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Tough Decision for U.S.
TAIPEI OR PEKING

China's Premier
Chou En-lai
There is a cause for the state of the world today. And there has to be a cause that will produce the peaceful and happy world tomorrow. There had to be a first cause for the very existence of matter, of life, of forces and energies.

But today, it is considered "intellectual to be willingly ignorant of that. I have said that in the first two centuries of the so-called Christian era, it was popular to embrace gnosticism — meaning, "we know." But today, it is popular to embrace agnosticism — meaning, "we don't know" — we are ignorant." Today, ignorance is embraced and labeled "knowledge."

Is it ignorance to recognize the facts of the great first cause who reveals the true cause of all of today's ills? Is it wise, intellectual and knowledgeable to be deliberately ignorant of basic facts and truth?

There are two main ways of life — two basic principles — two fundamental philosophies. One is the way of giving, the other of getting. One is love, the other lust. One believes it is more blessed to give than to receive. The other insists that acquiring, taking, accumulating, in the way of competition, leads to progress and happiness.

The one way is God-centered, the other is self-centered. The one accepts the Golden Rule, the other says, "Do it to others before they do it to you."

The one is the way of the divine nature; the other, the way of human nature. The one is the way of humility, the other, of vanity.

This world — all civilization — this world's society — is based on the hostile, competitive, self-centered way. It has produced every wail of human woe. It is the way that now threatens the extinction of humanity. This all means one thing. Man, imbued with human nature, is utterly unable to solve his problems. He can only worsen problems and create new ones. By the "knowledge" and efforts of man, this world is doomed and hopeless.
SIGN OF A TOUGHER AMERICA?
President Ford acted swiftly and resolutely to restore honor on the high seas — and honor at home.

BITTER MEMORIES KEPT ALIVE
The News Editor's tour of Eastern Europe revealed that World War II is more than just a dim memory.

THE MISSING DIMENSION IN SEX
Chapter 2 of the Editor-in-Chief's revised book.

WHEN TERRORISTS GO NUCLEAR
In our center spread, Science Editor Robert Ginskey shows how easily nuclear terrorists could blackmail a city, a nation . . . or the entire earth.

IS THE AMERICAN ECONOMY CURABLE
When an immoveable recession meets an irresistible inflation, something has to give . . . or does it?

IN BRIEF
General Counsel to the Editor-in-Chief, Stanley Rader, sees renewed pride in U.S. power in the wake of the Mayaguez.

GARNER TED ARMSTRONG SPEAKS OUT!
It's Moshe Kol's turn to "speak out," as Editor Garner Ted Armstrong interviews the Israeli Minister of Tourism.

PLAYING POKER WITH PETRODOLLARS
Aces in the hole are replaced by derricks in the desert in this bizarre game of winner-take-oil.

TAIPEI OR PEKING—TOUGH DECISION FOR U.S.

by Keith Stump

Following in the footsteps of his predecessor, President Ford is planning a state visit to the People's Republic of China later this year. Speculations are rampant as to what new initiatives might be forthcoming from the visit.

"He's not a tourist," an official in Taipei, capital of the "other China" on the island of Taiwan, recently remarked somewhat glumly to a visiting journalist. "He'll certainly want to accomplish something."

That "something," the people of Nationalist China fear, could be further steps toward eventual recognition of Communist China.

The death of Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek in April prompted widespread speculation that the U.S. might now feel free to change its longstanding policy toward Taiwan — the primary obstacle to closer relations between Washington and Peking. President Ford's recent reaffirmation of the U.S. commitment to the island has helped to allay Nationalist fears, at least temporarily. But as one reviews the developments in Washington-Peking relations during the past four years, it becomes obvious that besides full recognition of the Communist giant, there is little else of importance left to be accomplished — and little reason for a state visit.

Henry Kissinger's undercover mission to Peking in July 1971 initiated U.S. overtures toward the People's Republic, ending 20 years of mutual hostility and nonrecognition. The Kissinger sojourn led to President Nixon's historic China trip in February 1972.

A year later, mainland China and the United States opened "liaison offices" in each other's capitals. Washington, however, continues to formally recognize the Nationalist government on Taiwan despite this de facto recognition of Peking.

Until recent years, the Nationalist government had been recognized by most nations as the legitimate government of China. But after Taiwan was ousted from its U.N. seat in 1971 in favor of Peking, dozens of nations withdrew recognition from the Nationalists. Currently, only 30 nations still recognize Taiwan. In contrast, over 90 nations have established ties with Peking.

For Americans, Taiwan is a sensitive and emotional issue. During World War II, Chiang Kai-shek refused Japan's offer of a separate peace and continued to hold out at bay over 2 million Japanese who would otherwise have been fighting Americans in the western Pacific. Later, following his expulsion from the Chinese mainland in 1949 by Communist forces under Mao Tse-tung, the strong-willed Generalissimo inspired America's admiration with his unrelenting determination to one day lead his armies back to the mainland in victory.

Pro and Con

Proponents of recognizing Peking assert that the United States cannot afford to ignore a nuclear power of 800 million people. Furthermore, they observe, recognition does not necessarily mean approval. And finally, recognition of Peking would give the U.S. greater maneuverability against the Soviet Union.

Opponents of withdrawing recognition from Taiwan assert that the U.S. has little to gain from any further moves toward full relations with the mainland — but much to lose.

First, to terminate diplomatic relations with Taiwan would automatically abrogate the 1954 Mutual Defense Treaty between the U.S. and Taiwan, which obliges the U.S. to defend the island. For the U.S. to unilaterally scrap this treaty with a time-tested friend would, they assert, result in a further loss of U.S. credibility around the world.

There is also the question, opponents point out, of who and what the U.S. would be recognizing. According leaders Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai are not far from death's door. There is much uncertainty as to how the chips will fall within China after their departure. So is now the time for recognition?

Finally, there is the basic issue of political morality. In abandoning a longstanding, faithful and tested ally in favor of recognizing its avowed enemy, the United States would be sacrificing a friend on the altar of political expediency and would lose a large measure of national self-respect in the bargain, opponents of Peking recognition assert.

Despite all these considerations, most observers feel that recognition of Peking is only a matter of time. But no matter what face-saving formula Washington may eventually come up with to explain such a move, to the people of Taiwan, at least, it will be a clear-cut case of being sold down the river.

---

WEEK ENDING JUNE 7, 1975
Return of the Mayaguez
SIGN OF A TOUGHER AMERICA?

For one brief moment, the United States once again acted like a great power. In mid-May, decisive and direct military action successfully recovered the U.S. merchant ship Mayaguez with its 39 crewmen from Cambodian hands.

The incident was distinguished by its brevity. The Khmer Rouge government of Cambodia seized the American vessel on Monday, May 12; by Thursday, May 15, the U.S. had the ship back.

After diplomatic overtures to the People's Republic of China and a request for United Nations intervention had failed, 200 American marines, with the help of air cover, physically took the pirated Mayaguez in Koh Tang harbor. Soon afterward, a Cambodian fishing boat, flying white flags, turned over the captured crewmen.

In the course of the fighting, nearly a fourth of Cambodia's known navy — three Khmer Rouge gunboats — were sunk.

The swift use of American power, in contrast to the protracted military operations of the Vietnam war, drew a mixed world reaction.

The biggest single "adjustment" was the decision made in 1960 to allow Panamanian flags to fly alongside the Stars and Stripes at selected points in the zone. This action was meant to symbolize Panama's "titular" or residual sovereignty in the zone. Friction between Panamanians and American "Zonians" over the flag issue erupted into bloody violence in January 1964.

The popular argument that U.S. "gave away" some aspects of sovereignty to Latin America will be harmed if the canal zone is not surrendered, however, may weaken the anti-giveaway Senate bloc. It is believed that only twenty of the thirty-six Senators who signed the resolution are said to be really hard-core opponents of a new treaty.

WEEK ENDING JUNE 7, 1975

Panama Canal: New Move to Erode Control

Reports are circulating in Washington that authority in the U.S.-controlled Panama Canal Zone over police, fire protection, and postal services will soon be unilaterally handed over to the Republic of Panama. The situation would be analogous to, say, authorities in Tijuana, Mexico, assuming civil functions in San Diego, California, prior to the return to Mexico of America's southwestern states.

The move is obviously intended to move the United States further along the road of total relinquishment of U.S. sovereign rights to the strategic

world waterway. At the same time, the State Department is continuing to work out the "details" of a new canal treaty which will hand full ownership of the canal to Panama (see Plain Truth, April 5, 1975).

