of the system, the average consumer in this growing economy will continue to need *more* energy tomorrow than he does today."

The implicit assumption in this executive's argument is that consumer needs must continue to inexorably expand. Or else the real assumption was that people will *want* more in the future or even be manipulated to want more.

Herein lies one of the fundamental flaws of our industrialized, mass-production society. Goods are produced not just to fulfill basic needs but to satisfy wants. High-powered assembly lines can continue to mass-produce only if there is continual mass demand. Genuine needs usually exist at a stable or stationary level and there is a limit to their growth potential. Wants, on the other hand, are more elastic. They can be artificially stimulated by a production-oriented industrial complex that continually advertises its wares through every possible medium. As Lewis Mumford explained it: "The aim of industry is not primarily to satisfy essential human needs with a minimal productive effort, but to multiply the number of needs, factitious or fictitious, [to] produce profits. These are the sacred principles of the power complex" (*The Pentagon of Power*, p. 328).

Expansion is of course important in an industrial-based society because growing profits are directly tied to it. Without expansion, investors lose confidence, stocks drop in value, capital dries up, and the corporation finds itself spinning its assembly-line wheels in an intolerable no-growth situation.

"Our whole society, especially our industrial system," writes Maurice Strong, former executive director of the UN environmental program, "is geared to a set of automatic, habitual responses that are inherently self-defeating: more production, more growth, more everything."

Social considerations obviously have to take a backseat in this kind of profit-centered orientation. "So what if trains are less polluting and use less energy than automobiles?" this kind of reasoning would go. "Their return on investment can't begin to match that of a healthy automotive industry." Hence the dilemma.

Anyone with the authority to reverse these priorities would soon find himself with *no* authority if he tried. Stockholders, for instance, aren't about to stand for a company that says profits are secondary. And if the stockholders won't stand for it, neither will the board of directors, the president, and anyone else who values his corporate position.

Presumably if there were an infinite supply of energy and resources available to such a growth-oriented society, there would be no physical problems inherent in this philosophy. But as the distinguished British economist E. F. Schumacher observed: "An attitude to life which seeks fulfillment in the single-minded pursuit of wealth—in short, materialism—does not fit into this world, because it contains within itself no limiting principle, while the environment in which it is placed is strictly limited" (*Small Is Beautiful*, pp. 29-30).

Garrett Hardin, a University of California professor of human ecology, was even more emphatic: "In the new era of scarcity, laissez-faire and the inalienable right of the individual to get as much as he can are prescriptions for disaster. It follows that the political system inherited from our forefathers is moribund" (*Skeptic*, No. 2, p. 52).

Towards a New Social Ethic

Facing reality means first recognizing the fact that our institutions as they are presently configured are virtually incapable of coping with the factors that lay at the root of the energy crisis. No number of technological breakthroughs, new sources of energy, or vacuous public relations statements will alter this fundamental dilemma.

As economist Robert Heilbroner explained it: "Resource-consuming and heat-generating processes must be regarded as necessary evils, not as social triumphs, to be relegated to as small a portion of economic life as possible. This implies a sweeping reorganization of the mode of production in ways that cannot be foretold but that would seem to imply the end of the giant factory, the huge office, perhaps of the urban complex" (*An Inquiry into the Human Prospect*, p. 139).

Needed also is a new human ethic to accompany a change in our institutions—a revolution in human values, if you will.

Schumacher described it as "an entirely new system of thought . . . a system based on attention to people, and not primarily to goods" (*Small Is Beautiful*, p. 74). It would also require an ultimate end to growth-hungry corporate technostructures, politicians that value power more than principle, and people who are unwilling to give their fellow humans the same considerations that they themselves would expect. It would take a new spirit of sacrifice which would motivate the consumer to voluntarily renounce such things as gas-guzzling autos or vans in favor of subcompacts or mass transit. And it would also necessitate a revolution in our work, labor and production habits: Things would be made to last rather than primarily to produce profit.

Anything short of these goals and we are kidding ourselves. Failure to take effective action could ultimately result in the ruin of our society or the loss of our personal freedoms. One way or another, our fool's paradise of "endless energy" will ultimately come to an end. It can be either changed on a voluntary basis or forced upon us, perhaps even by tyrannical forces outside our control. If we cannot bring our society into harmony with our finite world, then that society will soon cease to exist.

We still have the opportunity to change it—if we are willing. □





The spaced-out junkie with needle marks up and down both arms and legs, the wino on skid row, the foodoholic who can't get through the day without his coffee and candy bars—all these negative images are conjured up at the mention of the word "addict." But there are habits—and, yes, addictions—that we might all do well to cultivate.

As Thoreau put it, most people live "lives of quiet desperation" punctuated by occasional periods of happiness, ecstasy, delight and joy. It's only rarely that you come across someone who is really "high on life"—who deeply enjoys and savors every experience, who seems to perpetually live in the present moment.

Instead, most of us slog through our daily existence trying to avoid as much pain as possible, rarely rising above the routine. And for some of us, the pain—physical or emotional—is overwhelming. When it becomes extremely difficult to cope, there is a real temptation to take any easy way out. And when fast and pleasant relief is available in the form of a needle or a pill or a quick drink, such relief can quickly become a desperate need.

But pain of all kinds is a fact of life for many of us—yet not everybody ends up an addict or on skid

ON BECOMING AN ADDICT

by Carole Ritter

row. Why are some people so much more readily "hooked" than others?

Researchers believe that a metabolic factor, such as lack of a certain chemical in the body, can predispose an individual to a particular kind of addiction. It has been speculated that just as a diabetic needs insulin, so an addict needs his or her own particular missing chemical or hormone, and will accept any substitute that alleviates the pain.

But wouldn't it be fine if addiction-prone people could somehow figure out what their bodies were missing, and work on supplying that element, rather than ingesting some artificial substitute? And wouldn't it be great if "normal" people living ordinary lives were able to feel delight and joy on a regular, daily basis without resorting to chemicals? And what if there were forms of addiction that strengthened one's body and character rather than destroying them?

Getting "High" Nature's Way

Actually there are ways to bring about druglike "highs" without resorting to chemicals—at least chemicals like alcohol or cocaine or pot or speed. And they don't violate the Protestant work ethic, either, because to get such highs one has to work and work hard at it.

For those of us who are "into" natural foods and holistic medicine and organic everything, the following knowledge will be extremely comforting: The human brain manufactures its own narcotics. The very organ most addicts are trying to deaden makes its own drugs, the way God designed it to. These drugs do the same things regular drugs do, only more effectively and without a hangover. They can mollify pain, cause pleasant feelings of well-being, and even wipe out anxiety and induce euphoria.

Researchers have discovered that the brain has many tiny "drug" receptors which are stimulated by the presence of either the body's own chemicals, or if one indulges, by manmade drugs such as morphine (Richard Restak, "The Brain Makes Its Own Narcotics!," *Saturday Review*, March 5, 1977). These receptors are located in the limbic system, a part of the brain which deals with

pain and emotion. And pain and emotional distress are the two factors indicated in every case of addiction. Dr. Avram Goldstein, professor of pharmacology at Stanford University and director of the Addiction Research Foundation in Palo Alto, California, believes that addicts may be taking narcotics "in order to overcome an inborn deficiency in the natural 'drugs' produced by the body."

Scientists are now working to either synthesize such "drugs" or find out how to turn on the body's own production of these substances in order to treat addiction and certain forms of mental illness.

But in the meantime, there are other ways to bring about the same results. Hong Kong neurosurgeon Dr. Wen Hsiang-lai has discovered an unusual but highly effective method of causing the body to make its own drugs. He uses acupuncture, that staple of traditional Chinese medicine, to treat heroin addicts. His treatment (which consists of running a 12-volt or lower current through a small needle inserted in the concha—the cuplike outer portion of the ear above the lobe) causes his patients to experience an absence of withdrawal symptoms in a matter of minutes. The electric current apparently stimulates a cranial nerve which signals the brain to produce a chemical which addicts are lacking. Preliminary tests show that his method worked for at least 51 percent of a group of heroin addicts who were free of the drug habit a year after the experiment ended, compared to 28.5 percent of a control group who were dosed with the traditional methadone used as a heroin substitute in the U.S. and Britain.

The Running Habit

But there is another more mundane way by which those of us who have no access to research programs or Hong Kong acupuncturists can get ourselves into drug production: by running. Yes, plain old running. If you run or jog regularly enough, and long enough each session, there is a good possibility you'll reach an extremely pleasant mental state that many running addicts experience and have only recently begun to talk

about. (Some researchers believe that such feelings of euphoria result from an increase in the chemical epinephrine in the bloodstream, which causes a measurable drop in anxiety.)

John Griest of the University of Wisconsin found running more effective than traditional psychotherapy in treating abnormally depressed patients. And Dr. Kenneth Cooper, author of *The New Aerobics*, also finds it useful in relieving anxiety: "... exercise is a natural relaxant. This alone is highly beneficial in many clinical conditions. . . . The reduction of anxiety through exercise also is helpful in treating some patients with emotional problems" (p. 127).

And Dr. William Glasser of the Institute for Reality Therapy has come up with a concept which he calls "positive addiction," the title of his latest book. He believes individuals can build strength of character through seeking out and finding their own particular natural high. Through his research he has found that the two most common methods of achieving a positive addiction are running and the less strenuous but less sure method of meditation—not spiritual meditation, but a form of conscious relaxation in which the image-oriented right half of the brain is allowed to function dominantly, in contrast to the verbal problem-solving left hemisphere of the brain which is usually in charge during our waking hours. This unleashes all sorts of creativity, much the same way that ideas "come to one while shaving." It also seems to induce the brain to produce the desired chemical balance.

Getting Addicted

Glasser gives six steps to achieving positive addiction: "... a positive addiction can be anything at all that a person chooses to do as long as it fulfills the following six criteria: (1) It is something noncompetitive that you choose to do and you can devote an hour (approximately) a day to it. (2) It is possible for you to do it easily and it doesn't take a great deal of mental effort to do it well. (3) You can do it alone or rarely with others but it does not depend upon others to do it. (4) You believe

that it has some value (physical, mental, or spiritual) for you. (5) You believe that if you persist at it you will improve, but this is completely subjective—you need to be the only one who measures that improvement. (6) The activity must have the quality that you can do it without criticizing yourself. If you can't accept yourself during this time the activity will not be addicting. This is why it is so important that the activity can be done alone. Any time you introduce other people you chance introducing competition or criticism, often both" (*Positive Addiction*, p. 93).

While the most popular way of getting positively addicted seems to be running or jogging, some people have achieved this state through such diverse activities as swinging a baseball bat, singing, or listening to music.

