The Passing of Europe's Old Guard
WHY DO some religious people feel that their religious life must be one of giving up all the fun and enjoyment of living—that in order to please God, they must endure a life of morbid gloom? As a boy I was brought up in a respectable Protestant church of traditional Christianity. I never did know very much, as a boy, about what the church believed—but I did know that it regarded sin as violating their many don’ts: don’t smoke, don’t dance, don’t play cards, don’t go to the theater, don’t drink, drop of wine, don’t do this, don’t do that.

A world-famous philosopher, editor, and lecturer whom I knew said he had no desire to live a life of Christian re- 

WEEK ENDING DECEMBER 6, 1975

I never did know very much, as a boy, about what the church believed—but I did know that it regarded sin as violating their many don’ts: don’t smoke, don’t dance, don’t play cards, don’t go to the theater, don’t drink, drop of wine, don’t do this, don’t do that.

A world-famous philosopher, editor, and lecturer whom I knew said he had no desire to live a life of Christian re-

Meanwhile a lot of people have received a lot of weird and false ideas about Jesus Christ—I mean the Jesus of your Bible. Actually, I think almost no one knows what the Bible says about Him. It seems most people think sin is the thing that is best for us, but which a stern, wrathful God denies us. Some years ago a little book was selling big on Hollywood newsstands. It was titled How To Sin In Hollywood. It was brought up in a re-
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Why don’t people know that God our Creator has never forbidden us a single thing that is good for us—never said ‘don’t’ about a single thing except that which is good for us to our own hurt. What God does command us not to do are the very things that bring on unhappiness, frustration, pain, suffering, and a life of morbid gloom.

Let’s get this matter straight. The real Jesus Christ said He came to bring you happiness and joy! Jesus said, “I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly!” And He came that we might enjoy full abun-
dant life eternally. God Almighty intended the real Christian life to be happy. Jesus said, “My joy I leave with you!”

There is a way of life that causes peace, happiness, and joy. God the great Creator set that way as an inexorable law— an invisible spiritual law—to produce peace, happiness, joy, abun-
dance! There is a cause for every effect. In this unhappy confused world we have discontentment, unhappiness, wretchedness, suffering. The world is full of that. It should be full of peace, happiness, and joy. There’s a cause. People don’t like God’s law. That law is the cause of peace and everything desirable and good. People want everything that is good and desirable. They just don’t want to obey that which would cause it! They want to be right, but they don’t want to do right.

Christ came to call people to repent. Repent of what? Repent of causing unhappiness, strife, war, and pain—and then to receive the gift of the holy spirit. And what kind of results will the spirit of God produce in you?

If you tell us, first, what it won’t produce. It won’t produce the morbid, unhappy, painful, gloomy life that many think is the Christian life. Let the Bible tell you what ‘fruit’ it will produce in you. “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law” (Galatians 5:22-23).

Look at that more closely: ‘the fruit of the spirit’—this is the spirit of God. This is the holy spirit that God imparts only to those who have repented—that is, turned from that which has caused unhappiness, morbid gloom, discouragement, frustration, despair. On the contrary, that fruit of the spirit is first of all love. And the second fruit is joy! Joy is happiness brimming over and running. That doesn’t sound like an unhappy, empty, gloomy life, does it? And God’s spirit is not static. It flows. It flows spontaneously from God into and through you, and out from you making still others happy and joyful.

The very first result produced in your life by God’s spirit is love. Love is a rightous love of and for others. It will mean your face is beaming. It’s an outgoing concern for the good and welfare of others. It will mean that you are really giving out—that you are radi-

ant and happy. And love results in joy—that’s the second of these fruits. The third is peace. Instead of an attitude of hostility, instead of going around quarreling, being resentful and bitter, angry, and arguing, you’ll be in an attitude of peace—peace in your mind and with your neighbor and with your God.

Next comes ‘longsuffering.’ That means patience. How much has impa-

tience made you unhappy? Probably impatience makes more people unhappy than almost anything else! If you can really come to have patience, you’ll be acquiring one of the things that will make you happy and make life worth living.

Then next is gentleness. That makes others happy and automatically adds to your happiness. And then goodness and faith! Faith is confidence—not self-confidence, but reliance on the super-

me power. It means that the sup-

reme power of God is working for you. It means reassurance. It means assured hope instead of doubt, fear, discour-

agement. If you could evaluate in dollars what all these tremendous benefits mean in your life, you’d have to put on them a value of millions and millions of dollars. But these are benefits you can’t buy. God simply wants to give them to you. What they cost you is repenting of that which has been producing unhappi-

ness, pain and suffering, discouragement and frustration. It’s a tremendous bar-

gain! That is the fruit of God’s spirit that will spontaneously spring forth from you, radiate from you and cause you to be a joy to others, as well as to yourself.