Appropriately the giveaway will not be accomplished without a fight; over 36 Senators have afixed their names to a resolution that the U.S. must not surrender sovereignty over the 50-square-mile zone.

They are also expected to resist the new State Department attempt to subtly erode U.S. authority in advance of a formal treaty.

Since it only requires a third of the Senate to block any treaty, it would seem that the canal will remain under American jurisdiction for some time to come. However, the "historical momentum" surrounding the canal issue is against American retention. Nearly every revision of the principles of the original 1903 treaty which gave the U.S. "sovereign rights in perpetuity" has weakened the American claim to canal control.

The biggest single "adjustment" was the decision made in 1960 to allow Panamanian flags to fly alongside the Stars and Stripes at selected points in the zone. This action was meant to symbolize Panama's "titular" or residual sovereignty in the zone. Friction between Panamanians and American "Zonians" over the flag issue erupted into bloody violence in January 1964.

The popular argument that U.S. "gave away" some aspects of sovereignty to Latin America will be harmed if the canal zone is not surrendered, however, may weaken the anti-giveaway Senate bloc. It is believed that only twenty of the thirty-six Senators who signed the resolution are said to be really hard-core opponents of a new treaty.

If, or perhaps better yet, when, the canal does go, it will not only mean one more stop backward in a long American tryst from the pinnacle of world power and prestige it enjoyed just after World War II. Even more, it will represent the loss of one of the vital "gates" (see Genesis 22:17) promised to the descendants of Abraham.

For one brief moment, the United States once again acted like a great power. In mid-May, decisive and direct military action successfully recovered the U.S. merchant ship Mayaguez with its 39 crewmen from Cambodian hands.

China accused the United States of committing an "outright act of piracy" by bombing Cambodian territory and shipping, ignoring the fact that it was a Khmer Rouge gunboat which had originally "pirated" the unarmed merchant vessel in international waters.

South Africa, on the other hand, generally applauded the American use of force. Plain Truth correspondent Robert E. Fales reports that the news "helped most South Africans enjoy their breakfast and head to work in a cheerful frame of mind. After so many embarrassing reversals, it seemed the Americans were showing a bit more self-respect."

In Britain, the Daily Mail pointed out that the Americans were "justified in going to the limit to rescue their men and their ship," sentiments generally echoed by conservative and middle-of-the-road papers such as the Daily Express and The Times. The liberal Guardian, however, called the incursion "both basty and reckless" and said President Ford had tried "too much too soon."

The Belgium press was divided: La Cite said the United States had been treated as a paper tiger and, in order not to lose face, had to react and show its teeth with La Libre Belgique, however, said the incident had only hurt American prestige.

Domestically, the Republican Congress joined in broad bipartisan support of President Ford's handling of the ship seizure. Praise came from both conservatives (Senator Barry Goldwater said he was glad Mr. Ford had "the guts to do what he should have done") and liberals (Idaho Democrat Frank Church said Mr. Ford was to be commended for the way he handled the crisis).

The only exception came from the left wing of the Democratic party. Senator George McGovern called the action "premature," adding, however, that "it appears to have worked."

The Thai Connection

The most violent response to the Mayaguez operation occurred in the Cambodian capital.

An angry Thai Foreign Ministry official, upon learning that Cambodian boats had been sunk by U.S. planes based on Thai soil, called it "piracy" and "madness" — an action taken with no thought for the consequences to Thailand. An angry Thai Foreign Ministry official, upon learning that Cambodian boats had been sunk by U.S. planes based on Thai soil, called it "piracy" and "madness" — an action taken with no thought for the consequences to Thailand. An angry Thai Foreign Ministry official, upon learning that Cambodian boats had been sunk by U.S. planes based on Thai soil, called it "piracy" and "madness" — an action taken with no thought for the consequences to Thailand.

The Thai government demanded an apology from Washington. The United States responded with a message of "regret" for the action, but no apology, Bangkok accepted it nevertheless.

The Exception That Proves the Rule

Lloyd M. Robb, captain of the U.S.S. Pueblo, has said that if the North Koreans' seizure of that ship in 1968 had been handled the same as the Cambodian seizure of the Mayaguez, the Cambodians would never have dared capture the American vessel in the first place.

His statement underscores the fact that the headlong retraction in which the United States found itself at the time of the Cambodian seizure was largely the result of America's failure to use power it already had. After vacillating militarily for a decade in Vietnam, America had finally conducted an operation in Southeast Asia with definite goals and purposes. It was against this backdrop that many observers applauded the strong action which forced the return of the Mayaguez.

But, despite this isolated incident, the U.S. remains in global retreat. The recapture of one merchant ship does not erase recent American failures in Indochina or the Mideast. The doubts that the Indochina collapse raised in American allies still remain.

The timing of the Mayaguez incident was unique. After the Vietnam debacle, the forthright action off the Cambodian coast could not have come at a better time. But would the U.S. act the same six months from now when circumstances are different?

In this instance, President Ford's personal prestige was on the line. Already under fire from his own party for being a weak leader, he had to react with strength at the point where world perception of American power was at its lowest ebb since the thirties.

It remains doubtful whether the Mayaguez incident will mark the reassertion of American strength in world affairs. The historical momentum is going in the other direction.
Mrs. Gandhi Walks a Tightrope

by Norman Cousins

NEW DELHI: It is difficult to think of any head of state whose political life is more of a high-wire balancing act than that of India's Gandhi, prime minister of India.

Like her father, Jawaharlal Nehru, first prime minister of India, Mrs. Gandhi's main job is to keep her nation united. Considering the ethnic and cultural pluralism of India, with 14 separate major languages and hundreds of sects and subsects, this is one of the most difficult political undertakings in history. She is widely criticized, but almost everyone agrees that she is probably the only political figure in India today who can hold the country together.

Some people complain because she doesn't use all the powers of her office to solve the country's problems. Others attack her with equal severity because she has not been too arbitrary and dictatorial. The pressures and counterpressures are as fierce as they are prodigious. Just in the past 10 years, India's population has swelled to more than 500 million, an increase of almost 100 million since Jawaharlal Nehru's death. The amount of arable land has shrunk during this period. The government is attempting valiantly but with small success to stem the overcrowding pressure.

The number of mouths to feed is beyond the food-growing capacity of the country. It is also greater than the amount of food India is able to import from the outside world.

India is a Hindu country, but the majority of 60 million Moslems represents a major factor in government policy, both domestic and foreign. India can never forget that the presence of so many Moslems could create a serious internal crisis in the event of a break with Pakistan. The sympathy of India's Moslems for the Arabs in the Middle East crisis is a potent factor in the formation of Indian foreign policy. A related pressure on the prime minister's mind is the problem from India's dependence on the Arab states for its oil. Pakistan gets its oil from Iran, while India's oil costs have quadrupled. Vast pressure has been brought on the prime minister to withdraw of a "dictatorship of the proletariat."

In a recent interview published by the Turin newspaper, La Stampa, the leader of Italy's dominant Christian Democratic Party, Amintore Fanfani, warned that his party would commit political suicide if it agreed to a Christian Democratic/Communist coalition in the future.

An electoral triumph by the Communists could provoke a strong reaction from the right, especially from the extreme element of the Italian Social Movement. In retaliation, the Communists—already controlling Italy's three largest unions could paralyze the nation by calling a national strike.

Italy's continual political stagnation has permitted violent extremist elements to arise. The growing incidence of street battles by the politically motivated mobs in the larger Italian cities is reminiscent of pre-Mussolini days.

Although the Neo-Fascists do not have the numerical support the Communists have, they did emerge, however, with almost 10 percent of the votes in the last elections. Since that time there has been an upsurge in rightist activities with some members embarking on a terrorist campaign of violence and intimidation. Rumors of rightist plots, attempted coups, and assassinations are increasingly becoming part of the Italian day-to-day conversation.

The following day in Bucharest, Romania, we witnessed the somber Victory Day proceedings at the base of the Soviet War Memorial—a bit more subdued perhaps since, for the greatest part of the war, Romanian soldiers fought on the German side. The biggest celebration of all was reserved for the Soviet Union itself. Western observers were surprised to note that the size and scope of this year's observance even eclipsed that of the 25th anniversary in 1970. The role of Soviet armed forces in the "Great Patriotic War" was exaggerated even further this year by Soviet historians, the participation of her democratic allies being further discounted and diminished.