Interrelated System

Reaching a state of positive addiction through exercising the body is not really all that unbelievable. The mind and the body are one and the same interrelated system. As George Leonard writes in his book *The Ultimate Athlete*: "It is only through a heresy in Western thought that we could consider any aspect of life as 'nonphysical.' The body is always involved, even in what we call the most cerebral pursuit. Einstein tells us that the Special or Restricted Theory of Relativity came from a feeling in his muscles" (p. 189).

The twin scourges of boredom and chronic depression can also be alleviated by a regular exercise program. Dr. Kenneth Cooper states that "in their domestic lives, women often become the victims of routine. Many of them lack the challenges that men face in their work. . . . Aerobics has proved to be a turning point in the lives of many such women. Getting on the program marks for them the point of a new departure. They shed boredom and become alert and responsive again. The vitality women gain from upgrading their fitness sometimes opens the door to many other interests, giving their whole existence new meaning" (*The New Aerobics*, p. 143).

Such a form of positive addiction has other beneficial side effects. Minor aches and pains and irritating conditions are often improved once the body is in a really vibrant, healthy, dynamic (not just un-sick) condition. And flabby muscles can lead to more than just being unable to open jar lids without help. George Leonard writes that: "More than 6 million people in the United States are treated for some sort of backache every day, and back trouble is the greatest single drain on industrial compensation funds; estimates of the cost to the nation run up to \$10 billion a year. Yet, the great majority of back problems are caused simply by flabby muscles, especially those of the abdomen which are needed to hold the pelvis straight and thus reduce strain on the muscles of the lower back. A balanced physical-activity program, taking only a few hours a week, would doubtless eliminate most back ailments. Sufferers turn instead to drugs, heating pads, and doctors' appointments" (*The Ultimate Athlete*, p. 154).

But what if you're one of Dr. Cooper's victims of domestic routine (or office fatigue), yet don't feel comfortable and safe trotting up and down the streets of your neighborhood? What if dogs and smart-aleck kids and staring motorists all but imprison you inside your four walls? For you, Cooper's book includes a variety of indoor aerobic exercises such as stationary running, skipping rope, climbing stairs, stationary cycling, and running on treadmills. (The word "aerobic" was coined by Dr. Cooper and means exercise that improves the condition of the heart, lungs, and blood vessels. Most conventional forms of exercise such as games like volleyball, calisthenics, gardening and even housework do not stimulate the body long enough or steadily enough to produce beneficial changes in circulation and oxygen usage. And even exercises like walking and jogging must be done very regularly to achieve the desired cardiovascular fitness.)

Last July *The Plain Truth* ran an article by Harry Sneider, executive fitness director at Ambassador College, outlining the many benefits of

regular exercise. The article also contained cautions on beginning a program, such as checking with your personal physician before beginning a regimen. *The New Aerobics* also carries the same warning, including the fact that you should progress slowly, exercise only within your tolerance, warm up properly and cool down slowly afterwards. And strenuously exercising only on weekends can be more harmful than no exercise at all. It should be done at least four times a week.

A Positive "Fix"

Many if not most of us are addicted to one thing or another, even though we may not recognize it. Human beings just seem to operate that way. Even people who aren't dependent on any chemical may become addicted to certain emotions, such as the "high" associated with a love affair. They may pursue conquest after conquest in order to get their regular emotional "fix." (Just as chemicals in the brain can affect emotion, certain emotions can cause various chemicals to be produced. Anger stimulating adrenalin production is a common example of this process.)

So as long as we're going to be addicts, we may as well opt to be the positive variety. As Glasser mentions in his book, people who are positively addicted are stronger emotionally and better able to cope with whatever curves life throws them. They're able to wait out crises and withstand pain to a much greater degree than those without such regular habits.

You may have to search and experiment to find out exactly which "positive addiction" fits your own particular needs and lifestyle, but the search is well worth it in terms of health and mental satisfaction. □

ADDITIONAL READING

The New Aerobics by Kenneth H. Cooper, Bantam Books, 1976.


Aerobics for Women by Mildred Cooper and Kenneth H. Cooper, Bantam Books, 1977.

Positive Addiction by William Glasser, Harper and Row, 1976.

The Dilemma of Drugs (Available from us free of charge. See inside front cover for address nearest you.)

A Lighthearted Look at the "Going to Heaven" Idea

by Lawson C. Briggs



Reprinted by Permission of N.E.A.

This is a different sort of article. Have you ever heard a sermon or read a whole article—before right now, of course—that actually goes right down the line, scripture after scripture, and *proves*—from the Bible—that heaven is the reward of the saved, and that we go right to heaven when we die?

No?

That's just what I thought!

Well, just continue reading. We'll remedy that situation right now.

Let's start right out with some of the many, many references all through the Gospel of Matthew which speak of "the kingdom of heaven." Now obviously that means a kingdom *in heaven*. The Bank of California is in California, and the Bank of America is in America—I'm sure it must be—well, anyway, its headquarters is. And the Bank of

Morgan is in Morgan—well, I guess that must be an exception, because "of" always ought to mean "in," oughtn't it? But anyway, let's get back to the kingdom in heaven.

Christ Himself said: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:3). Now surely that proves it. Those who are not proud and haughty in attitude or spirit of mind will inherit the kingdom of heaven. He went on to say that if they are persecuted for righteousness' sake, "theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (verse 10), and "blessed are ye" when you are persecuted and falsely spoken evil of, for then "great is your reward in heaven" (verse 12). See that! That says "*in heaven*."

Don't you want to be among those who are going to go and get their reward **IN** heaven?

What's that? You don't think we are going to go to heaven to get our rewards? Why, Paul specifically wrote that our citizenship (correct translation) is in heaven (Phil. 3:20). And we are told all through the New Testament to lay up treasure for ourselves in heaven. You don't suppose there would be all those references to the saved having a treasure in heaven if we are never going to go there and claim it, do you? Why, there are so many verses I have neither time nor space to quote them, but you can look them up for yourself. What about Matthew 6:20 and 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 6:23 and 18:22; Colossians 1:5; I Peter 1:4? Notice that last one. It says our inheritance is *kept* there!

You say we're not going there? It's coming down to us? Why, that doesn't make much sense! I'd rather *go* there. How's that? Oh, yes, I

know it does say in Revelation 22:12 that Christ is coming back to earth, bringing everybody's reward with him. But that's just one verse, and . . .

Well, that's off the subject anyway. Now notice that some are going to be great and some are going to be "least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:19-20), and it talks about *entering* the kingdom of heaven. And Matthew 18:1-4 shows the same things again. Surely that proves we're going to leave the earth behind and live in heaven. Now doesn't it?

What? You think the Kingdom of heaven is a specific kingdom *on earth*? A government with laws and people and land, with Christ as King, that the saved will enter by being born again by resurrection from their graves (see Col. 1:18; Rom. 1:4; 6:5), just like being born in this life, for example, into the kingdom of the Netherlands? Hmph! That's not what I've been taught! In fact, none of the well-respected, established churches teach that! [Editor's note: We have a free booklet on this subject entitled *Just What Do You Mean—the Kingdom of God?* Also, another booklet of interest: *What Is the Reward of the Saved?*]

Justin Martyr *what?*! Considered those who believe souls go to heaven heretics? Now where do you get that? Chapter 80 of his *Dialogue with Trypho*? Yes, I know Justin was one of the earliest and greatest of the church fathers. Irenaeus didn't believe in going to heaven either? Nor other early Christians? Oh! Well, now let's look at some more of the proof we go to heaven.

You know, when I think about all those great men of the Bible, I can hardly wait to get there and be with them. Noah, Abraham, Moses, David . . .

You say David's not in heaven? Well, *why not?* David is one of the greatest Old Testament saints! Oh, I know he committed some sins, but he repented. And we know he was saved, because he is going to be king over Israel again in the millennium (Jer. 30:9), and the Bible even says he was, or became, a man after

God's own heart (Acts 13:22). Acts 2:34? What does *that* say?

"For David is not ascended into the heavens"?

Well, maybe David didn't, but the rest did. No? Why not?

"No one has ascended into

"Moreover, I also informed you that there are some who are Christians in name, but in reality are godless and impious heretics whose doctrines are entirely blasphemous, atheistic, and foolish. However, that you may be assured that I am not making this admission in your presence only, I promise to write up our whole debate in book form as well as I can, and in it I will insert the admission I just made to you, for I do not desire to be a follower of men and their teachings, but of God and His doctrines. If you have ever encountered any so-called Christians who do not believe this doctrine [of the millennium], but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham and God of Isaac and the God of Jacob by asserting that there is no resurrection from the dead, but that their souls are taken up to heaven at the very moment of their death, do not consider them to be real Christians . . . "

Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, chapter 80

heaven but . . . the Son of man [Jesus]" (John 3:13). "[God] hast made them [the dead in Christ] a kingdom [the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, as all the New Testament writers except Matthew call it] and priests to our God, and they shall reign *on earth*" (Rev.

5:10). How long? "They . . . reigned with Christ a thousand years [the millennium which Jeremiah said David would reign in]" (Rev. 20:4).

Well, anyway, Christians have a "house" in heaven to live in. II Corinthians 5:1-2 tells us that, and says it is "eternal *in the heavens*."

What? Now look, who's writing this article, anyway, you or me? OK, so it *doesn't* prove our spirit body or house is going to remain eternally in the heavens or that it will be there when we dwell in it. But the Bible does prove there are people in heaven.

Revelation 5:3 says "no man in heaven" was able to open the scroll, so there are men there. And Revelation 19:1 says there was a sound of "a great multitude in heaven." Just don't pay any attention to these newfangled modern translations that change those scriptures. Who do they think they are, anyway, claiming the Greek text is superior to the good old King James Bible!

And why do you suppose Paul wanted to "depart and be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23) if people don't go to heaven? He was anxious to die because he would immediately be with Christ in heaven. It doesn't say that? Oh, I know it doesn't exactly *say* it, but that's what it means. You mean, you would rather believe Paul wanted to die just to be finished with all the labor and persecution he had to suffer, even though he knew he would remain unconscious for thousands of years until the resurrection and the second coming of Christ?

Yes, I know by then he was an old man and tired, and maybe ailing, and death would come as a welcome relief. OK, you go ahead and believe Christians *don't* go to heaven, if you want to. I've tried my best to teach you the truth.

Oh, all right, if you insist! I concede the words "going to heaven" or "when we all get to heaven" are *not* found anywhere in the Bible. What's that? Uh, no, I don't guess I was really able to prove we will go to heaven at death. But surely I have taught you something profitable in this article. I sure hope so. □

WHAT'S THE WORD FOR TODAY?