Now this is not to say that there are never troubles in the Christian life. Far from it. There will be persecutions. Jesus Christ was persecuted. He said, “If they have persecuted me, they will per-

secute you.” That comes from without. But unhappiness is something that springs from within. Happiness is a state of mind; happiness is within.

And the person who does have this inner peace—this joy, this patience and love, and absence of resentment and bit-

erness—isn’t going to be anywhere, near as disturbed and unhappy as when he didn’t have them. You’ll always face problems—but you’ll have faith and God’s help in solving them. But prob-

lems and tests of faith are good for us—the very building blocks of perfect spiri-

tual character.

I know that the Bible says: “Many are the afflictions of the righteous,” but the same scripture adds, “but the Eternal
delivereth him out of them all” (Psalm 34:19).

It’s true Jesus was “a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.” It’s true He suffered—He knew what suffering is. But His suffering and grief was not caused by pain others inflicted on Him—not from resentment, or being hurt by others—but by His love for others. He suffered because they were bringing so much suffering on themselves. But He also was a man of boundless joy, and He said, “My joy I leave with you.”

Yes, He said, “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly!” (John 10:10).
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ABUNDANT LIVING
"RICH NATIONS" SUMMIT: PROMISES HARD TO KEEP
The heads of state of six industrial powers met near Paris to discuss the troubled world economy. They reached few conclusions.

CHINA DISCOVERS OIL POWER
The "Sheiks of the East" have discovered that the presence of oil may bring unexpected economic and geopolitical benefits.

FOOD FACTS AND FALLACIES
Supermarket prices will never be as low as they once were, despite ten common fallacies people ascribe to food finances.

A HOLLOW VICTORY FOR DR. KISSINGER
Will the sacking of Defense Secretary Schlesinger backfire in Mr. Ford's face? Columnist Stanley R. Rader analyzes the controversial move.

THE U.N. AT 30
The venerable world body celebrated its thirtieth anniversary with one of the most despicable acts of its tainted history.

WHEN THE OIL RUNS OUT...
Our reporters conducted in-depth interviews and did research into the "forgotten crisis"—energy. They found that the problem did not magically disappear, as some thought it would.

WOMEN'S LIB '75: MODERATES VS. MARXISTS
Moderate feminists who have been mis-merized by the radical rhetoric of the Marxist fringe should begin to disown their more vocal sisters.

GARNER TED ARMSTRONG SPEAKS OUT!
The United Nations censure of Zionism is yet another sign that "the way of peace they know not" (Isaiah 59:8).

LONDON: The Franco era in Spain is over. And with its passing undoubtedly will also pass Spain's relative tranquility of the last three and a half decades.

Changes must take place soon in other countries ruled by aging patriarchal leaders. The future of Yugoslavia after Tito is uncertain. The country has long borne the intimate stamp of his own personality. Moreover, the uncertain health of the U.S.R.'s Leonid Brezhnev and his impending retirement cast a greater shadow over the whole of Europe. Will his successor follow the path of détente or will he choose a policy of more aggressive and violent exploitation of the West's "crisis of capitalism"?

Juan Carlos' Thankless Task
General Franco's successor, King Juan Carlos I, is faced with the thankless task of heading off dissent and possible revolution in the country. Realizing that the most important pillar of Spanish society is the army, the new King has tried assiduously to curry support from its ranks.

The support of the army will be especially important in assuring an orderly and peaceful transition from the authoritarian style of Franco to a perhaps more democratic style under Juan Carlos. Recently Spain has been rocked by shootings and bombings by urban guerrillas wanting greater political freedom and separation. In the twilight of his rule, Franco earned the odium of left-wing supporters around the world by the execution of five men responsible for police assassinations.

If Spain's new leader is to rely on the army, he will find it no solid pillar of strength. According to recent reports by exiles, as many as a thousand officers support the popular front of the democratic junta comprising communists, socialists and Christian Democrats.

Juan Carlos is therefore faced with the difficult task of maintaining national unity in Spain, while bringing the country slowly closer to the mainstream of the European democratic tradition. The freezing of political freedoms for Spaniards will require a great deal of astute and wise leadership. In the coming months and years, as this political evolution takes place, it will become clearer whether Spain will take its place as an aspiring member of the European Community, remain a semi-isolated, ethnic state, or drift under Soviet influence should presently outlawed communists rise up in strength.

Yugoslavia: Will Collective Scheme Work?
Ever since the days when Tito's name came to the fore as a resistance fighter against the Nazis, he has towered head and shoulders in political stature above any of his rivals. The 73-year-old communist leader has been the mainstay, which has held together the crazy-quilt federalation of differing nationalities, languages, and religions—even alphabets—which is Yugoslavia.