In the West, by rather stark contrast, the memories of the struggle against the greatest single tyranny known to date seem to have lasted, perhaps diluted by the influence of two decades of nearly unbroken prosperity. French President Giscard d'Estaing even decided that this year's celebration of the end of the war should be the last, that further future observances would only harm the cause of cooperation of a rehabilitated Germany with her European allies. Predictably, many Frenchmen, especially those who fought in the resistance movement, reacted in outrage against their President's suggestion. They also didn't take too heartily to the recommendation of some French officials that West Germany should be entrusted with an equal band in the operation of a European nuclear defense force, suggested to be created from the pooled resources of the British and French weapons systems.

One wonders. Do the Soviets and their allies in Eastern Europe know something—or, at least, have a greater sense of history and apprehension of the future than the somnolent West?
JOHANNESBURG: A strong South African trade with Europe is now conducted on the continent. Even if these difficulties are overcome, the European nuclear program, as massive as it is, could still leave the Continent in a precarious situation. Optimize estimates indicate that such a crash program, if combined with reduced consumption, could provide only 17.5% of the energy needs. Although coal, geothermal energy, and other sources will make a contribution, Community planners forecast that oil will still supply 40% of Western Europe's power needs in 1985. Most of that would have to be imported oil, regardless of the risk of current North Sea explinations. And increased energy demand will mean that the same amount of oil needed today will still be needed then.

And, ironically, nuclear power needs a fuel — uranium — and Western Europe depends heavily on foreign sources for its supply. Europe is sensitive about this dependence, as borne out by her vigorous reaction in April to a temporary U.S. suspension of sales. The U.S. Navy League, for example, was echoed by Representative Charles E. Bennett, Chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. Bennett, releasing the report on extensive hearings held last year, recommended that Congress immediately enact a five-year extension of U.S. suspension of nuclear shipbuilding to catch up with the Soviet Union. He stated that "a viable, healthy system of shipbuilding, both foreign and private — is necessary to our national security," adding, however, that "our shipbuilding program is experiencing serious difficulties."

The report noted that the key cause of the troubles has been the inability of shipyards to plan for the future because of "the lack of a clear, long-range, national program."

In 1969 the United States had a navy of about 1,000 ships. That number is now down to 300. The subcommittee report said the Soviets passed the United States in the number of nuclear submarines in 1971, and in the number of surface combatants in 1973. Since the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviet Union has gone on a virtual shipbuilding spree, sending new combatants down the ways at a rate of 90 per year. In contrast, as one U.S. naval authority points out, there are "only 67 new ships under construction in the U.S. for delivery in the next five years."

The $30.5 billion shipbuilding program suggested to the sub-committee by the Navy calls for construction of 35 to 40 ships each of the five years.

The merchant marine sector of shipbuilding is also facing difficulties. According to Fairplay International, the authoritative British shipping weekly, the U.S. merchant fleet, seventh in the world, was the only one of the top 24 national fleets which had less tonnage washed away in 1974 than in 1973. The percentage of U.S. overseas trade carried in U.S. flag ships has steadily declined over the past quarter-century from 57.4% in 1947 to only 5.5% in 1970.

Ugandan President Idi Amin today reiterated his belief that Nazi leader Adolf Hitler was a great man, and said he would erect a monument to him on a spot where British and German troops fought in the First World War.

Radio Uganda, monitored here, said General Amin told Mrs. Riches, the German-born estranged wife of British teacher Denis Hills, who is under arrest on espionage charges, that he had received a warm welcome when he visited West Germany in February 1972. General Amin met Mrs. Hills today to present her with a certificate of permanent residence.

The Ugandan president praised the Germans, particularly Hitler, for their bravery, but said he had been disappointed not to see Hitler's portrait or a monument to him in Berlin, the Radio Uganda broadcast added. Radio Uganda quoted General Amin as saying that, although some people felt Adolf Hitler was bad, he was a great man and a real conqueror whose name would never be forgotten.

An historical spot in Kaeace province would be named after the late dictator and a monument to him would be erected, the Ugandan leader added. British and German troops fought in the province during the First World War. Uganda was part of the German colony before the war.
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The dissemination of knowledge about sex has occurred only since World War I. Medieval ignorance, coupled with the "sex-is-shameful" attitude and church repression, caused frustration and miserably unhappy marriages. But the modern diffusion of sex knowledge and the permissive sexual freedoms of the "new morality" have plunged the Western world from the frying pan into the fire. Why?

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Part II

T he most vital dimension in knowledge about sex and marriage has been missing. But this vital dimension is missing not only from knowledge about sex and marriage, it is missing from knowledge in general.

To understand, we need to realize the impetus behind the general knowledge explosion and now the most vital dimension came to be missing.

The dramatic rise in the world's total fund of knowledge began, roughly, 170 years ago, with the advent of modern science. The new knowledge in the fields of science and technology developed slowly at first. Knowledge production gained momentum gradually, and then, finally, came the knowledge explosion.

Even when I was a boy, we used kerosene lamps, horse-and-buggy transportation, and the little "dinky" trolley-cars which had just replaced the horse-drawn street cars. Radio, television, and airplanes were unheard of by most people.

It's hard to realize, now, that this world went along on virtually an even keel — with no material progress to speak of — for thousands of years. It was primarily an agricultural world, using primitive farming methods. The cast-iron plow was not invented until 1797 — the disc plow not until 1896, when I was a growing boy. The first harvest came in 1836.

Think of it! Through those long millennia the world was virtually without transportation or means of communication. Transportation was by foot, mule-back, camel, elephant or horse. By sea it was by slow-moving sailboat. The telephone was not invented until 1876, wireless in 1896. The first steamboat (Fulton) was 1803.

In my lifetime we have seen the machine age, the jet age, the nuclear age, and the space age. What stimulated this accelerating materialistic development? It occurred simultaneously with the sudden spurt to national wealth and power of two nations — Britain and the United States — 1800 to 1803. With this suddenly acquired material wealth, our people became materially-minded.

The New Messiah — Modern Science

Our scientists assured the world that man had progressed to the point where he could safely dispense with the superstitious crutch of religion and belief in God. Now humanity could rely on the new messiah — modern science.

"Given sufficient knowledge," said the scientists, "we shall solve all of human's problems and cure all the world's ills." The tools of modern science were merely a stepped-up version of those man had employed since the dawn of history — observation, experimentation, and human reason.

So knowledge production has increased at a continuously accelerating pace. And this includes the area of sex!

But Evils Increased Also

But, paradoxically, humanity's problem, troubles and evils have been increasing at an equal pace of acceleration! In the one most recent decade, from 1960 to 1970, man's total fund of knowledge doubled! But, incredibly, in that same ten short years the world's troubles and evils doubled also!

What's wrong with the dictum that knowledge is the sole need for solutions? Increasing evils have come with increasing knowledge! That's the hard, cold fact that must be faced!

Is it wrong to possess or gain knowledge? Most certainly not! Am I discouraging the acquisition of knowledge? By no means!

On the other hand, we are face to face with the fact that evils have escalated along with the production of knowledge. That does not necessarily mean that the knowledge produced caused the evils. It does mean that the knowledge produced did not cure existing evils or prevent new evils.

There has to be a knowledge gap — a missing dimension — somewhere! It's high time we learn what it is!

For every effort, there has to be a cause!

There has to be a cause for all the world's evils! There has to be a cause for the worsening moral problem! There can be two kinds of knowledge — true and false.

Academic Freedom

In this feverish development of knowledge production, scholars in universities have been placing great emphasis on academic freedom. Academic freedom is defined as the independent judgment allowed teachers, scholars, scientists, students, in the pursuit of knowledge.

Science as a whole and higher education have exercised the academic freedom to postulate a creation without a Creator. They have engaged in the activity of knowledge production with total rejection of any possibility of the miraculous, the supernatural, the existence of God — or anything outside the realm of the material. They have rejected utterly revelation as a source of basic knowledge!

When I engaged in research on the theory of evolution, I studied Darwin, Haeckel, Huxley, Vogt, Chamberlain and other exponents of the theory. I also looked at the other side of the question. But I would venture to say that most of those whose higher education has been acquired during the past half century have been taught and have accepted without question the evolutionary theory, not having examined with any seriousness the biblical evidence of special creation. To go along with the evolutionary concept has become the scholarly "in" thing. In most institutions of higher learning, the world's "best seller" has been dismissed without a hearing.

Is it not human to err?

Could it be possible for the most highly educated minds to have been intellectually misled or deceived? Could they, viewing only one side of the question, be infallible, entirely above making mistakes?