Where can you find words to describe today's world? Problems bubble, seethe and then explode in every corner, in every direction. Where are the phrases to capture the feeling of the massive megaproblems that have pushed us to the brink of annihilation? Where are the principles that will guide us even to see in their awesome scope, if not to solve, the crises which cause us to consider cosmo-scide?

by Jon Hill

Where in the world can we find words to express the turmoil, frustration and despair we feel as we see the burden of the future descend on us with a crescendo of problems which grows even faster than the exploding world population?

Newly coined words are a dime a dozen. Rhetoric repeats itself with historic boredom. Political promises, the always bright, new manna for the day, breed worms and stink even *before* the sun goes down! Parish pastors peep and mutter inane and hypocritical soothing sayings like, "The good in human nature will prevail. Peace, brother, peace—" when there is no peace! Sober scientists search for words to sound the alarm they feel when they view the devastating statistics of overkill potential in the hands of the nuclear club of nations, the sinister statistics of world population totally eclipsing food production, the fearsome potential of new scientific discoveries in fields like genetic engineering, the menace of newly invented Buck Rogers weaponry, the threat to world ecology posed by our burgeoning industrial output.

The Crisis of Crises

The subhead above is not mine. I borrowed it from a renowned scientist, John Platt, research biophysicist and associate director of the Mental Health Research Institute at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, who was writing for *Science* magazine in its November 28, 1969, edition, page 1116. Permit me to quote a few more phrases from his article, "What We Must Do."

The principles, phrases and word choice of this seriously concerned, if not shaken and alarmed scientist are reminiscent of my favorite Book. This man shares my alarm at apparent human lethargy in the face of present and coming catastrophic crises. And the same alarm is sounded with living, modern, up-to-the-second—yet old, in the sense that they are eternal—words, phrases and principles of my favorite Book!

"A few years ago, Leo Szilard estimated the 'half-life' of the human race with respect to nuclear escalation as being between 10 and 20 years. I think this multiplication of domestic and international crises today will shorten that short half-life. In the continued absence of better ways of heading off these multiple crises, our half-life may no longer be 10 to 20 years, but more like 5 to 10 years, or less. . . . The time is short. . . . The time is horribly short."

We've been lucky enough to survive longer than Platt thought we would—but this only brings us closer to the culmination he projected.

The Crisis at the End

That subhead above is not mine either. I borrowed it from the pages of my favorite Book: "And now, O Daniel, keep all this a close secret and keep the book shut as a secret, till the crisis at the end" (Daniel 12:4, Moffatt translation). Daniel goes on to say, "I heard this, but I did not understand it. So I asked, 'O my lord, what is to be the last phase before the end?' But he said, 'Ask no more, Daniel, for the revelation is to

be kept secret and close, till the crisis at the close" (verses 8-9).

The whole book of Daniel deals with world government. Daniel had received information about all the world governments which would rule the earth between his time and the time when God would set up His government on earth. Naturally Daniel wanted to know how long this was going to take, and what were some of the things that were going to happen just before God's intervention so he could watch for those telltale signs indicating the imminent coming of God's Kingdom.

God knew it would be a long time yet, and so Daniel would not be frustrated, He told him to "forget it." But He also commanded Daniel to write down the details he had been shown, because they would be of use to people like Daniel just before and during "the crisis at the close." So despite the fact that these words of the Bible are "ancient," they hold the key to the riddle of today's world. They answer the seemingly unanswerable questions that plague statesmen and scientists alike in the "crisis at the end."

The simple warnings of God's Word tell it like it is. There was no need of preserving endless place names. God didn't need to list the wars that would quickly culminate in *the* war to destroy all mankind that we all see on the horizon. God didn't need to perpetuate meaningless words like Korean police action, Vietnamization, Cambodianization, or whatever may be next. He didn't need to coin phrases like cold war, guerrilla war, war of

nerves, coup d'etat, etc., ad infinitum. All our Creator needed to do to inform thinking and reasonable men in time to make proper preparation was to cause to be written and preserved these simple statements: "You will hear of wars and rumours of wars. . . there will be sore misery then, such as has never been, from the beginning of the world till now—no and never shall be. Had not those days been cut short, not a soul would be saved alive . . ."! (Matt. 24:6, 21, 22, Moffatt.)

Those words plainly tell us in succinct form what to watch for in the daily headlines just before the end (that's the end of the present society, man's governments, by the way, and not the end of the earth, as scoffers would like to believe the Bible teaches). What's more important, these words are comforting! Comforting because they add the good news of what God has in store beyond the scope of mere human sight. They add the sure word of hope in an age of hopelessness.

Read those words!

The Word for Today: Bad

When you see all these problems exploding around you, God's advice in modern language is, "Don't get shook!" "See and do not be alarmed. These [things] have to come, but it is not the end yet" (Matt. 24:6). God knew things were going to be the way they are today. God knew mankind would not be able to find solutions to his multiple problems. God knew human beings would escalate their troubles to the point of human extinction. Now mankind is beginning to see the picture. Mankind sees all the problems, but none who see the problems well are very enthusiastic about the possibility of solving them. Scientists readily admit they do not now have the answers. Politicians certainly don't have the answers (they are a big part of the problem!). Priests and clerics sit mumbling at the bottom of an abyss where the world has thrown them and their dead god. (Read about that in Isaiah 26:12-14.) Educators are fighting for their own lives—they have no answers;

their future looks black! Industry in its greed is creating a major portion of the problems, is reluctant to reform, has no real answers. The financial world is busy digging its own grave—no answers there.

The Word for Tomorrow: Good

But God says things are not going to end the way mankind predicts! God says He knows mankind has the power to blow himself off the face of the earth, but God insists by His right as Creator and Ruler that He will not allow things to go quite that far—He plans to stop the world and get on!

Believe it or not, God loves us in spite of all our faults. In fact, He loves us more than we love ourselves, and He is not going to allow us to destroy ourselves! (John 3:16, Romans 5:8, Matthew 24:22.) Those are the words for tomorrow, plus whole chapters, whole books that outline in detail God's good news for tomorrow's world!

The Word for Today

But back to today—that's what the article's about. The Bible can provide you advance notice about next week's headlines, next month's and next year's! It's more than modern. It's beyond up to date! It's *past* present!

If you get busy and read the Book, you'll be able to anticipate world events.

And more important, you'll learn how God in that same Word has provided the principles which will enable you to live through those events and participate actively in the good news beyond! When you pick up your daily newspaper, your weekly news magazine, when you watch TV news (or programs), you'll be able to say, "I read it first in the Bible!" These are some areas for you to prove the point, to practice with, to get excited about.

And remember God's comforting advice about today's news: "Don't get shook!" Today's news is bad, and bound to get worse! But as you read more of the Book you'll see more of the good news beyond today's bad news.

Does "Don't get shook!" mean we

should take today's bad news and the horrors yet to come with a shrug of the shoulders? No! Does that mean we shouldn't be alarmed into action? No! Does that mean we should not begin to make personal changes, because God is going to do it all? No, no, no! It simply means that as you begin to see God's plan for the future, you don't have to face it with all the frustration that accompanies the ignorance of the unknown that mankind alone, without God, must face. It means you can have hope beyond the horrible terror man predicts for the world's future. It means you will want to join us in getting this good message to a dying world!

A few samples:

Read Isaiah chapter three. Go to your local library and read the same chapter in several modern translations of the Bible. Then read your daily newspaper and see if you can find any resemblance between the two!

God warns us in many places that in the time frame just before Christ's return, conditions in society would be a blatant, unblushing, even proud duplication of those of Sodom and Gomorrah just before He wiped them out! Read Genesis 18, 19; Jeremiah 6:13-16 and Luke 17:28-30. Then pick up your local paper and read through the advertisement pages for the movies, or go to the local drugstore and look at the books and magazines for sale, or just look at the people passing by on the street and see if God's Bible is the Word for today or not! (Request our free booklet *Are We Living in the Last Days?*)

The time is now, that time Daniel sealed up his Book for, the time to unseal and understand with God's help what not even Daniel in his day could understand!

That's enough for one day. Pleasant, or at least exciting, reading to you. If any questions come to your mind which you can't answer for yourself, just drop us a line. We'd be glad to help—we've read the Book before! We read the Book every day! And, remember: You read it *first* in the Book, the Bible! That's the Word for today! □

HOW TO HELP YOUR CHILD SUCCEED

Want to improve your child's performance in school? Some noted researchers offer a few suggestions for developing your child's human potential.

by Robert D. Oberlander

At any given moment somewhere on this globe a proud parent is effusively exclaiming, "That's my kid!" Whether it's the joy of a baby's first step, a daughter's first ballet performance, or a new promotion for a 35-year-old "baby," it's wonderful when children do something to cause parents such pleasure.

Parents want their children to be successful, happy, and well adjusted. Some parents even go to great lengths to turn their children into prodigies, geniuses, or *wunderkinder*. But many mothers and fathers may not realize that they can do a lot more toward developing such traits. Recent studies have revealed the sobering fact that parents play an incredibly important role in the total development of their children. That role appears to be doubly important during a vital ten-month period early in a toddler's life.

Importance of Parental Contact

Professor Robert Zajonc and his colleague Dr. Gregory Markus, two University of Michigan researchers, have concluded that adult contact is



Candida Photo

a significant factor in the development of the intellectual ability of children. Their research found that the child's rate of mental development was related to the amount of adult knowledge available to the child. In order to increase both the parental contact and the knowledge available to the child, both necessary for greater intellectual growth, children should be spaced at least three years apart. Their research shows more rapid growth in intellectual skills when the parental

knowledge is not shared by two or more children.

Recently there has been a growing concern over a drop in scores of high school graduates taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Zajonc and Markus cite the baby boom of the 1940s and 1950s as a possible cause in these declining scores. Then, parents had more children and spaced them relatively close together. The researchers feel the decline in performance will reverse as we move into the 1980s and see the reflection of fewer children per family with more time separating them.

Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget for many years has researched the area of intellectual development. His work has reflected the "active and creative nature of children's thinking" from birth forward. Piaget's theories have lent themselves to further investigation in this important area.

In 1965 psychologist Burton L. White started a research operation called the Harvard Preschool Project. At that time, scientists were just beginning to realize that intellectual development started before school age. Dr. Benjamin S.

Bloom of the University of Chicago, in his book *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, indicated that by age four as much as 50 percent of a child's intelligence is set. White states: "For us to think education begins when a child goes to first grade is grossly in error. Children start to learn long before they are 6 years old. They start to learn at birth. It's pretty much all over by the time they are three." He feels that by this time developing and learning capacities are relatively well established for life.