Numerous purges of aspiring politicians during the years have meant that there is no heir apparent to Tito. Instead he has engineered a new constitution which degrades that, after his departure, power will pass to a collective council with members drawn from the constituent regions of Yugoslavia.

Some observers feel the shared authorship plan is a recipe for disaster. They believe that the Soviet Union will attempt to drive a wedge between nationalist factions of the federation, with the object of bringing all or part of Yugoslavia back into the Moscow orbit, from which she was expelled in 1948.

Of course, such activity would be in clear violation of the principles of the European Security Conference. Nevertheless, a Soviet-controlled corridor through Yugoslavia would realize the centuries-old Russian dream of a door-way on the Mediterranean Sea. Soviet naval bases on the Adriatic would shake the foundations of NATO and put the democracies of Italy, Greece and Turkey in grave danger.

Brezhnev—Stepdown Believed Near
It has been apparent that for some time General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev has been suffering from some type of sickness—perhaps cancer. His retirement from public affairs is expected in the next few months. The possible change of leadership could not have come at a more critical period for the West. For, at the moment, the Kremlin seems divided among itself as to the best policy to follow.

There are those who argue that the Soviet Union, needing a prolonged infusion of Western technology in order to attain a position of world industrial domination, will continue its program of cooperation with capitalist powers. Others maintain now is the time for Moscow to exploit divisions in the West, while it is still being at an economic recession. Recent pronouncements in the Soviet press have reminded Communist Party leaders in Western Europe that revolution, not parliamentary processes, is the way to political power. Should this militant faction gain control in the Soviet leadership, it would destroy the policy of détente and return the world to Cold War confrontation.

Of considerable bearing on this are relations between the U.S.S.R. and China in the post-Mao, post-Chou En-lai period. It's no secret that Moscow would like to see new leadership in Peking that could eventually agree to some form of rapprochement between the two powers.

One thing is clear. When one looks at the "old guard" in several key countries, major changes—as in Franco's case—may only be a heartbeat away.
Double Digit Inflation—In Crime!

While their worries over the economy have slackened a bit in the last few months, Americans are not about to enjoy any relief from the wave of crime and violence—clipping along at double-digit increases.

According to the latest FBI crime report, the 1974 increase was the largest yearly jump in U.S. history—a whopping 18% over 1973. Police reported over 10.1 million serious crimes for the year—four times as many as reported only ten years ago!

One of the biggest surprises in the annual survey was the 20% increase for 1974 in suburban and rural crime, while cities of over 250,000 population registered "only" a 12% increase.

Another surprise was the rapidly increasing involvement of women in crime. Arrests of women since 1960 have increased almost 110%; arrests of males in the same period rose 24%.

The "crime clock" shows that, nationwide, there is a murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, or other theft every three seconds. And since it has been clearly demonstrated that much more crime—from two to five tithes in some categories—goes unreported than enters into official statistics, an average of one serious crime every second is probably much closer to reality.

So much for the criminals. What of the victims?

A Justice Department crime survey showed there were 37 million victims of crime in America in 1973. Other studies have demonstrated that astounding numbers of Americans do not think it is worthwhile to report they have been the victims of criminal attacks.

Arrest odds demonstrate that crime pays. Following the average of the past several years, only 21% of serious crimes were "cleared" by arrest in 1974.

... for the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence.

—Ezekiel 7:23

Many of the nation's leading criminal justice officials met recently in Washington, D.C. Most doubted that merely more police and better courts and prisons would significantly reduce crime rates. Only a change in society's moral values will, they agreed. And these values, most felt, must be based first on family cohesion, love, and instruction in self-discipline. These character traits must be further supported by the community, the church, and the schools.

Glenn D. King, executive director of the National Association of Chiefs of Police, said at this meeting: "At the present time there is no effective deterrent to crime at all. In the past there was a social stigma attached to crime, but we don't see much of that attitude now."

• And so double-digit crime inflation may be here to stay. Already it is up 13% in the first half of 1975.

PROJECT POLARKA

YUGOSLAVIA—Potential Balkan Powder Keg

Upon the death of Yugoslav leader Marshal Tito, the Soviet Union launched a sudden massive invasion into Eastern Austria, using Czechoslovakian troops as a vanguard. After the occupation is consolidated comes the primary objective: the invasion of Yugoslavia and its reintegration into the Soviet bloc, from which it was expelled in 1948.

Thus runs the basic scenario for "Project Polarka," a detailed military blueprint developed by the Soviet high command in the late 1960s and exposed by Major General Jan Sejna, who defected from the Czechoslovakian military at the time of the Russian invasion in 1968.