The Cause of Errors

For many years now, I have observed that errors almost always come from a false basic premise, carelessly assumed as self-evident, and taken for granted without question, then building on that false basic hypothesis. The basic premises for knowledge production in our time has been the evolutionary concept. It has been the eyesgnlase through which all questions have been viewed. Yet it remains unproved, and by its very nature it is a theory not subject to proof. It is a farrago. And to question it is — to those who embrace this faith — academic heresy!

Do we, then, dare question the theories so generally accepted by advanced scholarship? Is it heretical to question their assumed conclusions and ask for proof? Is it academic heresy to look at the other side of the coin?

Suppose, now, we appropriate the academic freedom to carefully examine that which has been dismissed without examination.

It might prove exciting and enlightening, at this point, to allow ourselves the latitude of academic freedom unprejudicially to examine the biblical narrative of the forbidden fruit. That bit of revelation purports to describe the crucial initial event in human experience that changed the entire course of history.

The first three chapters of the Bible do have something to say about sex and marriage. And, after all, the man and the woman there described were naked, weren't they?

Evidently few, if any — whether scientist, scholar or theologian — have viewed.

There has to be a cause for all the world's evils! There has to be a cause for the worsening moral problem! There can be two kinds of knowledge — true and false.

this account with any remote conception that it might explain the origin of the scientific method of knowledge production. Or, that it might reveal, the very source of the fatal missing dimension! Certainly almost no one — theologians included — has ever understood what this account really does say!

Begin at the Beginning

I think we must begin our view of the forbidden fruit narrative at the beginning, the very first verse in the Bible.

So we begin: "In the beginning, God . . ." That statement definitely puts God in existence before all else. No postulate — no guess — no "perhaps" just the simple positive statement, " . . . created the heavens and the earth." Whether fact or fiction — truth or error — that is what was written, purporting to be the revealed Word of God.

Something tremendous is indicated to have occurred between what is stated to have been the original creation of the earth (verse 1) and the statement in
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verse 2: “And the earth was [bcome] without form and void” (Hebrew, tohu and bohu) meaning without confusion, emptiness (see any Hebrew-English lexi­
on). What occurred between events and conditions described in those two verses is revealed in many other biblical pas­
sages. And this allows for any duration of time between the two verses. So far as bib­
lical statements are concerned, the
original creation had occurred millions of years prior to the state de­
described in the second verse.

Coming to the 26th verse, chapter 1, it is
stated: “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” Other biblical passages state that man is in the same form and shape as God — but with this difference: that God is composed of spirit and man of physical matter.

Now verse 27: “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female cre­
ated he them.”

Soul — Spirit or Material?

Here is a dogmatic statement that God designed and created SEX! And next, chapter 2, verse 7: “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nos­
tils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” The fiat statement

God had explained fully to Adam and Eve the way to live that would cause every good effect — peace, happiness, prosperity, com­
forts, interesting life, abundant well­
being.

Note, now, how much is summa­
ized and condensed into few words:

“And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. . . . And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Genesis 2:16, 17).

God told Adam that he was mortal and could die. He told him that he had been formed of matter from the earth (verse 7) and also “dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (chapter 3, verse 19).

Notice, what is symbolized and re­
vealed here. The tree of LIFE symbolized eternal life. They did not, as yet, possess immortal life. This was freely offered to Adam and Eve as God’s gift.

Compelled to Make a Choice

But they were required to make a choice.

Also in the garden was another sym­bolic tree — the tree of “the knowledge of good and evil.” To make the wrong choice of taking of that forbidden tree would impose the penalty of death.

“They shall surely die,” said God — if they chose to disobey and take of that tree.

In other words, as we read in Romans 6:23: “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life.” This clearly shows that God revealed the gospel to them. And what is the Bible definition of sin? “Sin,” it is written in 1 John 3:4, “the transgression of the law.”

Actually, there exist, overall, only two BASIC WAYS of life — two divergent philosophies. They travel in opposite direc­
tions. I state them very simply: One is the way of LIFE — the other of death.

More specifically, the one is the way of humility and of outgoing concern for others equal to self­concern. It is the way of cooperation, serving, helping, sharing, of consideration, patience and kindness. More important, it is also the way of obedience to, reliance on, and worship solely toward God. It is the God­centered way, of love toward God and love toward neighbor.

The opposite is the self­centered way

The Cause of Peace and Happiness

IT IS A LAW AS REAL, AS INEXCEPTLY RE­
LENTLESS AS THE LAW OF GRAVITY! It governs and regulates all human relationships!

Why should it seem incongruous that man’s Maker — the Creator of all mat­
ter, force and energy — the Creator of the laws of physics and chemistry, grav­
ity and inertia — should also have created in motion this SPIRITUAL LAW TO CAUSE EVERY GOOD RESULT FOR MAN?

If the Creator is a God of LOVE — IF OUR Maker is a God of all power — could he possibly have done otherwise? Could he have neglected to provide a way — a CAUSE — to produce peace, happiness, prosperity, successful lives, abundant well­being?

I repeat: There has to be a cause for every effect.

If there is to be peace, happiness, abundant well­being, SOMETHING MUST CAUSE IT! God could not be God without providing a cause for every desired good.

Isn’t it about time we realize that IN LOVE for the mankind he created, God also created and set in motion in­
crass this spiritual law to provide the cause of every good result!

Now recapitulate: death is the pen­
ality of sin. Law is the TRANSMISSIO­n

of this law! To transgress this law is to re­
ject the way that would cause the good all humans want — to turn to the way that causes every evil result. God for­
made Adam and Eve to take the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, under penalty of death!

Why? Because he wanted them to choose the way of every desired good — because he wanted them to avoid causing evils, sorrows, pains, suffering, unhappiness. Therefore, taking this fruit was symbolic of transgressing God’s spiritual law.

To have taken of the tree of LIFE was merely symbolic of receiving the gift of God’s holy spirit, the very LOVE OF God (Romans 5:5) which fulfills this spir­
It was a necessary condition of obey­ing this law (Romans 13:10) and which gives only to those who obey his law (Acts 5:32).

The Cause of World’s Evils

Consider further: A just God could not have warned the first humans of the death penalty without having fully re­
vealed to them the spiritual law the transgression of which carried that pen­
ality — the law codified as the Ten Com­
mandments. Remember, the details are not written here — only the highly con­
densed overall summary of what God taught them.

So God had explained fully to Adam and Eve his WAY OF LIFE — the “GIVE WAY” — his inexorable spiritual LAW. God had explained the LAW that causes all good. He had ex­
plained also THE WAY that causes EVILS — the transgression of that law — else he could not have told them that for trans­
gression they would surely pay the penalty — death.

More clearly stated, God gave man his own choice. He could choose to cause every good and to receive eternal life in happiness. Or, he could choose to cause evil. It is the WAY of GOOD and the WAY of evil.

Now come to Chapter 3 in Genesis.

“Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made” (verse 1).

Much of the Bible is in symbols — but the Bible explains its own symbols. It is of course, very out­of­date to believe in a devil today, but the Bible plainly speaks of a devil, named Satan. In Revel­

Still Adam and Eve to take the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God had said, “Ye shall not eat of it.” And the serpent said unto the woman, “Ye shall not sure­ly die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall as gods: margin: [God], knowing good and evil” (Genesis 3:1­5).

The narration here attributes astute subtility to the devil. First, he discredited God. In effect, he said, “You can’t rely on God’s word. He said you are mortal and can die. He knows better than that; he knows your minds are so perfect that

you can be God.”

(Continued on page 15)
WHEN TERRORISTS GO NUCLEAR

by Robert Ginskey

To The Honorable Mayor of Your Beautiful City: A radio-controlled nuclear bomb has been carefully concealed near the heart of your metropolis. If you distribute 20 million dollars in small bills to the minority members of your community within the next three days, you will be notified of the bomb's location and no harm will befall you or your people. However, if you fail to meet these demands, the nuclear device will be detonated. Tens of thousands will be killed, your city will be destroyed, and radioactive contamination will render it uninhabitable. Enclosed are the plans for the device. You bomb experts will confirm that I know what I'm talking about — and I'm not kidding!

In 1970, a precocious 14-year-old Orlando, Florida boy sent local officials a note threatening to annihilate the city with an H-bomb if he were not given $1 million. He supplemented his demands with a convincing set of detailed plans that had experts more than slightly worried.

The boy was eventually apprehended, and his nuclear blackmail turned out to be a hoax. But the very fact that he was able to supply a realistic set of plans for a nuclear bomb sent ripples of concern and uneasiness throughout the nation. Were homemade nuclear devices nearer than we dared to admit? Was the day that terrorists go nuclear frighteningly close at hand?