The Harvard Preschool Project set out to determine how to raise intellectually competent children. White established two groups of normal 3-to-6-year-olds for contrast. The first group he called A group. These children rated exceptionally high on all aspects of competence both in and outside the school classroom. The second group he called C group. These children had some difficulties and were never quite able to cope. White, coauthoring with Jean C. Watts, described this research in the book *Major Influences on the Development of Young Children*. Studying these children, they found a set of intellectual and social skills which could be isolated into 17 specific abilities to establish how the two groups differed. Group A had these skills while group C did not. Some of these skills include how to get help and attention from adults. Group A children planned and carried out complicated projects and were able to anticipate the consequences, and they understood more complicated sentences. The C group did not possess these skills. Interestingly, it was found that children at age 3, when tested, had the same skills as those at age 6; thus these particular abilities were developed prior to the age of three.

The Critical Factor

Finding these skills were developed before age three required the researchers to abandon the kindergartens and nursery schools and get right into the homes of children ranging from the ages of one to

three. Not only were the children observed, but mothers as well, to determine what activities they were providing to stimulate intellectual growth in their children.

The researchers found that by 1½ to 2 the skills were already set, but at 10 months it was not possible to define differences. Apparently a very important transition occurs between 10 months and 18 months. This difference is not attributed to race, income, education or residence. The critical factor seems to be the interaction between the mother and the child. As White has stated: "Providing a rich social life for a 12-to-15-month-old child is the best thing you can do to guarantee a good mind."

What is it that mothers do to pro-

Apparently a very important transition occurs between 10 months and 18 months. This difference in skills is not attributed to race, income, education or residence. The critical factor seems to be the interaction between the mother and the child.

duce "A" children? While the interaction is important they don't spend a great deal of time interacting. Seldom do these mothers spend more than 10 percent of the child's waking hours in undivided attention of their children. This amounts to less than 1.2 hours a day.

"White found that the best parents excelled at three key functions: 1) they were superb designers and organizers of their child's environment; 2) they were firm disciplinarians while simultaneously showing

great affection for their children; 3) they served as personal consultants to their children in brief episodes of perhaps 30 seconds or less. These parents allowed the child to initiate most interactions between them, but were highly responsive to calls for comfort, information or a shared enthusiasm" ("Exploring the Origins of Human Competence," *APA Monitor*, April 1976).

The "A" mothers do not confine their children to playpens and high chairs for long periods. They provide a variety of toys and other household objects which are interesting and stimulating to the child. The "C" mothers, on the other hand, are restrictive, having many areas out of bounds to the child. They are "protective" of the child, thus limiting, during a period of critical development, growth and curiosity.

Reinforcing Skills

The mother's role as a consultant comes to bear when the child needs help or meets an impasse. According to White, the "A" mother will give the child a few seconds of time resulting in his receiving some language, beefing up his curiosity, giving related ideas that lead him to start thinking, reinforcing important skills, and teaching him to use adults as a resource. Many of these short sessions, from changing diapers to helping or playing, add up to the 1.2 hours a day responsible for the "A"-type development. The "C" mothers rarely stimulate the child to better understand why things are the way they are and how they work.

These findings do not relegate the "C" child to failure, but if neither the environment nor the mother as activity coordinator changes, then something will be lost in the child's intellectual development.

If you, as a concerned parent, provide an enriched environment during those critical periods of development, you will have done what you can to ensure a more fully developed intellect for your child, so that he or she can more completely utilize his or her human potential. □

Why Believe the Bible? OPERATING MANUAL FOR PLANET EARTH

by John R. Schroeder

Man's survival capabilities are now being weighed in the balance. Many heads of state, scientists, futurists, ecologists and others of the intelligentsia have already found them wanting. Twentieth-century man is in a state of shipwreck and the prospects for viable lifeboats are very few indeed. But are we seeking answers in the wrong places? Is there a long-forgotten formula found in an ancient collection of documents that would assure human survival? Are we trying to operate the machine without the manual?

Recent surveys have shown that at least 95 percent of the American people claim they believe in God. Similar polls in other Western nations yield somewhat lower percentages in the sixties, seventies and eighties. Still, the vast majority of mankind in the Western world does appear to believe in some kind of God.

To some He is only a First Cause who wound things up like a clock and then left the whole universe to tick away its eons without inter-

vention. But by whatever method this God started the whole process in the first place, does it make sense to us as rational beings that He would have left mankind without any basic instruction book?

A Prospective Manual?

There is no shortage of "holy books" with supposed messages from heaven. However, it would be only logical to begin our studies with the Book upon which the dominant religion in the Western world is based.

Despite the fact that the Christian Bible is a consistent best-seller, it is not a document that world statesmen and politicians habitually consult as a handy problem-solving manual. Usually it occupies the traditional spot on the family bookshelf and is superficially revered—but virtually untouched.

Few would dispute the rather sharp decline of biblical influence in our daily lives. Our secular education has generally precluded any serious study of the Scriptures. Religion is hardly front-page news today, and the counsel of its leaders little valued. Even unskilled manual laborers earn higher wages than the average clergyman.

A big barrier to widespread acceptance of biblical teachings is the very beginning of the Book itself. Chapter one, verse one of Genesis simply states: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." But those polled did not even rank creation among the top five theories advanced to explain the origin of the universe.

The Christian evangelist has no small problem on his hands. Convincing the world that Christianity is really, after all, a religion of revelation is no easy task. The world's secular viewpoint has already prejudiced most against the theologian's case. And of course the advocates of the Christian religion have not presented a united front to the world. There is not even any universal agreement on what the Christian Bible actually teaches.

So where do we begin in sorting out the problem of revelation? Where do we find the most

agreement? Upon what person is the whole Christian religion built?

Even those who believe much of the Bible to be myth still acknowledge that God has manifested Himself in a unique manner through the person of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. It is He who is the author and the founder of the true Christian religion. His view of the Bible must be considered as decisive. We cannot lightly lay aside His statements about creation.

Jesus and Creation

Was Jesus a *creationist or a believer in evolution? For the answer, notice His description of world conditions at the end of this age. "For then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be" (Matt. 24:21, RSV). Mark's Gospel puts it this way: "For in those days there will be such tribulation as has not been from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never will be" (Mark 13:19).

Consider too Jesus' own personal letter to the Laodicean Church in the 90's A.D. Notice how He describes Himself: "And to the angel of the church in Laodicea write: 'The words of the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of God's creation'" (Rev. 3:14). Other New Testament scriptures make it plain that Christ is the originator and source of all God's creation.

Paul described Jesus as "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities—all things were created through him and for him" (Col. 1:15-16).

So if we accept the New Testament record as authoritative, we can come to no other conclusion than that Jesus *literally* believed chapter one, verse one of the book of Genesis, i.e., the simple statement that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." □

*The term "creationist" as used here refers to belief in the literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1.

WHY NOT LOVE YOURSELF?

One of them, a lawyer, spoke up: 'Sir, which is the most important command in the law of Moses?' Jesus replied, 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul and mind.' This is the first and greatest commandment. The second most important is similar: 'Love your neighbor as much as you love yourself' (Matt. 22:36-39, *The Living Bible*).

God loves you.

You are made in His image, destined to become His son, a member of the family of God, God as God is God!

But how does that process take place? First, by a recognition of God's reality and His purpose for the creation of human life. Second, through a deep, godly repentance for all the actions and thoughts you have committed which have separated you from the goal God set for you. After these conditions are met, you receive His Spirit and begin to live and think like God Himself instead of that wretched person you used to be.

Yet it is not God's intention that you should remain forever in a state of remorse and guilt over the things that separated you from Him. Yes, we "die daily." Yes, it is a long, hard struggle, a lifetime job, this repentance and overcoming. But let's face it, it is God's purpose in *your* life for you to become one with Him, as He is, a member of His family.

As with any father, He is loving and merciful toward you. He likes you. He sees potential in you beyond your imagination. He's "proud" of you. The only thing He *dislikes* about you are those things that thwart His purpose in your life: He labels those things "sin"—and He hates the sin, but He loves *you*!

Now, if God loves you—how can you hate yourself? You are familiar, I am sure, with the scripture which tells us that if we say we love God and we still hate our neighbor we are liars and the love of God is not really in us (1 John 4:20). But, if your neighbor is a dirty, stinking, rotten, obnoxious, sinning, hateful, rebel against God and His way—how can you possibly love him (or her)? Answer: the same way God loves that individual. Remember, He came to save the *sinner*, not the (self) righteous.

Now, if you can have godly compassion on other sinners, if you can, with love, cover a multitude of sins (as Christ has done for you), if you can "love your neighbor"—why can't you love yourself? If it is true that you can't love God truly unless you also love your fellowman, then it is just as factual that you cannot truly "love your neighbor" (your fellowman) until you have come to love *yourself*! Does not the law say: "Love your neighbor as much as you love yourself"?

If you still hate yourself—perhaps because you are still an unrepentant sinner—then you cannot "love your neighbor." Think about it! How many giant guilt complexes have been passed on in the name of God and religion? How many conscience-torn people have gone to their graves totally dissatisfied with themselves? Doubting, fearful, hopeless?

I am not saying, "Love yourself, sin and all"—but just what Jesus said: "Love yourself." There's a gigantic difference! But how does true love begin—whether of God, your neighbor or yourself? With respect!

We are *commanded* to love God and neighbor and self! Yet love is the most difficult thing to legislate. Love cannot come by the "letter of the law," because that only brings death. True love must come from the wellspring of the innermost you—and it must come by the gift of God's Spirit, or it will not be genuine. It is something you were not born with, but must acquire. It is a gift from God!

Repeated more than once in God's Word is the statement: "Wisdom begins with the *fear* of the Lord." That is an unfortunate translation, because God's Word also tells us that "perfect love casts out fear." It would be better put: "Wisdom begins with the deep *respect and awe* of the Lord." We learn to respect and be awed by God because of His creation, His love, mercy, forgiveness, and His infinite purpose in our own lives: None of those attributes is to be *feared*! It is impossible to truly love any being, divine or human, without respect.

It's easy to respect, stand in awe of and love God—He's perfect. Human beings, with all their frailties and sins, their evil thoughts and doings, are more difficult to love and respect. Yet God loves human beings, respects and has an awe for the perfect design of His own creation, because He sees beyond the *now*, the sin, the degradation, the Satan-driven world of today—beyond to the perfect creation of a loving son yet in the future to be in His Kingdom. And He requires of us all the same compassion, love, respect, awe—sometimes before we achieve that perfection.

Why can't you respect, love and stand in awe of yourself? David, the man after God's own heart, said: "We are fearfully [perhaps better translated "awesomely"] and wonderfully made"! Each of us has the awesome and wonderful potential of becoming a member in the very family of God! I love that, stand in awe of it, think it's wonderful! How can you *not* love a being like that?

We all too often condemn in others those things we hate in ourselves—and all too often that condemnation leads to hate of self and others. To hate the sin is required, but to hate the individual is unacceptable to God—whether it is another or yourself. Repent of sin: That's good. Then, once forgiven, marvel at, stand in awe of and love the *new you* God has made possible.