At the time the "Polarka" project was revealed, the Soviet Union strenuously protested the publicity which the plan was given in the Western press. However, the Kremlin did not directly challenge the authenticity of Sejna's revelations.

Since that time the Helsinki Conference on European Security has been held, with its stated pledges of the "inviolability of frontiers." But many in the West feel that this principle is subject to widely varied interpretations.

The recent Soviet-East German "friendship" treaty, for example, has [Continued on page 4, col. 1]
China Discovers Oil Power

In an age when oil means power, communist China is in a big hurry to tap its newly discovered oil reserves and join the big league of oil producers. With a flurry of activity from the desolate stretches near the Soviet border to the South China Sea, China's backward oil industry is pressing hard to find, tap, refine, and sell its new-found treasure trove. Near Shangh hai, construction of an "oil city" for storing, processing, and tanker facilities goes on around the clock.

In the fifties, China was considered to be poor in oil reserves by Western geologists. From importing over 60% of its oil needs from Russia in those days, China has come to the place where she is now more than self-sufficient. With 1.2 million barrels a day in production, China is already second to Indonesia in Asian output. With sufficient Western technological help, some oil experts even feel China, by the early 1980s, could match the output of Saudi Arabia today.

China's suspected large deepwater oil pools almost certainly will require U.S. technology — and very likely help maintain the political "connection" to Washington.

Estimates of Chinese on- and offshore oil reserves vary widely. But even conservative estimates are staggering. Minimally they are at least as big as Alaska's North Slope. Other oil experts estimate potential reserves larger than those of the entire Middle East.

Geopolitical Leverage

Natural gas, the magic of black gold has awakened the Chinese leadership to economic and political potentials that were otherwise elusive. Suddenly a new great leap forward toward industrialization is possible. Such expanded oil production formed the basis for Chou En-lai's pledge in January to move the Chinese economy "into the front ranks of the world" by 1990.

China's present oil needs, while growing, are not huge (80% of its energy comes from coal). This leaves rapidly expanding oil production for exports which Chinese leaders realize is the quickest and least painful way for Peking to solve its vexing shortage of foreign exchange.

Already Chinese oil power is exercising significant leverage and influence on the world political scene. Japan eagerly absorbs the great majority of China's oil exports, though present export tonnages are still relatively small in relation to Japan's needs. But, as a result, Japan's Siberian oil that once was not as attractive to Tokyo as it once were.

China crude has been used to maintain leverage with North Korea and North Vietnam. Oil sales at special rates have greased diplomatic wheels with Moscow and Peking. For others, the Chinese ask what the traffic will bear — reaping OPEC benefits without incurring any limiting obligations.

Whether the new communist "Sheiks of the East" fully tap China's oil producing potential depends on a lot of vagaries: direction of the communist Chinese leadership in the years ahead, acceptance or rejection of major foreign technological assistance or mutual bilateral deals, and overall trade and political relations with the rest of the free world. All of these areas are still big question marks.

CHINA'S OIL PRODUCTION

(Continued from page 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Barrels per day</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soviet border to the South China Sea, China's "backyard" complete with refinery facilities goes on around the clock.

CHINA'S OIL PRODUCTION

Until 1949 was less than 100,000 tons (about 2,000 barrels a day) of crude oil. Subsequent production is shown in this graph, according to statistics provided by the Paris daily newspaper, Le Monde:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Barrels per day</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslav authorities are already alarmed over the possibility. The Tito government is now prosecuting a number of pro-Russian communists. Fearing that the Russians are trying to stir up division among Yugoslavia's diverse nationalities, authorities in Belgrade are also cracking down on leaders in the various republics and autonomous regions who stray too far from the concept of Yugoslav federalism.

Furthermore, guerrilla warfare classes are now being conducted in Yugoslavian schools. At the same time, Yugoslavia has speeded up construction of the new fighter-bomber it is building jointly with neighboring Romania, another maverick communist state. The pattern is clear: The Yugoslavs are preparing for the worst in the uncertain period which will evolve after the death of the aging Tito.

Frightened Europe

The shock of seeing Russian troops massed on the Yugoslav-Serb border would send shock waves throughout the rest of Western Europe. There would be outrages in certain quarters for free Europe to develop its own military defense system (probably relying on tactical nuclear weapons) as well as a crash program toward political union.

A Russian takeover of Yugoslavia would "break havoc on the alliance, under the strain of the events in Yugoslavia, as well as the Greek-Turkish troubles, "might well not survive," probably, the trend which would begin with the neutralization of Italy could continue unabated throughout Western Europe. Further governments would come to or stay in power in Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, and the Low Countries.