Prying Inside Pandora's Box

Several factors determine just how difficult (or easy) it is to design and construct a nuclear bomb (see the accompanying box). Only six nations — the U.S., U.S.S.R., China, Britain, France, and India — have so far managed to pry into the explosive secrets of Pandora's nuclear box. But one thing is clear: if the essential materials are available, it is very possible to make an atomic bomb using information that is available to the public.

"Any reasonably intelligent person can build a nuclear bomb," claims Dr. Theodore B. Taylor, who helped design much of America's nuclear arsenal. Taylor has long argued that with a do-it-yourself bomb guide drawn from publicly available federal documents or the local library, a person could buy — or steal — much of the materials for a nuclear bomb.

As if to prove Taylor's point, a recent TV documentary, "The Plutonium Connection," revealed that a 20-year-old M.I.T. college student had designed a crude but workable atomic bomb in five weeks. The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) challenged the student to design a nuclear bomb to test the theory that a homemade nuclear weapon could be fashioned solely through the use of available published documents.

The student said he relied solely on reports and files available in such places as his college library and the Atomic Energy Commission's own public reading room.

"All of these books are available through the National Technical Information Service in Washington, D.C.," the student observed. "I went down and picked them up myself, about five dollars a book. . . . It's really no problem to go down there and get enough information to design a bomb."

Even the Encyclopedia Americana gives a very informative discussion of the principles and techniques used in making nuclear explosives. Atomic scientists were shocked at what they considered a "fair chance" that the student's bomb would go off.

Swedish Defense Ministry scientist Jan Prawitz stated that the device might have the power of 100 tons of TNT, and added, "In the hands of the terrorist, from the point of view of authorities negotiating with the terrorist, the fact that the bomb might go off is the important thing."

"Now, what you do, you detonate the TNT," states the "student" on the PBS documentary. "That squeezes the tamper and the plutonium core together enough that the plutonium becomes supercritical. It stays together long enough that you get a chain reaction and, boom, you get a bomb. . . . It's that simple."

Nuclear Theft

Granted, it is possible to design an A-bomb, but just how would one acquire the necessary fissionable material? Undoubtedly, this is the greatest obstacle for a would-be nuclear terrorist. Sophisticated nuclear processing plants are incredibly expensive. Yet the solution may be surprisingly and distressingly simple: theft.

Military supplies of nuclear materials and even complete weapons are now widely dispersed around the world. The U.S. keeps 7,000 nuclear warheads in Europe alone, with 2/3 designated for use not by the U.S. but by our allies. The security surrounding such supply dumps is often appallingly inadequate.

Retired Adm. Gene R. LaRocque, a former Navy fleet commander and strategic planner who now heads the Center for Defense Information, recently admonished a Senate atomic energy subcommittee that "relatively few people" guard U.S. nuclear warheads and bombs stored in such countries as Greece, Turkey and South Korea. "A well-planned, well-executed terrorist attack could easily capture our nuclear weapons, and a fast plane or helicopter could get them out of the country just as easily," LaRocque warned.

The danger of atomic blackmail resulting from stolen military supplies could be minimized by increasing security and/or reducing the numbers of such weapons in vulnerable areas. But unfortunately, another source of illicit nuclear material is also on the horizon — the atomic power industry.

Nuclear power plants "burn" uranium and plutonium, both elements used in making atomic bombs. While being used for power generation, the uranium and plutonium are relatively safe from theft because they are mixed with other highly radioactive substances that make removal of the nuclear fuel extremely difficult and hazardous.

However, the fuel must eventually be removed from the plant and shipped out to a reprocessing facility. It is here that the various isotopes of uranium and plutonium are separated from other radioactive by-products as part of the recycling process. While transporting such nuclear material to and from a reprocessor, and especially at the reprocessing plant itself, theft can much more easily occur.

A recent Ford Foundation study, "Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards," asserts that "transportation is the weakest link" in the nuclear fuel cycle from the standpoint of vulnerability to theft and diversion. But the report adds that even
The Atomic Bomb — How It Works

One of the most intriguing and significant discoveries of the twentieth century was that atoms could be split or "fissioned." Just before World War II, scientists found that fast moving subatomic particles such as neutrons could cause heavy atoms like uranium-235 to fission into lighter atoms, and also release prodigious amounts of energy. Equally important was the discovery that the fissioning of a uranium atom produces 2 or 3 additional neutrons that could, in turn, fission other uranium atoms in a chain reaction.

Therein lies the key to an atomic bomb. All that is required is a sufficient amount of fissionable material to sustain a rapid nuclear chain reaction. In such a situation a sudden release of energy equal to hundreds or thousands of tons of TNT can occur in less than a millionth of a second.

In practice, of course, the making of an atomic bomb is not a trivial achievement. A means must be found to bring two or more "subcritical" (i.e., non-chain reaction sustaining) masses of uranium or plutonium together in one lump in much less than a thousandth of a second. A slower assembly time would produce a "fizzle" — a lot of heat and vapor, but not a real explosion. Thus the idea that a man could hold a sub-critical mass of uranium in each hand and threaten to create an A-bomb by bringing them together is totally unrealistic. A fizzle would undoubtedly occur and radioactive activity would be dispersed over a small area; but no explosion would result.

To produce an atomic bomb, the subcritical masses must be very quickly brought together by the use of high explosives.

Just how much fissionable material is needed? A few kilograms (a kilogram is about 2.2 pounds) is usually sufficient. But special techniques of compressing fissionable material can drastically reduce the amount needed to "go critical." Under certain conditions only a few ounces of plutonium may be critical.

Thus, there are two requirements for building a nuclear bomb: (1) A suitable mechanism using high explosives must be devised to combine subcritical masses of uranium or plutonium into a critical mass in a very short time; (2) A source of high grade fissionable material must be available.

The proliferation of nuclear weapons shows that neither of these requirements is especially difficult to meet.
Is the American Economy Curable?

"... he that earneth wages, earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes." (Haggai 1:6)

by Jeff Calkins

Back in the heady, halcyon days of the early 1960's when unemployment was declining and inflation was a tame two percent, government economists enshrined an economic myth called the "Philips Curve."

Named after a prominent British economist, it postulated that inflation and unemployment canceled each other out. It was the economic power of positive thinking. If you had high unemployment, Phillips believed, at least you wouldn't have inflation, and vice versa.

Furthermore, the theory produced the notion that inflation could be solved by higher unemployment. Last year's dismal statistics of double-digit inflation and near-double-digit unemployment proved it doesn't always work.

Many of us remember the earlier years of the Kennedy Presidency as a blissful Camelot: the "best and the brightest" would lead the U.S. economy into eternal fine-tuned prosperity through the simple expedient of unbalanced budgets and lower taxes. There was no economic ill the President's Council of Economic Advisers couldn't diagnose and cure — usually through the opiate of printing more money. The attitude was also reflected in the feeling of self-confident omnipotence that produced the national quagmire of Vietnam.

One of the first signs that something was wrong in Camelot was the nagging stagnation of Great Britain. Governed by essentially the same set of philosophically interventionist nostrums as the U.S. (only more so), the United Kingdom had become bogged down in a quagmire of Vietnam.

The climax of U.S. involvement in Vietnam around 1969 strangely coincided with the puncturing of our economic bubble. The federal government had just gone into the red by $25 billion, an unprecedented deficit for that day. Eight years of continuous economic boom ended, and, with rising inflation, businesses began laying men off. Recession set in.

Since that time, a succession of budget-busting deficits and liberal money management by the Federal Reserve in the presidential election year of 1972 combined to show that the American economy can indeed follow in British footsteps.

Economists within the Ford Administration now project both unemployment and inflation rates of 8 percent, to commemorate the nation's Bicentennial. This is the economic equivalent of having severe cases of both low blood sugar and hyperension.

The Diagnosis

Since 1965, nearly all the extra wealth the U.S. has generated has gone into the nation's bloated public sector — where it has covered both good causes (social security payments) and some not so good causes.

Moreover, in the last ten years, the country's economic circuits have reached the point of overload. Inflation was only the blowing of a fuse — a
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symptom that the whole house may be about to burn down. The United States simply has over-estimated its wealth and tried to do too much militarily and otherwise in the non-Communist world, educate every child to graduate school, make war on poverty, and compel business to solve deep-rooted sociological problems.

American ambitions have exceeded American potency. To accomplish its lofty social visions, the country has borrowed heavily against the future. The interest on the national debt alone now exceeds $30 billion.