God loves you! Why not love yourself?

BEGINNING NEXT ISSUE: A new series of articles by Senior Editor Jon Hill on "David—A Man After God's Own Heart." King David of Israel was certainly one of the most colorful and interesting of Old Testament characters. Be sure to catch each exciting installment of this brand-new series beginning in the May *Plain Truth*!

Q&A

Q u e s t i o n s

a n d

A n s w e r s

Q "Luke 6:35 reads: 'But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again.' Regarding the lending of one's possessions or money to others, I can see where such is practical within a group (family, church, etc.), but I fail to see where arbitrary lending to the world at large would be practical or even accomplish good. In order for me to get along in the present world situation I cannot lend without hope of repayment, or lend to just anyone. I would soon have nothing and nine times out of ten the person I lent to would have profited nothing either—he would have only squandered my possessions and I would have 'cast my pearls before swine.'"

G.T.,
Minden, Ontario, Canada

A Here is the context of Luke 6:35: "But I say to you that hear, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you And as you wish that men would do to you, do so to them if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and the selfish. Be merciful, even as your Father is merciful."

In this particular passage Christ was reacting to the Old Testament *lex talionis* or law of retaliation ("an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"). Here Jesus was saying that a Christian shouldn't have to exact punishment from someone who has

wronged him; that it is indeed far healthier to let yourself be wronged without seeking revenge.

This teaching is not a blanket command to lend to anybody and everybody who "puts the touch" on you; rather it is an admonition to be merciful and charitable and to give unsecured loans to worthy individuals who need temporary help but might not be able to pay the money back in the future. See Jesus' admonition to the Pharisees in Luke 14:12-14.

In order to follow the golden rule ("as you wish that men would do to you, do so to them"), a Christian with money to lend would need to take into account a potential debtor's ability to wisely use a loan—whether it would be a negative or character-destroying experience for the debtor to have the money to use improperly or unwisely. If so, it might be the loving thing to refuse to give the loan in the first place. The person may be more in need of good advice.

This particular passage is not enjoining Christians to indiscriminately give away their money, but rather to distribute whatever extra funds they possess with unselfishness and mercy.

Q "Does the Bible say that people who suffer from epilepsy or fits are possessed by evil spirits? (See Matthew 17:14-18, Mark 9:14-27.) Surely this is not so."

S.K.,
Wexford, Ireland

A The Bible does not equate "demon possession" with any particular disease. Although the symptoms mentioned in the scriptures you cited did have a certain resemblance to a grand mal

epileptic seizure, they were different in one very important respect: the possessed boy often fell into water or fires, since his evil spirit was trying to destroy him. An epileptic patient does not behave in a self-destructive manner.

Epilepsy is a neurological disorder sometimes brought on by brain tumors, lesions, chemical imbalances, or other factors. Many times the disease can be controlled by drugs and the epileptic can lead a totally normal life. Since epilepsy is not fully understood by a great many people, epileptics unfortunately must deal with a lot of misunderstanding and prejudice about their condition.

Q "Luke 12:51-53 reads in part: 'Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division. For from henceforth . . . the father shall be divided against the son.' These verses seem incongruous with so much of today's Christian philosophy, and they seem incompatible with the whole message of love in the Bible. On an individual basis, I feel that one of the main evidences of successful living is a peaceful, loving relationship within the family. If my beliefs were such as to create a breakdown in my family, I would have to seriously question the divine authority of my beliefs and understandings."

G.L.,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

A Christian principles uphold and protect marriage and the family. If every husband and wife were to practice God's law of love toward their mate and children, we would live in an idyllic society free from marital strife and family discord.

But we do not live in such a to-

tally Christian milieu, and human beings are incapable of living totally according to God's laws. So when choosing a mate, we realize that we must find as compatible a partner as possible—one who shares our background, our education, and our basic beliefs. Otherwise conflict is almost inevitable.

Religious compatibility is an extremely important factor in marital success. Even though a husband and wife may not themselves argue about religion, problems with in-laws may be a factor. And the question of which religion to teach the children may also present some difficulty. Although many interfaith marriages have worked out well, a great many others have ended in misery.

When Christ came on the scene, His religion was a new one. And while some households were called to the faith together (Acts 16:30-34), other individuals were called alone. Since true Christianity entails a turning away from false or pagan religion, such households were bound to be divided in their practices and loyalties.

Today some newly converted Christians face the same conflict with their unconverted families and friends. While they are committed to love these individuals, they still must turn away from their former unchristian practices, and this change will probably offend some.

So while a Christian who truly lives by Christ's teachings might in principle make a wonderful spouse, in reality religion can be a barrier to a good relationship with someone who believes differently.

Q "In the December 1977 *Plain Truth* I was surprised to read about trees being 8000 years old. I thought that before 6000 years ago the world was 'without form and void.' So how do you explain 8000-year-old trees?"

George M.,
Daly City, California

A The article you refer to stated that living bristlecone pines are known to be nearly 5000 years old, not 8000. However, the article

did explain that by matching the inner tree rings of a living tree with the outer rings of even older dead stumps or logs, a sequence of over 8000 (presumably annual) rings can be established. If such tree-ring chronologies are accurate, they seem to imply that there was at least some continuity of life over the past 8000 years or so. This in turn would indicate that if the words "without form and void" (Hebrew *tohu* and *bohu*) in Genesis 1:2 refer to a period 6000 years ago, then they cannot mean that life totally ceased at that time. This should not be too surprising, since the expression "*tohu* and *bohu*" need not mean total destruction and the cessation of all life. In Jeremiah 4:23, for example, the land of Palestine is described as "*tohu* and *bohu*." In this passage, Palestine is destroyed and desolate; yet life continues and men are said to flee from the cities into the thickets (verse 29). The bristlecone pine does indeed pose a challenge to certain religious concepts, especially the belief in a 6000-year-old universe. But for those who accept the scientific and biblical evidence for a much older creation, such tree-ring chronologies can be welcomed as a valuable tool to better understand the past.

Q "If only Adam and Eve and their two sons were alive on the face of the earth, why was it necessary for the Lord to set a mark upon Cain? And when was his wife born or created? It would almost appear that there were people living on the earth before God created Adam and Eve."

C.N.,
Basom, New York

A Genesis 5:3-5 reads: "When Adam had lived a hundred and thirty years, he became the father of . . . Seth. The days of Adam after he became the father of Seth were eight hundred years; and he had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years. . . ." Adam and Eve conceived Seth after Cain killed Abel, so between the time Adam and Eve were created and the

time of that murder approximately a century had elapsed. This provided plenty of time for several generations of human beings to spring up from the "other sons and daughters" that Eve bore during this period. The Genesis account names only Adam's dominant children—those who had a profound effect on history.

It is obvious that Cain married one of his sisters. There simply weren't any unrelated females for him to marry. Adam was the first man (1 Cor. 15:45), and Eve was the mother of all human beings except for Adam (Gen. 3:20).

Perhaps because of modern laws concerning marriage to near blood relatives, many have not seen this obvious solution. But it was not wrong for brothers and sisters to marry at that early time in human history. Abraham married his half sister Sarah (Gen. 20:12), and his brother Nahor married his brother Haran's daughter (Gen. 11:27, 29). However, by the time of Moses, marriage between close relatives was prohibited (Lev. 18). (Such marriages should not take place today. They greatly increase the danger of passing on inherited diseases or birth defects to any children that are conceived.)

So there were many people on the earth when Cain slew Abel, but they were all descendants of Adam and Eve. For more on this and related questions, send for a free copy of our booklet *Answers from Genesis*.

Q "Would it be possible to print the times of the holy days this spring?"

L.W.,
Friendship, New York

A This year the Passover is on April 21, the Days of Unleavened Bread run from April 22-28, and Pentecost is on June 11. Festival dates for several years in advance and other vital information on these annual occasions is available in the free booklet *Pagan Holidays—or God's Holy Days—Which?* Request yours by writing to the address nearest you (see inside front cover). □

THE GARNER TED ARMSTRONG TELECAST

U.S. STATIONS

Eastern Time

ALBANY — Channel 10, WTEN-TV, 8:00 a.m. Sun.
ATLANTA — Channel 17, WTCG-TV, 7:30 a.m. Sun.
BALTIMORE — Channel 45, WBFF-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
CHARLESTON — Channel 2, WCBD-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
CHARLOTTE — Channel 36 WRET-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
CHEBOYGAN — Channel 4, WTOM-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
CINCINNATI — Channel 5, WLWT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
CLEVELAND/LORRAINE — Channel 43, WUAB-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBIA — Channel 19, WNOK-TV, 8:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBUS — Channel 38, WYEA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
DAYTON — Channel 7, WHIO-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
ELMIRA — Channel 36, WENY-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
ERIE — Channel 35, WSEE-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
FLINT — Channel 12, WJRT-TV, 8:00 a.m. Sun.
GREENVILLE, N.C. — Channel 9, WNCT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
GREENVILLE, S.C. — Channel 4, WFBC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
HARRISBURG — Channel 21, WHP-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
HUNTINGTON, W.V. — Channel 13, WOWK-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
INDIANAPOLIS — Channel 4, WTTV-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat.
JOHNSON CITY — Channel 11, WJHL-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
LOUISVILLE — Channel 11, WHAS-TV, 8:30 a.m. Sun.
NEW YORK — Channel 9, WOR-TV, check local listing
PHILADELPHIA — Channel 17, WPHL-TV, 11:00 p.m. Sun.
PORTLAND — Channel 8, WMTW-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
PORTSMOUTH — Channel 10, WAVY-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.

PRESQUE ISLE — Channel 8, WAGM-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
PROVIDENCE — Channel 12, WPRI-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
SALISBURY — Channel 16, WBOC-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***SOMERSET** — Channel 8, COMEX-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
SOUTH BEND — Channel 22, WSBT-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
TAMPA — Channel 10, WLCY-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
TRAVERSE CITY — Channel 7, WPBN-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
***WILMINGTON** — Channel 6, WECT-TV, 12:00 a.m. Sun.