At this point, a violent reaction could set in. The same sort of leftist-tinted political chaos which prevailed in Europe in the 1930s could occur again. The time would be ripe for a "man on a white horse" to rally a flagging Western Europe back into line by promising "order" through a strong "European Union."

No Pushover

All of the above, of course, presumes the worst will happen — that the Soviet Union would try to take advantage of future developments in the Balkans and that the Yugoslavs themselves, could be easily divided and conquered. Perhaps in the present era of detente could occur again, with the Soviets needing security in the West and continued access to capitalist technology, no overt threats to Libyan, "providing" a wayward communist state would be attempted for some time. But the Balkans, almost by their very nature, seem to invite political adventurism. It was in Sarajevo, now capital of the Yugoslav republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, that the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand took place and touched off World War I. Keep your eye on Yugoslavia.
Rhodesia — Ten Years Later

SALISBURY, RHODESIA: The nation which British Prime Minister Harold Wilson said would be brought down "in a matter of weeks, rather than months" celebrated its 10th anniversary of independence on November 11.

A friendless nation, defying the world, firmly committed to principles other countries detest, Rhodesia has emerged with a stable government in a continent of coups, counter-coups, and revolutions.

Few Rhodesians envisioned the events that would follow their unilateral declaration of independence (U.D.I.) from Britain that Friday morning in 1965. Most expected a constitutional settlement over the weekend, with Rhodesia accepted as a Dominion within the British Commonwealth. But the British government would not back down on its insistence on a speedy path to black majority rule for the rebel colony.

If Harold Wilson, through the British appointment, Governor-General in Salisbury, had ordered the arrest of the rebel prime minister and his cabinet, the whole enterprise might have failed. While Wilson hesitated, Rhodesia consolidated.

Within weeks, Harold Wilson appeared at the U.N. urging all members to cease trading with the rebel government in Rhodesia. "Rhodesia is not a foreign country," said the prime minister, "it is the home of a civil war." The reasoning was clear: To talk to Rhodesia was to recognize it as a foreign power. The only hope was to isolate it.

The manufacturing sector grew in leaps and bounds following independence. As for goods became unavailable, enterprising Rhodesian businessmen produced their own versions. At first, these products were often inferior, but now they rank as top quality products anywhere in the world.

While Ford and BMC closed down their motor assembly plants due to a lack of spare parts, French and Italian companies opened new ones.

However, cars remain a luxury item. "We can't afford to buy grain," said a representative of a Rhodesian firm that produces fuel.

The hard-line terrorist faction, based in Lenasia, Zambia, is led by Bishop Abel Muzarowa. The moderate wing is led by Joshua Nkomo who presently has a strong popular following among the African population.

The three-year-old war against black terrorism is an increasing drain on the nation's economy. All white men between the ages of 18 and 50 are drafted into the security forces for a period of five weeks, two or three times a year. This practice is noticeably harming Rhodesia's economy and is leading to disillusionment and despair among many Rhodesians. A significant number of young whites, faced with a lifetime of military service, are leaving the country.

If Smith were to make a major concession to the blacks, there is now a good chance of a peaceful settlement and recognition from the community of nations. Once adamant about no power-sharing, the ruling Rhodesian Front is now talking openly of a mixed-race cabinet and the possibility of a black prime minister. Racial barriers are gradually being removed, and equal opportunity is being introduced.

Whatever the settlement, the whites believe they have earned a permanent place under the Rhodesian sun. Prime Minister Ian Smith has stressed he wants a society where "neither race dominates the other."

That's not an easy task in a country where blacks outnumber whites 22 to 1. But, after defying the world for ten years, Rhodesians are not about to surrender to the forces of black nationalism, terrorism, economic sanctions and ostracism by the world."

The reason we are buying wheat and corn from the United States is because of detente. Our leader Comrade Brezhnev is bringing peace to the world by accepting capitalist surplus food which we don't need. Detente is English means to buy grain."

"Comrade Teacher, why does the United States have a surplus of wheat and grain?"

"Because, you stupid Ivan, the United States has no five-year plan, and they grow more than they can eat. In Soviet Union we grow just enough food for everybody, so there is no waste. But the capitalists plant wheat and corn whether they need it or not."

"Why do they do this, Comrade Teacher?"

"It's simple. There is no state planning commission to tell them how much wheat and grain they can grow. In the Soviet Union we tell farmers how much wheat they should plant. The farmers don't grow a bushel more than what the state planning commission tells them. Now sit down and shut up, Ivan."

"But, Comrade Teacher, if the state planning commission tells them how much wheat they can grow, and they grow enough wheat for everyone, then what are we going to do with the American wheat?"

"Eat it, you Trotskyite. We are going to eat the American grain to prove to the United States that communism will get fat on capitalism's mistakes. Can we now discuss Sputnik?"