The Prescription

The Wall Street Journal points out that you can't fight recession and inflation at the same time using the standard economic medicine which has been in vogue since the Depression. These theories may have worked in the thirties past several weeks in Cambodia and Kissinger or Mr. Nixon, and now President Ford, failed to restate firmly and publica- tion, by an Israeli journalist, which is reportedly replete with references to statements made by Mr. Kissinger and leaked by an Israeli government official to give the impression that Mr. Kissinger was a benefactor of the country has, in fact, already had its first test in this regard, when it had to apply force against the Cambodian government for its seizure of the American merchant ship Mayaguez. Perhaps this provocative act by the Cambodian government was one designed to test the will of the United States at this particularly delicate time. Perhaps there will be other probes in other places to do the same. I have assured my European colleagues that the United States will react to any provocative and aggressive acts in a decisive, immediate and effective manner.

Vis-a-vis Mr. Kissinger, notwithstanding his recently avowed intention to stay in office for the benefit of the country and the world, it is difficult to foresee his staying on the scene too much longer. All of his policies have unfortunately resulted in failure or have been very seriously tarnished and unfortunately seem devoid of the kind of idealism that is expected of the United States abroad and by the American people. Mr. Kissinger's policy is dominated by his over-all view of the world, of the basic relationship between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the United States and its European allies, and the United States and Japan. He has from time to time alienated our European allies by failing to counsel with them or advise them in advance as was the case during the October 1973 Middle Eastern crisis. He has also deeply offended the Japa- nese on occasion. Basically Mr. Kissinger believes that the Russians are constantly watching the United States for signs of a weakening in the U.S. resolve to meet its obligations, particularly where the commitment of U.S. forces would be involved. Consequently, Mr. Kissinger has found himself maintaining the status quo even if such a posture would require ignoring basic hu- manitarian values. Mr. Kissinger's relations with Congress are worsening, and yet if the legislative and executive branches of the government are to work together in forming an effective national foreign policy of a consensus nature, the Congress will have to respect the Secretar y of State. Unfortunately Mr. Kissinger has shown a certain high-handedness in dealing with Congress as well as a marked preference for working under circumstances to that which would be required if Congress is to maintain a strong role in formulating basic U.S. foreign policy.

LONDON, May 12: Two questions are posed by Europeans in the wake of the U.S. withdrawal from Indochina. What will the United States do in the future vis-a-vis its commitments to its allies in Eu- rope, and will Mr. Kissinger remain in office throughout the balance of Presi- dent Ford's term?

It is ironical how strong the European reaction has been to the events of the past several weeks in Cambodia and Vietnam - ironical because during the long U.S. involvement in that area there had not only been a singular lack of material and moral support from its Eu- ropean allies but moreover there had also been sharp criticism and rebuke of the U.S. effort. Now that the United States has done, in fact, done what was for so long advocated, however, those same European allies are directly and in- directly stating that the United States has abandoned South Vietnam or at least has failed to support its allies and it has shirked its moral responsibilities, not only to the government of Saigon, but to those many thousands of South Viet- namese who supported U.S. programs and policies and who were not able to be evacuated during the dramatic war's end rescue operations. The Europeans now realize once again how very much they must look to the United States.

Public opinion polls abroad only two years ago showed that Mr. Kissinger was the most popular American in the eyes of the European peoples. But his image of Captain Marvel, one able to "single-handedly" resolve some of the most knotty problems confronting mankind, has now been very badly tarnished. Many of the people with whom I speak are concerned that, should Kissinger re- main in office, American diplomacy dur- ing the next two years will suffer because of a lack of unity and idealism. I have tried to reassure my friends that America will not turn its back on the world and that the withdrawal from Indochina does not suggest that it will. President Nixon made it plain upon gaining office in 1969 that he intended fully to disengage American forces from that area at the earliest possible opportu- nity consistent with an honorable peace, including the return of all Ameri- can prisoners of war. It is plain from everything that Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon have done over the period 1969-1973 that both were concerned with the credi- bility of the United States worldwide as a result of the ultimate disengagement that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger knew was unavoidable. Unfortunately, the U.S. efforts to strengthen the South Viet- namese to stand independently even in the face of future aggression from the north were unsuccessful and were doomed to be unsuccessful from the start since President Nixon was unable to fulfill his promises to President Thieu and his government to use force if neces- sary to ensure the Peace Accords of January 1973. But at no time have Mr. Kissinger or Mr. Nixon, and now President Ford, failed to restate firmly and precisely that the United States would honor its commitment worldwide.

The United States is making this plain its real or potential adversaries who- ever they may be and wherever they may be. The United States has, in fact, already had its first test in this regard, when it had to apply force against the Cambodian government for its seizure of the American merchant ship Mayaguez. Perhaps this provocative act by the Cambodian government was one designed to test the will of the United States at this particularly delicate time. Perhaps there will be other probes in other places to do the same. I have assured my European colleagues that the United States will react to any provocative and aggressive acts in a decisive, immediate and effective manner.

Vis-a-vis Mr. Kissinger, notwithstanding his recently avowed intention to stay in office for the benefit of the country and the world, it is difficult to foresee his staying on the scene too much longer. All of his policies have unfortunately resulted in failure or have been very seriously tarnished and unfortunately seem devoid of the kind of idealism that is expected of the United States abroad and by the American people. Mr. Kissinger's policy is dominated by his over-all view of the world, of the basic relationship between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the United States and its European allies, and the United States and Japan. He has from time to time alienated our European allies by failing to counsel with them or advise them in advance as was the case during the October 1973 Middle Eastern crisis. He has also deeply offended the Japanese on occasion. Basically Mr. Kissinger believes that the Russians are constantly watching the United States for signs of a weakening in the U.S. resolve to meet its obligations, particularly where the commitment of U.S. forces would be involved. Consequently, Mr. Kissinger has found himself maintaining the status quo even if such a posture would require ignoring basic human values.

Dr. El-Enany, that the major role that Kissinger had played in bringing about the initial dis- engagement pact between the Israeli- Egyptian forces and the Israeli-Syrian forces was that of the admired and re- trusted by all parties - this being par- ticularly important as both Egypt and Syria could not and would not talk to Arab leaders during his confer- ences with the Israelis at a time when he was treated with respect, admiration and trust by the leaders of the Arab nations, it is difficult to see how Mr. Kissinger could justify that course of action of any value in future negotiations along the lines of the past. This would be par- ticularly sed since both President Sadat and Prime Minister Rabin have sug- gested on several occasions since the col- lapse of the last round of talks that they would still welcome new initiatives by the United States and Mr. Kissinger.

In addition to the foregoing it seems that Mr. Kissinger, even if he should remain in office, will have to make the independent and all-powerful position in foreign policy matters that he has had for almost three years. President Ford will meet with President Sadat in Salzburg early next month and will probably meet also with Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. Kissinger is meanwhile making additional plans with members of President Ford's White House staff, many of whom feel he should not be allowed to dominate both the National Security Council and the State Department.
Interview With Moshe Kol

W e're visiting with Minister Moshe Kol, Minister of Tourism for Israel. We want to ask a few questions about the current situation in the Middle East, but we'll start with the tourism picture.

Has the current Middle East situation hurt Israel's tourist income, and under the current conditions, would this summer be a good time for Americans to visit Israel?

KOL: The decline in tourism during 1974 was only 6 percent worldwide and 10 percent from the U.S. I think the economic situation there, inflation, and the Middle East tensions have all contributed to this decline. But we have enjoyed an increase of 11 percent in Canadian tourists, and increases from Australia, Argentina, and South Africa. The decline from Europe was very small, so the situation is not bad at all.

I'm sure this summer will be a safe time to visit Israel. I don't expect any war this year, even though there are the constant threats and speeches. We are even now discussing the possibility of holding the Geneva Conference meetings this summer.

GTA: So you expect that as long as both sides are hoping to negotiate at Geneva there won't be any renewed hostilities?

KOL: After the Secretary of State's mediation was interrupted, there were two possibilities — either he would try to renew the negotiations (and I don't see how that can happen) or the Geneva Conference would convene. If the Geneva Conference convenes, we will have debates and maybe even hot discussions, but I don't believe we'll have hot shooting!

GTA: What about the position of the Israeli government vis-a-vis the Palestinian Liberation Organization? The PLO insists on going to Geneva and being part of the talks.

KOL: The Israeli government will not negotiate with the PLO, because the PLO program means the destruction of the state of Israel. This is their stated program. We are ready to talk to Palestinians about the "Palestinian problem," but the PLO was not elected by the Palestinians to represent them.

King Hussein's idea of a Palestinian-Jordanian Federation was a very good idea. Today, King Hussein is out of the picture, after the Rabat conference, but maybe the Arab leaders will ask him to come back into the picture after they realize we are not ready to negotiate with the PLO.