Central Time

ABILENE — Channel 12, KTXS-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
***AMARILLO** — Channel 10, KFDA-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
BATON ROUGE — Channel 33, WRBT-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
BEAUMONT — Channel 12, KBMT-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
BIRMINGHAM — Channel 6, WBRC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
BISMARCK — Channel 5, KFYZ-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
CHICAGO — Channel 44, WSNS-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun.
COLUMBIA — Channel 17, KCBJ-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBUS — Channel 4, WCBI-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
CORPUS CHRISTI — Channel 3, KIII-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
EL DORADO — Channel 10, KTVE-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
FT. WORTH — Channel 11, KTVT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.
GREEN BAY — Channel 2, WBAY-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
GREENWOOD — Channel 6, WABG-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
HOUSTON — Channel 39, KHTV-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sat.
HUNTSVILLE — Channel 48, WYUR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
KANSAS CITY — Channel 4, WDAF-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
LUBBOCK — Channel 11, KCBD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat.
MERIDIAN — Channel 11, WTOK-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
MINNEAPOLIS — Channel 4, WCCO-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
MINOT — Channel 10, KMOT-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
NEW ORLEANS — Channel 4, WWL-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
OMAHA — Channel 6, WOWT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
PEORIA — Channel 19, WRAU-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
RAPID CITY — Channel 7, KEVN-TV, 10 a.m. Sun.
SELMA — Channel 8, WSLA-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SHREVEPORT — Channel 6, KTAL-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SIoux CITY — Channel 14, KMEG-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.

SPRINGFIELD, IL. — Channel 20, WICS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
TOPEKA — Channel 27, KTSB-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
WICHITA — Channel 3, KARD-TV, 4:30 p.m. Sun.
***WICHITA FALLS** — Channel 6, KAUZ-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
WILLISTON — Channel 8, KUMV-TV, 12 noon Sat.

Mountain Time

BOISE — Channel 6, KIVI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
CLOVIS — Channel 12, KFDW-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
FARMINGTON — Channel 12, KIVA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
POCATELLO — Channel 6, KPVI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
ROSWELL — Channel 10, KBIM-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SALT LAKE CITY — Channel 5, KSL-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
TUCSON — Channel 9, KGUN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

Pacific Time

ANCHORAGE — Channel 13, KIMO-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
FAIRBANKS — Channel 11, KTVF-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***HAYWARD** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sat. & Sun.
LOS ANGELES — Channel 9, KHJ-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun.
***OAKLAND** — Channel M, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
PORTLAND — Channel 12, KPTV-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sat.
SAN FRANCISCO (Oakland) — Channel 2, KTVU-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat.
***SAN FRANCISCO** — Channel 21, ASAD-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sat. & Sun.
***SAN LEANDRO** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
***SAN LORENZO** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
STOCKTON — Channel 13, KOVR-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***TACOMA** — Channel 10, CTEN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun., 3:30 p.m. Mon. & 7:00 p.m. Sat.

CANADIAN STATIONS

Newfoundland Time


SAINT JOHN'S — Channel 6, CJON-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

Atlantic Time

HALIFAX — Channel 5, CJCH-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.
MONCTON, N.B. — Channel 2, CKCW-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.
SYDNEY — Channel 4, CJCB-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.

Garner Ted Armstrong makes the news make sense.

These are only a few of the stations that carry the *Garner Ted Armstrong* program. But you won't want to miss out on his fascinating commentary—so send for your free copy of the up-to-date radio and television log. Just write to the address nearest you (see inside front cover).



Eastern Time

BARRIE — Channel 3, CKVR-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
KINGSTON — Channel 11, CKWS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
MONTREAL — Channel 12, CFCE-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
NORTH BAY — Channel 4, CHNB-TV, 1 p.m. Sun.
OTTAWA — Channel 6, CHRO-TV, 1:00 p.m. 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.
SASKATOON — Channel 8, CFQC-TV, 12 noon Sun.
***SWIFT CURRENT** — Channel 5, CJFB-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
WINNIPEG — Channel 7, CKY-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 3, CKOS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 8, CKSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 7, CFSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 6, CHSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.

Mountain Time

CALGARY — Channel 4, CFCN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

EDMONTON — Channel 3, CFRN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
LLOYDMINSTER — Channel 2, CKSA-TV, 9:30 a.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 — Channels 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, WHTV-TV, 7:00 p.m. Sun.

Please check your local listing for possible time or day changes.
 * denotes new stations or changes.



Garner Ted Armstrong

**SPEAKS
OUT!**

On the Road to Ruin?

We've come a long way since the early days of the Republic, when the federal budget amounted to a few "paltry" tens of millions of dollars. It took a full 173 years—from the founding of the United States in 1789 until 1962—for America's national budget to hit the staggering \$100 billion mark. It took only nine more years, until 1971, to reach \$200 billion. Four years later we surpassed \$300 billion, and two years after that, \$400 billion. Now, President Carter has proposed a \$500 billion budget for fiscal 1979, which begins October 1, 1978—an increase of \$38 billion from the previous year.

It's hard for the average person to grasp just how much a half-trillion is. Here's one way: If you put that amount in a line of dollar bills laid end to end, it would reach to the moon and back 250 times! Stacked up, 500 billion silver dollars would reach as high as 2,830,500 Empire State Buildings. Looking at it another way: If you had started at the birth of Christ to spend \$700,000 a day, 365 days a year, you would just now, in 1978, finally be getting rid of \$500 billion.

Now we are going to be spending that much in a single year! And by fiscal year 1986—just eight years away—we will probably be spending double that amount: a full trillion dollars! The prospect is mind-boggling!

Moreover, the government expects to take in by taxation only \$440 billion (if one can use "only" to describe such a sum), assuming President Carter's proposed \$25 billion tax cut to stimulate the economy is enacted this fall. This would leave a budget deficit of slightly over \$60 billion to be covered by increased government borrowing—and that on top of a roughly equal red-ink total for fiscal 1978. We will thus be racking up the biggest two-year deficit in the history of the nation.

This gives us yet another way of putting the new budget into perspective. In the coming fiscal year, the federal deficit alone—\$60 billion—will be nearly 12 times greater than the entire federal budget during Herbert Hoover's last year as president! In that year, the federal budget totaled less than \$5 billion, a mere one-hundredth of today's figure.

Continued deficit spending has resulted in a steadily growing national debt now standing at some three-quarters of a trillion dollars—almost \$3300 for every man, woman, and child in the nation. Moreover, the interest which must be paid on this debt—just as private individuals have to pay interest on loans from banks—amounts to over \$50 billion annually. Thus, the interest burden on our national debt will constitute a

full ten percent of the 1979 fiscal budget!

What are the reasons for the soaring growth in government spending? Why is it that Washington—like many individual Americans—just can't seem to hold down expenditures and bring its spending into line with its income?

Inflation, of course, is partly responsible for the record leaps in federal outlays in recent years. But then again, inflation is largely caused by the borrowing and money supply increases necessitated by government overspending. It's a vicious circle from which Washington just can't seem to break loose. It is part of the famous "inflationary spiral."

But inflation is by no means the only culprit, as we can see by measuring federal spending as a percentage of the gross national product (GNP), the dollar value of the country's total output of goods and services. Going back again to the presidency of Herbert Hoover, the federal government was taking only 2.5 percent of the GNP when he assumed office in 1929. Today, Washington's share of the GNP is a walloping 22 percent!

Aside from inflation, the single most significant factor in the soaring government budget is the alarming jump in recent years in outlays for social services—health, education, welfare, and various

other social programs. Spending in these areas has greatly outpaced that in other sectors, including national defense.

If the proposed comprehensive national health insurance program is enacted in coming years, the problem will be further compounded. Proposed federally funded "full employment" programs along with a suggested major urban renewal program would also add to the increasing burden of social spending.

In the minds of many Americans, the record half-trillion-dollar budget for 1979 is difficult to reconcile with President Carter's campaign pledge to put "highest priority" on fiscal austerity and to balance the budget by 1981. Ironically, however, the new half-trillion-dollar budget is actually considered to be "conservative" and "restrained." It is only 8.2 percent higher than fiscal 1978's \$462 billion budget. Considering inflation, the planned increase for 1979 is a mere two percent in real terms.

Carter has described his budget as "lean and tight"—and, in fact, there are no major new spending programs included in it, a fact sure to disappoint many of the liberals and minority groups who were instrumental in electing him. One na-

tional newsmagazine even asked in a headline, "Is \$500 Billion Enough?"

Why, then, another record budget?

President Carter—or any president for that matter—actually has personal discretion over only a small portion of the national budget. He is virtually locked into spending increases over which he has little or no control. These so-called "uncontrollable" items in the budget—social security benefit payments, medicare and medicaid, interest on the national debt, federal pensions, and so on—today account for well over three-quarters of the entire budget. The budget, in effect, largely grows by itself, and neither the President nor Congress appears able or willing to arrest its growth.

Each year, for example, there are more people reaching retirement age and qualifying for social security or federal pensions, which are automatically tied to increases in the cost of living. Also, the number of people eligible for food stamps, medicaid, housing subsidies and other assistance is growing each year.

American government spending is literally out of control, and, ironically, there seems to be little that

can be done about it. It is as though Washington has created a Frankenstein monster which continues to devour multiple billions of additional dollars each year—automatically!

The only way the budget will become balanced by 1981 is by short-circuiting the monster: introducing no major new spending programs, permitting some current ones to increase only nominally, and cutting out numerous programs altogether.

But politically such "surgery" can be costly. Congressmen dislike taking away federal dollars from constituents—especially in election years. Belt tightening is simply not good politics.

So where is all this leading?


If the government continues to incur large and persistent deficits to finance spending, inflation will continue unabated. This would clearly involve risks—risks of eventual runaway inflation, recession, or worse. It would also put America in a worse trade position in the world, with international confidence in the dollar continuing to sink.

Bringing the budget—and inflation—under control, on the other hand, would also involve some painful readjustments in the economy, though they might possibly be less devastating in the long run.

The United States has been on a spending binge for years. By perpetuating inflation through persistent overspending, it has succeeded only in postponing the day of reckoning.

But the piper will have to be paid! Just like a person who embarks on an extended credit card binge, the U.S. will one day have to come face to face with the consequences of its spendthrift ways. Economic disaster scenarios such as those outlined in two recent national best-selling novels, *The Crash of '79* and *On the Brink*, seem increasingly plausible.

Will the American people and their leaders be willing to make the sacrifices necessary to prevent total economic catastrophe? The next few years will tell. □



Chicago Tribune—New York News Syndicate

Personal from...

(Continued from page 1)

supernaturally puts within you His Holy Spirit. This impregnates you with His life—begets you as His child, actually yet unborn. Actually, what many professing Christians call “being born again” should be termed “being begotten.”

Technically, to be “born of God” means to be changed in composition from flesh and blood matter to spirit—no longer mortal, no longer human. But it does put within you a NEW NATURE. “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new” (II Cor. 5:17). You are, as Scripture says, given “exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be *partakers of the divine nature*” (II Peter 1:4).

This, then, becomes your very life!

You can only succeed if your goal is kept constantly—continually—before your eyes. When you drive a car, if you take your eyes and attention off what is in front of you (and sometimes coming from the side or behind) even for two or three seconds, you may find yourself “coming to” in a hospital, dying, and saying, “It all happened so suddenly!” Driving carefully means being alert—being diligent every second—keeping your eye and your mind and attention on the matter of driving—not on conversation or other things.