"Comrade Teacher, would it not be better to refuse to buy American wheat so they will be stuck with it and then they will have a depression and we can bury them."

"Ivan, you ask stupid questions. If we buy American wheat, the price of bread goes up in the United States and then you have depression and finally comes the revolution."

"But you said the United States has a surplus of wheat."

"They do unless we buy it, Ivan. I don't want to send you to the KGB office, so will you stop asking so many rotten questions."

"I'm sorry, Comrade Teacher. I was only asking for my mother."

"Why were you asking for your mother?"

"Because she said she couldn't give me any bread for lunch."

"It's nonsense that your mother couldn't buy bread when the Soviet Union has had another bumper crop of grain. Let me see the hands of anyone else in the class whose mothers couldn't buy bread this morning. . . Put down your hands, you fools. Do you want to get us all arrested?"

"What should I tell my mother, Comrade Teacher?"

"Tell her what our great leader Comrade Lenin's wife said when she was told the people had no bread."

"What was that, Comrade Teacher?"

"Let them eat cake!"
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Explaining the Grain Deal to the Russians

WASHINGTON: It must be a terrible blow to the Soviet government to explain to their people that they have had to buy American wheat and corn from the United States because their agricultural plans have failed.

But they're probably up to it. Let us go to a Soviet school and listen in on a class.

"All right, Comrade Children, today we shall talk about food. Who is greatest agricultural country in the world?"

Class in unison: "Soviet Union, Comrade Teacher."

"That's good. Now we will discuss Sputnik."

"Comrade Teacher."

"What is Sputnik, Comrade Ivan?"

"Why, if the Soviet Union is the greatest agricultural country in the world, do we buy wheat and corn and grain from the United States?"

"I'm glad you asked that question, you little bourgeois counter-revolutionary Moscoist."

WELCOME TO KANSAS

"BREADBASKET of the SOVIET UNION
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Food Facts and Fallacies

by Ron Horswell

What do many Americans consider to be a "food crisis"? Is it when thousands starve each day and billions are chronically malnourished? No. Is it when drought grips the Sahel or floods wipe out crops in Bangladesh? Of course not!

A genuine bona fide food crisis is when supermarket prices in the United States rise forty percent in three years. It's when Americans spend more of their disposable income for food (17.4 percent in 1975) than in any year since 1967. Now that's a real disaster, a terrible "food crisis."

Selecting a Scapegoat

The energy crisis has its scapegoats — the "cunning" Arabs and the "money-grubbing" oil companies with their "obscene profits." Likewise, the food crisis must have its villains. There are more scapegoats than you can shake your food stamps at. You can even take your pick between: farmers, agribusiness, grain companies, commodity speculators, consumer advocates, environmentalists, communists, the Illuminati, banks, any secretary of agriculture from Henry Wallace on, any President since Herbert Hoover, a whole assortment of "middle men" (truckers, processors, and labor in general), supermarket chains, advertisers, exporters, and, of course, God, who's accused of botching the weather.

It's easy to separate some facts from fallacies.

Fallacy #1: Earl Butz Caused It

Fact: The Department of Agriculture has certainly made some mistakes over the years, but Earl Butz's biggest blunder is simply that he became secretary of agriculture at a time when the forces that affect food prices were changing from a situation of domestic surplus to one of worldwide shortage.

Earl Butz understands and articulates the essence of the food crisis often and well. Writing in Skeptic, he observed, "There can be no adequate supplies of food produced in any country that insists on clinging to a so-called cheap food policy. It won't work."

Alas, dear Earl of Ag, you consumer spends too much on food to buy your argument or eat your words, even though you're right.

Fallacy #2: The Russians Caused It

Fact: It is true that the Soviets bought a lot of U.S. grain at low prices in 1972, causing grain prices to skyrocket the following year.

However, food prices continued to rise dramatically in 1974 and 1975 when the Russians were not in the market. Clearly other factors were involved. The main problem with Russian wheat purchases is that the Soviets have only entered the international market sporadically and unexpectedly. The Russian wheat problem now seems to be solved with the conclusion of a U.S.-Soviet agreement that provides for eventual Soviet grain purchases.

Fallacy #3: The Farmers Are Getting Rich

Fact: True, farmers are generally better off than in most previous years, and if export doors remain open, rural prosperity will probably continue. The sudden swelling of grain prices made 1973 an all-time record year for farm profits, but that's not the whole story.