The PLO must give up their terrorism. Israel will not negotiate with anybody under the threat of terror. We will not negotiate with the PLO for we know the Palestinian people to be moderate people in general, although their leadership is very negative.

The Geneva conference is important, and the Palestinian problem is important. We must find constructive solutions to the problem. The Palestinian people are entitled to such a solution, but not with the PLO.

GTA: After the assassination of King Faisal, his brother released a statement through the Ministry of Information of Saudi Arabia that his policies would be about identical to those of his brother. This included the fervent desire to pray someday in the Old City at the Dome of the Rock. This means the Saudi Arabian people still hope to someday possess the holy places for the Muslim religion. Isn't Jerusalem itself very crucial to a solution in the Middle East?

KOL: Jerusalem will never be divided again. There is no reason to divide it. It is a peaceful city. Jews and Arabs are living together, working together, conducting business together. It's open to people from all religions. As I said when I was in New York, I was ready to give a very nice welcome to King Faisal if he came to pray at the mosque, but if King Faisal wanted to come here only when Jews will not be here, then he could never achieve, never realize, this dream.

And I can say the same about King Khaled.

In 1974, we had 125,000 Arab visitors coming here. They traveled all over Israel, with no limitations. I don't know of any such example elsewhere in the world. They are people from "enemy countries," who are speaking about the destruction of Israel, yet they are permitted to go everywhere to see and enjoy Israel. They could pray in the Al-Aksa mosque or the Dome of the Rock, if they so chose. Jerusalem is open. It was never so open to people of all religions as it is now.

GTA: Why is this not widely known?

KOL: I don't think it has any influence on Israel's relationships with the Western powers. I don't think the politics in the Western world are influenced now by religious orders. I would like religious principles to have more influence, I am sorry that the politicians of today are not religiously minded when they are discussing the problems of the world.

Flashing the 1974 Holy Year, so that millions of them could come to Rome to continue to Jerusalen also, The Pope was very complimentary, and we agreed that the Vatican would encourage the people who come to Rome to continue to Jerusalem. Two thousand years ago, these two cities were at war. Now we are in very peaceful coexistence.

GTA: Do you feel that increased Catholic-Jewish dialogue is going to support Israel's position in the predominately Catholic European powers?

KOL: I don't think it has any influence on Israel's relationships with the Western powers. I don't think the politics in the Western world are influenced now by religious orders. I would like religious principles to have more influence, I am sorry that the politicians of today are not religiously minded when they are discussing the problems of the world.

Tb ,i's could very much " help til bUild . a better world: After all, we are living in a crazy world now.

The Western world is again going in the direction of appeasement vis-a-vis the Arab leaders, because of oil. Your President said only a few days ago that if there would be war, there would be another boycott of oil. I think it is not a good policy to keep appealing to the Arab leaders, the leaders of the desert, that they can really dictate to the world how to live. I believe that we have to govern the world by humanitarian principles among leaders. In 1974, Yasser Arafat appeared in the U.N. with a gun, and he got a standing ovation; it's very shocking! But Israel is not Czechoslovakia, and Israel will not yield its sovereignty.

The Middle East can be the most flourishing area in the world, not only because of the great cultures of the world were created here, but also because of its future potential.

We don't want any more "victories," because we don't want any more wars. We don't want to kill Arabs, and we don't want our boys to be killed. If we are to work for peace and a better life, we have to be inspired by the principles of religion, the great principles of God.
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Hire Your Own Hip-Pocket God
by Ron Horswell

King David, in rather desperate straits, once implored God to break the teeth of his enemies, cut them to pieces, and sweep them away in innumerable ventures, both business and military, even to the point of sanctifying both sides of a war at the same time.

The British labored under the "white man's burden." The French, a "civilizing mission." We Americans sweated to fulfill our "manifest destiny" as chosen pawns of God's holy will. Granted, we "pawed" the Indians. We got cheap land, cheap resources and cheap labor, but what a small price for the heathen to pay in exchange for the torch of freedom, the light of Christianity, and a little firewater thrown in on the side.

Pious imperialists have always seen the advantage of comparing themselves to Israel of old. God, if you recall, gave ancient Israel, upon entering Canaan, carte blanche to conquer, exterminate, and occupy.

At Senator Albert Beveridge put it "about the time America was getting em-pire hungry: "God has not been pre-paring the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing.... He has made us the master organizers of the world to estab-lish a system where chaos reigns.... He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples.... And of all our race he has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world."

How selfless! How noble! How conve-nient!

Once having "Israelized" yourself, all you need is a contemporary Canaanite — a foe you can bill as pagan or atheistic or degenerate, a foe obviously and blan-tantly aligned with the minions of evil, a foe to be smashed with divine ven-geance or conquered with divine mercy.

Of course, we Americans weren't the only ones smart enough to employ God. After all, whom do you think Napoleon, Mussolini, and Hitler claimed as a backer? The Devil!

Hitler believed and convinced others that the hope of the world lay with the Aryan race. Doth not nature herself preach the clear doctrine of Aryan supe-riority? To pollute the Aryan race meant (quoting Mein Kampf) "nothing less than sinning against the will of the Eter-nal Creator."

Hitler, like so many others, got his will mixed up with God's. God was em-ployed. And somewhere, somehow, by some-one, God is no doubt still being em-ployed.

Yet it seems doubtful that the Creator is a "Kelly God," out for odd-job hire, to scare those who need scaring, to con-vince those who need convincing, or to brand those who need branding.

For some reason, it's been hard for us humans to distinguish between seeking God's will and seeking our own will in His name. Surely there is some-one kneeling right now in heartfelt prayer:

Our Father who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, My Kingdom Come. My will be done, on earth, But endorsed in heaven.

Week ending June 7, 1975

Nudity in Church
by J. G. Calanda

The latest development in church li-turgy is to be an explosive com-bination of sex and spirituality, reminiscent of the good old Bible days. In East Lansing, Michigan, the Uni-terarian Universalist Church has begun showing porne flicks to raise money. Early reports show that the featured movies — "Love and the French Woman" and "Seven Short Sexy Sto-ries" — are attracting far more viewers than last year's hoary Disney films and far more money than bingo callers ever dreamed of.

Meanwhile, down in the Bible Belt, the First Unitarian Church of Richard-son, Texas, has spurned celluloid in fa-vor of firsthand female flesh. They've have their own stripper.

The Richardson congregation was recently graced with a divine revelation named Diana King, who graciously do-nated her time and talent to do on Sun-day morning what she does for a living on Saturday night.

Needless to say, the audience was ec-static. According to the pastor, Bill Nichols, 200 adults members-and their children watched in "fascinated silence" as Diana did (or undid) her bit. (One wonders if the church members nor-mally sit through services in such "fasci-nated silence.") Mr. Nichols commented, "I haven't had our com-plaint. I feel like exotic dancing is a part of life. It fits very well into our service."

Diana herself waxed eloquent on the cosmic joys of laying the truth bare. "I create a fantasy. I turn people on. I really felt good. It's hard to articulate how you're expressing things in church this way.... It's affirming nature and love."

According to Diana, even bigger pro-ductions are in the offing. "I would like to do a sermon using the exotic dance, and members of the congregation could join me if they wished."

What an interesting, even arousing, idea. Furthermore it would be oh so biblical! Just think, members of the con-gregation could join in, take off their clothes, and "rise up to play" just like the ancient Israelites (Exodus 32:6). If the church budget could stand it, they could even choreograph the exotic dancers around a golden calf. What spiritu-ality! There's no limit to the series of Passion Plays that could be built around the Bible. After all, doesn't the apostle Paul point us back to the ancient Israel-ites — swinging desert nomads that they were — for our examples (see 1 Corinthians 10:6)?

Speaking of Corinthians, a permiscuous pastor would be extremely biblical if he tried running his church the way the Corinthians did — fornication and all. The Greek verb "to Corinthian-ize" meant "to prostitute oneself." How sub-lime. How spiritual. How sexy.

The Bible is, after all, a pretty sexy book, in places. The key is to pick the right places — and ignore the rest.

Diana King and Bill Nichols have ob-viously pioneered a new concept in American religion. Many listless congre-gations desperately need to be "turned on" to religion. Consequently, adding sex to religion holds immense potential for lighting the revival flame.