In the same manner, if you let other interests, material pursuits, steal first place in your mind and heart, even for a few days, you are inviting a spiritual smashup that will let you wake up being plunged into the lake of fire, which will mean eternal death.

That’s why God doesn’t want you to have these other gods before Him. For your own sake—in your own interest—you must keep Him enthroned and enshrined constantly ABOVE ALL. You must study His Word in order to be instructed by Him.

Instructed in what? Instructed in true knowledge—knowledge of God’s purpose for you, knowledge

of and about God, and knowledge of how to live. Jesus Christ said you must actually live by the words of the Bible. It is your GUIDE TO LIVING—your INSTRUCTION BOOK the Maker sent along to instruct you how to operate this mechanism that is you.

More, you must study His Word—your Bible—to find what you now believe that is wrong, and what you are now doing that is wrong and to be corrected and reproved by it.

True spiritual mindedness is not sticky sentimentalism. It is not the use of a certain religious phraseology, saying constantly, “Praise the Lord,” or, “Glory, hallelujah!” I have known many people whose talk is so very “spiritual”—but whose hearts were as far from God as the prophet Isaiah described.

You must study it to let it instruct you in the ways of God’s righteousness—His way of life. And then you must devote yourself to living it!

Still, without regular and constant prayer, you cannot maintain contact with God. And when that contact is broken, you are cut off from Him—and His spiritual life, love, and very nature cease flowing into you. For, understand, these divine attributes of His Spirit do flow! They are in motion. They do not stagnate. You either grow spiritually—in knowledge, in grace, in God’s character—or you deteriorate back toward becoming a mere physical animal, to die in eternal punishment in the lake of fire!

But if God, and the things of God—His revealed knowledge, His law, His love, His way for you to

live—are constantly foremost in your mind, your thoughts, your interest, then you are PRAYING ALWAYS—that is, in a constant spirit of prayer, a constant mental attitude of prayer. The contact with God must be perpetual!

This kind of Christian life—the only kind that truly is Christian—requires, as the Bible emphasizes repeatedly, zealous DILIGENCE. You must concentrate on it. You must be dedicated to it. It requires utter consecration. It requires total earnestness.

Yes, it requires the application of the other six laws of success—education, in which the Bible is the main textbook; good physical health; drive, or concentrated diligence and effort; resourcefulness; perseverance—endurance; and continual contact with, and the guidance, help, and power of God.

True spiritual mindedness is not sticky sentimentalism. It is not a certain emotional mood. It is not the use of a certain religious phraseology, saying constantly, “Praise the Lord,” or, “Glory, hallelujah!” I have known many people whose talk is so very “spiritual”—but whose hearts were as far from God as the prophet Isaiah described (see Isaiah 29:13).

Jesus Christ was a perfectly spiritual man, but He did not go about using such mushy language. He was not an effeminate, sentimental or emotional weakling. He was a strong, virile, masterful, yet kind and gentle man. He possessed leadership, strength, purpose, supreme strong will—and yet these masculine qualities of strength and power were perfectly blended with wisdom, judgment, knowledge, understanding, justice, and also patience, compassion and mercy. He was filled with peace, love, faith. And His will, strong as it was, was totally yielded and obedient to God. All this was the character of God.

He is our pattern. We must imitate Him—copy Him.

Look at the men of God in the Old Testament—Abraham, Noah, Joseph, David, Daniel, Elijah. They were all different from Christ in one respect—in which you and I are also different: They had human weaknesses, and all did sin. Yet these

men all repented and strove to overcome. But they were all men of strong purpose, strong will guided by God; all possessed leadership, but also love and faith and a consecrated obedience to the will of God. But they were not effeminate, sentimental men indulging in an affected, put-on, religious-sounding way of talking.

Look at the apostles Peter and Paul. They were the same. You don't find any of this pseudospirituality in them—yet they were truly spiritual men, devoted to obeying God and serving the needs of the people.

But one thing to watch and guard against every second is an attitude of resentment, bitterness, hatred. Don't let anything, no matter how unjust, make you sour and bitter. That is the deadliest mental and spiritual poison. We must love even our enemies who perpetrate the greatest outrages—though we do not condone their evils.

Remember what a glorious goal we have before us!

How grateful we ought to be! How our hearts ought to be flooded with love and gratitude to the Great God for His matchless love toward us. I'm sure we don't grasp what a supreme price He paid to make it possible. He wants us to be changed—to overcome and root out this debasing, rotten carnality—and to grow into His righteousness, that we may share His glory.

And, you know, I believe God wants and longs to share the supreme glory that He has with you! Make it your supreme overall life vocation, and work hard at it!

The Japanese spy who stealthily and secretly obtained all the information the Japanese needed to bomb Pearl Harbor said that he was not a very brilliant man, and learning came hard to him, but he worked hard, relentlessly, with zeal, and with purpose, and with diligence. He succeeded—with terrible destruction—in plunging the United States into World War II—and, finally, in the eventual defeat of his own nation.

Let us work hard at our calling and mission of being real Christians. We shall succeed, with God's help—in final and eternal glory! □

IS MAN ALONE?

(Continued from page 6)

about. We live in a very fortunate generation. Not only have we entered an era in astronomy when physical knowledge of the universe is expanding beyond our comprehension, but revealed knowledge about the true origins of man, the earth and the universe is increasingly becoming available to an ever growing number of people.

You are a spark of life in the universe. Your potential is truly awesome! You are a potential dynamo! But the physical universe of itself will not reveal the source of that great power to you. It has *already* been revealed by a Super Intelligence somewhere in the confines of outer space.

You see, there are intelligent creatures that occupy a different dimension in the cosmos. And these beings from outer space have visited this earth and have even left certain documents and records to prove it.

Popular writer Erich von Daniken

has written that the earth has had extraterrestrial visitors and that they have left definite indications of their visits, if only men would take the trouble to look at the evidence. But the records and documents I'm writing about do not have to be found in unexplored ruins deep in the jungles of Guatemala or Honduras. They do not have to be sought for in remote caves hidden in the Libyan desert.

More than likely you have a personal collection of these records and documents right there in your own living room. I think you know what particular Book I'm talking about.

Man's ultimate destiny lies in whether or not he gets into contact with the great Superior Being residing somewhere in outer space. If any person ever *really* makes that contact, it can change his whole life's direction.


If you wish to discover what this human life is all about, why there is a universe, and if spaceship Earth is a possible platform for future exploration into space, then write for our free article entitled "When a Man from Space Visited Earth." □



Why Were You Born?


To live, die, and ultimately go to heaven, hell, or someplace in between? Or to fulfill the most exciting, mind-boggling destiny imaginable? To find out, write for the free booklets *Why Were You Born?* and *Our Awesome Universe*.

See the inside front cover for the address of our office nearest you.




Why go to College?

Ask *“College gives me the chance to discover and develop the abilities I have. Through my classes I get opportunities to come up with my own ideas, put together a plan, and do the work it takes to see a project completed.”*
John
McCarthy



John McCarthy is an Ambassador College student who comes from Cape Province, South Africa. Following his graduation, John plans to study law before going on to a career in the diplomatic service of his home country. "I came to Ambassador College because I wanted to learn more about how to work with



people, about life itself and what I can contribute to it."

Ambassador College offers its students more than just career training. It equips them with a knowledge of the principles that produce the real winners in life. John McCarthy is determined to win—that's why he chose Ambassador College. For information about

admissions, call toll-free (800) 423-4444 [except in California, Alaska and Hawaii, call (213) 577-5000], or write: Ambassador College Admissions Office, 300 W. Green St., Pasadena, Ca. 91123.

**Ambassador
College**

Salvation?

(Continued from page 3)

"immortality" can be found only five times in all the Bible. In Romans 2:7 you will read it is something for us to seek. Of course! It is the gift of God, who has it to give! You don't need to seek for something you already have! In I Corinthians 15:53, and again in verse 54, immortality is something the saved shall put on at the time of the resurrection. In I Timothy 6:16 it speaks of the resurrected and glorified Christ, who only, of all who have been born human, has immortality. And finally, in II Timothy 1:10, immortality is something Jesus Christ brought to light—made possible for us to receive—through the gospel.

So the Bible teaches that the soul is not immortal, but is mortal, subject to death as the penalty of sin!

All have sinned. That includes you. The penalty is death! You do not possess eternal life from natural birth. Christ said: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John 3:6). So you are only mortal, material flesh. You are "of the earth, earthy" (I Cor. 15:47). The life you were born with is merely temporary chemical existence! You live by breathing air in and out of your lungs—the breath of life.

You are only one breath away from death—the cessation of the existence we call "life." If you don't draw that next breath, you can't keep alive or conscious ten more minutes. There is no immortal soul that will keep you alive and conscious. You are a soul (Gen. 2:7) that has sinned, and so shall die, unless saved from death by Christ's grace.

If your heart does not make that next beat, there is nothing in you to keep you alive ten minutes. You exist by breathing of air and circulation of blood—and are fed by food and water. You have only temporary chemical existence. You are like a clock wound up, and running down. You don't know at what second it will stop!

You can't give yourself any life beyond this dwindling chemical

existence. There is no eternal life inherent in you. Nothing you can do will produce it, supply it, or earn it. You can't get it by your own works!

What your own works have done is earn for you the penalty of death. And it is eternal death—eternal punishment!

It is not "eternal punishing" in life but eternal punishment in death (Matt. 25:46). Notice, Jesus said the punishment, death, is to last forever—"everlasting punishment." Again, in II Thessalonians 1:9, speaking of those who reject God's salvation, they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction." The punishment is not *life* in torture but *destruction* to be final, total, forever.

God—and only God—has immortality! Instead of assuming carelessly the pagan teaching of the "immortality of the soul," turn again to I Timothy 6:16 and read it with your own eyes in your own Bible! The risen Christ, and He only of all who were born human, has immortality. God has immortality—life inherent—in Himself (John 5:26). He has given to the Son, Jesus Christ, also to have life in Himself. And only God can impart eternal life to you! It comes through Christ.

But how are you going to go to God? Your past sins not only have condemned you to the penalty of death, they also have put a total barrier between you and God. They have cut you off from all access to God!

Read it! See it in your own Bible: "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear: but your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear" (Isa. 59:1-2).

How Should You Seek God?

So how, when this barrier stands between you and God, are you going to go to Him to obtain eternal life?

Again Isaiah answers: "Seek ye the Eternal while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts.

... For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Eternal" (Isa. 55:6-8).

So now you seek God that you may obtain eternal life from Him. You repent! You forsake your way of life, and turn to God's way—or at least you think you do. But something is still lacking! You still are cut off! The barrier is still there! Do you know why?

At this point we need to stop and find out what is meant by that word "sin."