Farmers suffer from the energy crisis, inflation, and high interest rates even more than most other Americans. The price of agricultural machinery has risen forty percent in two years and 70 percent since 1967. The average price of fertilizer and agricultural chemicals is up 125 percent from two years ago. And one good crop year does not a rich farmer make! One year giveth, and the next year taketh away. After the 1973 record, farm profits fell by 37 percent in 1974. Many farmers are heavily mortgaged, and a bad crop year or tumbling prices in a good crop year could trigger massive foreclosures. With the rising cost of feed grains, many cattle ranchers are currently on the financial brink.

Fallacy #4: Food Exporters Push Prices Up

Fact: If the U.S. closed its export doors, prices would temporarily go down, but in the long run these low prices would drive farmers out of business, thereby cutting production and forcing prices back up.

If the government chose to avert foreclosure on the farms, it could support the farmer with massive payments. Con-
Fallacy #5: Grain Reserves Are the Answer
Fact: Reserves cannot be rebuilt without closing the door on exports (with all the attendant problems listed under the category above).

Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store . . . and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow. — Deut. 28:5, 12

As a nation we may ask if reserves are needed to protect ourselves against pri­
vation due to a bad crop year (the like of which we have not had in recent his­
tory), but that’s a totally different ques­
tion. But if you think reserves will keep
food prices low — forget it. The supply and demand equation must now include the demand of the whole hungry world, not just U.S. demand.

Fallacy #6: Government Subsidies Should End
Fact: Government subsidies to the non­
producing farmer actually ended recently. The government is now officially committed to support commodity “target prices,” which costs little.

Actually, two thirds of the Depart­
ment of Agriculture budget goes to an­
other kind of welfare project — food stamps.

Fallacy #7: Higher Grain Prices Cause Inflation
Fact: The value of wheat in a loaf of bread has gone up one cent in the last three years, although the loaf of bread has escalated eleven cents in price. The price of the loaf is leavened at every truck stop along the way — commodity brokers, processors, truckers, and retailers.

Fallacy #8: The U.S. Can Have Dirt-cheap Food Again
Fact: Not so. Americans must now com­
pete on the world market for the Ameri­
can farmer’s food. Two recent dollar devaluations, plus the rising affluence of the rest of the world, have combined to make U.S. food seem attractively priced on the world market.

The nouveaux riches of the world want to eat more protein, and they are buying it, mainly through buying feed grains and soybeans.

The Japanese, for example, have dou­
bled their consumption of red meat since the late 1960s. This trend should continue for decades to come, since the average Japanese still eats less than one fifth as much red meat as does the aver­
age American.

Fallacy #9: American Food Is High-priced
Fact: Americans spend less of their dis­
posable income (17.4%) on food than any other nation. The British spend 25 percent; the Japanese 27 percent; Euro­
pean nations spend 30 percent and more; in Asia and Africa, it’s well over 50 percent. Food is still cheap in the U.S. We could try to make it cheaper by clos­
ing export doors and isolating our surplus. Or we could recognize that to­
day’s food crisis demands international leadership.

Fallacy #10: America Can (and Should) “Go It Alone”
Fact: American food policy will increas­
ingly become world food policy, for the simple reason that the United States has a
virtual corner on the market (see box).

Supply and demand yet live, and de­
mand for food has never been higher. There is economic demand in the form of marks, pounds, francs, yen, pesos, and rubles, and there is moral demand in the specter of gaunt, hungry faces.

Whether supply rises toward world de­
mand is a choice for America. If she chooses to “go it alone,” she will indeed be alone. She would be a nation without a friend, a nation without a conscience, and a nation without a future — all because she would be a nation without the facts, a people clinging to fallacies about the “food crisis.”

A Hollow Victory for Dr. Kissinger
In January 1973 the Israeli and Egyptian forces signed what was referred to as the 101 Disengagement Pact. The actual signing took place in the Sinai and was executed by the respective field commanders of the opposing forces. Immediately thereafter, to lend a little pomp and circumstance to the military formal­
ties, Henry Kissinger flew to Aswan in upper Egypt to “celebrate” the occasion with President Sadat. Mr. Herbert Armstrong and I were already in Aswan, having arrived an hour earlier than Dr. Kissinger with members of a Japanese delegation. The following day, after conferring with Deputy Prime Minister Dr. Abdel Hatem, we flew to Israel for a meeting with Deputy Prime Minister Yigael Allon (who is now Israel’s foreign minister as well).

I was very much interested in knowing just what Dr. Kissinger’s role had been in bringing about the so-called disengagement pact, and I asked Mr. Allon directly for his assessment. With a very wry smile Mr. Allon said that Dr. Kissinger’s prime contribution was to get Arab leaders in Syria and Egypt to agree on one thing: that there was something undesirable about Israeli arms being within some fifty miles of Damascus and Cairo.