Yes, the clock can be moved back to "that old time religion," back to "Bible times" — like Sodom and Gomor-rith.
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During the crucial oil negotiations in Teheran in 1971, the U.S. State Department committed a key tactical blunder. It chose to deal with the oil-producing countries (known as OPEC) as a group, rather than individually. This forced a hitherto squabbling collection of divided oilftions to harden into a powerful commodity cartel.

This miscalculation was to have a devastating effect on the world economy two years hence. Just following the Yom Kippur war in 1973, OPEC’s new-found bargaining power pushed the price of oil beyond $11 per barrel, a four-fold increase which entailed a massive hemorrhage of money from Western oil-consuming countries.

Industrial nations such as Britain and Italy almost went bankrupt trying to pay for their oil. Small developing states such as India and Bangladesh found it impossible to afford oil at all.

Many changes in vocabulary ensued as a result of the great oil robbery. Before 1973, “petrodollars” were unknown, and “recycling” was something we did with old beer cases and Coke bottles. Now, recycling refers to money from the Arabian Desert, and those monies (about $60 billion per year) have earned the chic sobriquet “petrodollars.”

**Petroleum Poker**

With a little imagination and a disconcerting degree of truth, we can liken the whole situation to a poker game. Imagine, if you would, the world’s nations gathered around a poker table stacked high with chips.

In one corner, members of the OPEC countries are raking in $100 billion per year in winnings, based upon their “ace in the hole” (also known as oil in the well).

Certain overly populous and less-developed OPEC members, such as Nigeria and Indonesia, have little trouble finding ways to spend their share of the loot at home. Meanwhile, the Midwest members are busily replacing sand dunes with skyscrapers in an orgy of conspicuous consumption.

Out of their $100 billion, however, they can only spend about $40 billion. At the poker table, that’s analogous to recycling $40 billion of the next poker hand, while the other $60 billion is drained out of the game.

For the most part, that troublesome $60 billion (called “petrodollars”) has been sloshing through the bank pipelines of Europe and the United States like a rich man’s allowance, with little to no interest rate and good credit risks. This sort of gentleman’s agreement is better than hiding the money under camel saddles, but it’s far from ideal.

Everyone (but OPEC) is losing the game of petroleum poker. The real problem is that only a few “losers” are allowed to play under-the-table poker with the $60 billion of surplus “petrodollars.” In other words, the under-the-table stakes are so high that it won’t be too long before some of the players have to drop out of the game.

**The Fourth World Folds**

The first nations to be forced from the table will certainly be those nations known as the “Fourth World” — a handful of Asian and African countries that are the earth’s poorest credit risks.

For example, to call Bangladesh “poor” would be a complimentary understatement. It hasn’t had a winning hand since it emerged as a nation in 1972. The people of Bangladesh don’t use much oil — perhaps four gallons per person each year (as compared to several hundred gallons per person in the industrialized West) — but every drop of oil flowing into Bangladesh is vitally needed. At four gallons per person, little gasoline will be wasted cruising Dacca’s main drag.

In 1972 Bangladesh’s oil bill was $25 million, but by 1980 it could be ten times that much. This may not seem like much in our trillion-dollar economy, but it’s a lot to them. They don’t have computers or F-111’s to sell in exchange for oil. They have precious little to sell at all. Hence the need for “recycling petrodollars.” In their case, “recycling” means finding some way of channeling to Bangladesh and other losers some part of the $60 billion flowing around under the table.

**Former Winners Now Losers**

At the industrial end of the table, things aren’t all rosy either. Certain “have” nations are also losing their shirts. The outlook for some such nations is economic depression. Unfortunately, economic depression in one major industrial nation (such as Italy or Britain) could easily ripple through the other industrialized nations.

In the first year of wallet-witling oil prices, the international banking system did a much better job of recycling these petrodollars than many thought it could, but every day the surplus grows, it becomes clearer and clearer that the present-day semi-official arrangements can’t hold up indefinitely.

Given the current status quo, it seems certain that in the coming months, some players will be forced to drop out of the game. Whether they’ll fold with a whimper or make an international bang can’t now be foreseen. What we can be sure of is that whoever is forced out of the game will definitely be a “loser.”

**Turning the Tables**

What’s really needed is for the poker table to be turned into a conference table. Theoretically, such a transformation is no problem — just reshape the table, make a new sign on the door, remove the visors, stash the chips, and bring out the business dossier — but actually begin cooperating is another matter.

Take, for example, the recent diplomatic efforts in Paris. Ten nations, representing the Industrial World, OPEC, and the Fourth World — got together, hoping to be able to cooperate on preparations for a future major conference between oil producers and consumers. For all they accomplished, they might as well have met in a casino in Monte Carlo.

What’s needed is economic cooperation such as the Free World enjoyed immediately following World War II. Today, however, everyone wants to win the pot, not split it. Nations today seem to prefer all-out, winner-take-all gambling to the teamwork and cooperation needed to forge world peace and productivity.

As for the future, we’ll probably see some adroit betting, a lot of bluffing, no more raises (of oil prices), and quite likely a few catastrophic “folds.” We may even witness some auspicious “side bets” between two table powers, to the exclusion of all others.

With this, our analogy must end. International economies can be explained in many ways — and this poker game analogy certainly isn’t the most accurate way of reducing high finance to lay terms — but it serves to introduce a further key to understanding petrodollars, a key which most economists ignore.

**Prophecy and Petrodollars**

Until 1974, when the oil producing nations raked in a record trade surplus of $97 billion, Daniel 11:43 couldn’t be readily understood. This amazing prophecy speaks of a time when “treasures of gold and silver” would exist in the Mideast area.

Up until 1974, the Arab states could hardly be considered “wealthy” in terms of gold and other foreign exchange. Their present wealth, however, now approaches statistical absurdity. For instance, one year’s petrodollar surplus could buy out the entire U.S. farm crop.

If the current OPEC income were extrapolated into the next century, the oil "producers would own all the wealth of the world.

Let this sound too absurd, many respected economists have pointed out that the current mammoth transfer of money means not only that bookkeeping credits and paper currencies will change hands, but also that real wealth — land, gold, factories, corporations — will also fall into Arab hands in the near future.

This has further prophetic implications. In Daniel’s words, a “king of the north” would eventually take control of these Mideastern “treasures.” As Arab money accumulates in European banks, it becomes vulnerable to power of the European powers become so inclined.

The “king of the north” in biblical history represents the ancient Roman Empire. The modern counterpart of that king would also represent the same basic geographical area controlled by the Roman Empire.

Consequently, an autocratic leader of a future United Europe could fulfill the prophecy of Daniel 11:43, “But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt...” To fulfill this prophecy, the “king of the north” would now need to expropriate the petrowealth in European banks.

As Arab wealth mounts, there will be an overwhelming temptation for a leader of a future Europe to nationalize this huge pool of money. The result could be “justified” by recalling that many of the Arab oil states acquired their wealth by nationalizing foreign oil companies on the spot.

Petrodollars have possibly become the key ingredient to Daniel’s long-shrouded prophecy. Not only have they awakened European interest in the Mid-east, they have also increased tension to the point where the following is a future possibility.

“And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him, and the king of the north shall come against him, one on his side, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships...”

“He shall enter also into the glorious land... (modern-day Israel) (Daniel 11:40-41).

The Arab petrocratic crisis is a very recent development, only 20 months old as of this Jane, yet it may serve as a prime mover of the biblical “end times,” and an important catalyst toward fulfilling all of Bible prophecy.
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It is the prerogative of God alone to determine what is right and what is sin - what is good and what is evil. God has not delegated this power to decide what is sin - but he compels us to decide whether to sin, or to obey his law.

To rightly determine what is good required the creative power to produce and set aside such ineradicable Laws as this spiritual law and the laws of physics and chemistry - a law which automatically causes good if obeyed and evil if transgressed.

Adam and Eve had only God’s word that they were mortal and could die. Now man disputed this. He said they were IMMORTAL SOULS.
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Test your Bible knowledge.

1. Heaven is the reward of the saved  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
2. Jesus was resurrected on Easter Sunday  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
3. The King James Version is the original Bible text  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
4. Dead sinners suffer for eternity in the fires of hell  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
5. Bible prophecies are found only in the Old Testament  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
6. Man has an immortal soul which leaves the body at death  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
7. A “Christian” is any person who professes belief in Christ  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
8. Jesus was born on Christmas Day  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
9. Jesus’ Olivet Prophecy was all fulfilled in 70 A.D.  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE
10. God is a Trinity  [ ] TRUE [ ] FALSE

The answers to the above statements may surprise you! The Bible is full of surprises. So is the Good News magazine because it makes Bible teaching plain — easily understood. Full color. Mailed monthly.
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