Haven't you honestly been a bit confused by this religious terminology? You hear people talk about "sin," "getting saved," "under law," "under grace," "justification," "sanctified," "heaven," "hell," "predestination," and dozens of other terms. Haven't they been pretty vague to you—rather meaningless? Do you know that most religious people who use all these terms usually don't know any more than you do what they really mean?

What Do You Mean—Sin?

We started by quoting the scripture "All have sinned." We said that included you!

But what is sin? Why, when men preach, don't you hear that explained, defined, made clear and understandable? Why are these religious terms used most of the time loosely, vaguely, meaninglessly?

Once, in Springfield, Oregon, a young man with a Bible in his hand accosted me on the street. An evangelist had come to town and pitched a tent. He brought with him a "gospel team" including some eight young men of college age, who roamed the streets carrying Bibles, stopping people and inviting them to attend the services. One stopped me.

"Well now," I said, "does your evangelist teach that Christ saves us from sin?" He assured me he did.

"Well, what I want to know," I persisted, "is what I have to quit doing or what I have done that you call 'sin.' Just what is 'sin'?"

"Well," he answered, "Christ died for our sins."

"But that doesn't tell me exactly

what I've done that Christ had to die for," I insisted. "What is 'sin'?"

"Christ died for our sins," came the reply.

"Yes, I know—you said that before. But what is this thing, 'sin,' that He died for? What do I have to quit doing? Can you open that Bible you have and show me the Bible definition of the word 'sin'? Is there a place in the Bible where it gives a plain definition—where it says 'sin is'—and then in plain words tells what it is?"

He called to a second of the young men—then a third, and a fourth. Finally, with a large crowd gathering, they called the evangelist himself. But even he could not—or would not—turn to the Bible answer! One by one, the evangelist and his team all slunk away!

Then I took a Bible out of my briefcase, turned to I John 3:4, and read to the crowd: "Sin is the transgression of the law."

But what law? This is explained in Romans 7. So next I read: "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law"—or, in the plain-er English of the Moffatt translation: "Why, had it not been for the Law, I would never have known what sin meant!" In other words, the law defines sin. Sin is breaking the law. But what law? Continuing, same verse: "... for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet."

There we are told plainly what law it is sin to transgress. It is the law that says: "Thou shalt not covet." And that is a direct quote from Exodus 20:17, where the Ten Commandments are being given. That law is the Ten Commandments. It is sin to break any of the Ten Commandments.

In verses 12 and 14 of this same seventh chapter of Romans you will read that the law is holy, just and good, and that it is a spiritual law—a law of spiritual principles of living!

Of course, the whole spiritual law may be summed up in the word "love." This may be divided into the two great commandments: love toward God, and love toward neighbor. The first four of the Ten Com-

mandments tell us how to love God; the last six, how to love neighbor. The whole Bible elaborates, showing the principles involved, until it includes the entire right way of life!

Now notice Romans 3:20. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

Of course! A deceived popular teaching to the contrary notwithstanding, that is precisely what we teach. Keeping the law by one's own efforts will not justify anyone. We have all sinned. We cannot justify this guilt we have incurred, we cannot avoid the wages we have earned—death—by obedience, goodness, works, or anything we can do.

God's Spiritual Mirror

Let's make that very plain! Most women carry a mirror in their purses. A woman takes out her mirror, steals a glance at her face, discovers dirt on it. Does she try to wash off the dirt with the mirror? Ridiculous? Yes, of course. Looking into the mirror won't cleanse the dirt already there. Why? Because by the mirror comes the knowledge that the dirt is there! Now God's law is His spiritual mirror. Your Bible says so—plainly (James 1:22-25). You look into God's law. It shows you the spiritual dirt on your heart. To hear God's Word, which corrects, reproves and rebukes (II Tim. 3:16), and then do nothing about the spiritual dirt it reveals, is like a man beholding his face in a mirror, seeing the dirt, gaining knowledge of it, then forgetting how dirty he is—doing nothing about it.

God's law is His spiritual mirror. But keeping yourself from becoming more dirty today does not wash off the dirt already there. By being careful to incur no penalty today, you do not erase the penalty incurred yesterday and all the days previously. So, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Why? Because "by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20). Of course!

Sin is "the transgression of the law." Paul would not have known it was sin to lust, except the law had

said, "Thou shalt not covet." The function of the law is to tell us what sin is—not to cleanse us of yesterday's sin or erase the penalty of last year's sin.

There can never be a law, unless there is a penalty for its violation. And, "where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. 4:15), and there could be no penalty—no punishment. If the wages—the punishment—of sin is death, and death is the penalty, then there is a law. And if there is no law being broken, there is no transgression and no penalty—and then we need no Savior—no salvation from the punishment.

Now where did the law come from? Again through James, God says, "There is one lawgiver" (James 4:12). That is God. God set in motion many laws—laws of physics and chemistry among them. The great law of love is a spiritual law. It is the way of peace, of happiness—of right relationship with God and with human neighbor. It is inexorable—a living law as much fixed and in motion as laws of gravity and inertia.

This spiritual law was set in motion by a loving God to provide the way to every desired good: peace, happiness, prosperity, security, abundant life. To break it is to turn in the opposite direction from peace, happiness, security, abundance, and toward strife, fear, worry, unhappiness, suffering, death. The final wages you earn traveling that way is death! For eternity! Eternal punishment!

Yes, the wages of sin is death. But we have hope! The gift of God is eternal life.

So now, where are we? Eternal life can be had only from God. So, as stated above, you seek God. But you find a tremendous, impenetrable barrier: the sins you have committed. Until they are justified you have no access to God.

My next article on this subject will tell you exactly how justification occurs—what God has done on your behalf, and just what your part is in claiming the promise of salvation. □

(To Be Continued)

orchids

L E T T E R S

& onions

Underground Readership

In January I wrote asking for a subscription to your magazine. To date I have received only the May and June issues. Nevertheless, the two copies that I did receive have really made the rounds, being read by U.S. citizens who are residents of Cuba, and Cuban nationals who are fluent in English. For obvious reasons I must show care to whom I loan the magazines. However, if and when I receive additional copies, you can be well assured that they will reach at least fifty readers before they fall apart, as the last ones have from overuse.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could put more issues in the mail. Please remember that it is not advisable to send printed material in Spanish, but only in English. Written material in English has a much better chance of slipping by Cuban postal inspectors who have orders to ban any material dealing with God.

Name Withheld,
Havana, Cuba

Taking Sides?

I am puzzled after reading some of your world affairs articles in *The Plain Truth*. It appears as though you are taking sides with the forces of democracy against communism. I fail to see why you would take sides with any government established by man and inspired by Satan—and all existing governments fall into this category. In South Africa you clearly take issue with the Communist-inspired forces which are trying to work out their own selfish goals. I agree with you in this. Yet you openly support a government which is based solely on racism. It is obvious that South Africa and Rhodesia are not practicing the second of two great commandments, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." God tells us to lift up our voices, cry aloud and tell His people their sins. Your writings seem to indicate that the only sin that has been committed is allowing

communism to exist. Why don't you tell *everyone* to repent and explain what will happen to them if they don't?

James E. Stewart,
Durham, North Carolina

Grateful Prisoner

As a prisoner, I would like to express my deepest thanks regarding the spiritual and physical love and encouragement I've experienced from the many sincere people of the Worldwide Church of God here in Maryland. Since becoming aware of your work, my whole life has changed completely. [My minister] visits me quite often at my present place of confinement. In addition, I'm further blessed with visits from the members of the Church here, along with receiving many letters of encouragement. I owe so much to these beautiful people. Sometimes the thought of receiving so many letters of inspiration and knowing that so many are concerned about me—a prisoner—truly brings tears of joy to my eyes. A burning desire is now in me to somehow reach the world with my appreciation and share this love and concern.

U. W.,
Jessup, Maryland

Causes of Depression

Though your article on depression ("Escaping the Gray Menace," January *Plain Truth*) is very excellent, it might lead one to believe that any and all cases of depression have psychological origins due to one's environment. I am sure *The Plain Truth* staff is well aware of depressions that are internally generated by biochemical abnormalities, such as hypothyroiditis, Addison's disease, hypoglycemia, Cushing's disease, etc. I realize that yours is not the type of magazine dedicated to publishing technical medical articles, but I believe it should be mentioned that if a person finds himself in a depression which does not go away in any reasonable length of time, despite efforts to change his lifestyle or reorient his thinking, he would

do well to seek proper medical help and find out just what the problem really is. Such states if not corrected can lead to serious consequences such as suicide. And depressions associated with endocrine disorders can lead to serious physical as well as mental problems.

Anyone suffering from severe depression would do well to seek professional help, especially if there is no obvious triggering factor. Some symptoms indicating depression include changes in sleep patterns (particularly early morning awakening), withdrawal and loss of contact with the environment, delusions, memory loss, or a total loss of the ability to make decisions. Because there is effective medical treatment for depression, it is important that one who is experiencing these symptoms seek proper medical help before lapsing into a state in which he becomes totally incapacitated and finally ends up the victim of suicide. This subject is very close to home with me because I have battled the severe depressions associated with Addison's disease, and I know whereof I speak.


Joyce Rojas,
Daytona Beach, Florida

In God's Image

I would like to congratulate you on the excellent article "In the Image of God" (December 1977 *Plain Truth*). Your revelations have knocked the wind out of some people's (and nations') beliefs—that the Bible gives them the right to mistreat their fellowman just because he is of a different ethnic background or economic and social status. I am a nonwhite, and after reading your message—supported by the words of the true God—I can afford to walk confidently and be proud that I am made in the image of God. I belong only to the human race, and I am free to seek God's will and find it no matter whatever status I have in this short life. This world needs your message. Please keep it up.

inyambo L. Nyumbu,
Fort Collins, Colorado

Would You Believe That...



741203-0303-5 31 P048

ROBERT S KUHNE
2845 WALTERS AVE
NORTHBROOK IL 60062

H. Armstrong Roberts

"To a lot of adults, children are not really 'people.'"


"Parents are really not conscious or aware of their actions when they don't treat their children with respect."

"Children will tend to treat parents as parents have treated them."

"The course of our entire civilization may be determined by the quality of time we spend with our children."

All the above are true. Want to know why? Like to read about "fighting fair" in marriage? Closing the generation gap? How to draw your family closer together? If you do, the free booklet *Building a Happy Family* (from which the above quotes are taken) discusses all these

questions and more. For your copy, use the envelope inside this magazine or send the coupon below to our office nearest you. (See inside front cover for addresses.)



LITERATURE REQUEST/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please check:

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

Print new address below

Name _____

Address _____

City / State _____

Clip and mail with address label at right to:

The Plain Truth
Pasadena, CA
91123

Zip _____