Although I had not been present and cannot vouch for the veracity of the story, I have been told that when Dr. Kissinger first arrived in Peking on the secret mission for President Nixon, his ploy to thaw the very cold relationship (in fact unreluctance) between the United States and the People’s Republic of China was to point to a map showing clearly the frontier between China and Russia, upon which map he hastily drew some indistinguishable marks and said, “Gentlemen, those are Soviet troops, that is the Sino-Russian border, and that is your enemy.” Apparently, if the story is true, the Chinese also agreed that there was something undesirable about having countless Russian divisions, as well as Soviet missiles and other military hardware, poised on their borders.

If it were true, however, one can easily see why Dr. Kissinger’s recent trip to China would well be described as “chilly,” and one can easily see why the Chinese are not looking forward (nor is President Ford) to Mr. Ford’s forthcoming visit to Peking. If the Chinese were cool to Dr. Kissinger several weeks ago, it is very easy to predict how very cool they will be now that Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger has been removed from office — because it is very well known that the most effective and persuasive critic of détente in the U.S. government was Mr. Schlesinger, who not only was persuasive but was also well-informed and intel­
lectually astute. In addition, he was Dr. Kissinger’s most severe critic, not in the sense of criticizing Dr. Kissinger in a personal and direct manner, but by contesting his ideas about détente and the Russians in Congress, in the Cabinet, in the White House, and in public.

In an earlier column, I expressed concern that détente meant one thing to the Russians and apparently another thing to us. This very concern has recently been expressed again and again in European journals, where informed and enlightened are very concerned that the Kissinger policy in arms limitation talks with the Soviets will play directly into Moscow’s hands and will lead to a Europe that gradually but steadily becomes defenseless. Yesterday, as a result of Mr. Schlesinger’s dismissal, West Germany’s Defense Minister, Georg Leber, was described by an aide as “quite stricken.” Mr. Leber has been a leading European exponent of Mr. Schlesinger’s views about the importance of maintaining a high level of defense spending and of not sacrificing preparedness for the sake of détente. A few months ago I also criticized Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger for failing to meet with famed Soviet Nobel Prize winning author Solzhenitsyn because of admitted White House fears of disturbing the Russians and détente.

It seems a pity that the Ford government does not have room for both a Mr. Schlesinger and a Dr. Kissinger. If Dr. Kissinger ever needed a man of in­
tellectual ability, proven experience, and great integrity to make his ideas and policies stand the test of competition in the market place (the President’s mind), now is the time. It is a pity that the Secretary of Defense will now be Donald Rumsfeld — “one of my guys” (as Mr. Ford referred to him) — a very nice man, without question, and with a man with a bright “political” future and a man described as able to keep his footing on this fast moving Washington treadmill. But is Mr. Rumsfeld a man big enough to fill the shoes of Mr. Schlesinger? It is a pity that, in this day and age when a country needs its best men in the key positions, Mr. Schlesinger’s dismissal should be referred to as a “victory” for Dr. Kissinger. 

A few months ago the renowned author, John Hersey, after having been given the opportunity to spend considerable time watching the President and the White House in action, reported how frightening it was that the only person advising Mr. Ford on foreign policy was Dr. Kissinger. It is much more frightening now that Dr. Kissinger’s primary critic in foreign policy matters has been so neatly eliminated.
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WEEK ENDING DECEMBER 6, 1975
Rising impressively from the banks of New York City’s East River, the United Nations’ tall, stately Secretariat building and the neighboring General Assembly, Conference, and Library buildings project an image of dignity, stability, and purpose.

Few visitors walking for the first time into the modern, well-lit lobby of the General Assembly building fail to be impressed by a sense of far-reaching importance. Surely, behind these walls serious diplomats from around the globe are carefully pondering and resolving weighty matters of great international significance — striving, in the words of the U.N. Charter, “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”

But behind this illusionary facade lies the increasingly apparent reality — the United Nations, 30 years old last month, is in deep trouble.

“Infamous Act”

In an action strongly denounced by the United States, the U.N. General Assembly in early November voted 72 to 35, with 32 abstentions and 3 nations absent, to declare Zionism — the movement to set up a Jewish national homeland in Palestine — “a form of racism and racial discrimination.”

Chaim Herzog, Israel’s British-educated ambassador, declared that in passing the resolution, the U.N. “had been dragged to its lowest point of discredit by a coalition of despotism and racists.”

Outspoken U.S. Ambassador Daniel Moynihan also vigorously assailed the Arab-sponsored resolution, asserting that the U.S. “does not acknowledge, it will not abide by, it will never acquiesce in this infamous act.”

President Gerald Ford termed the U.N.’s vote “a wholly unjustified action,” and Secretary of State Kissinger said the United States “will pay no attention” to the resolution. The U.S. Senate and House of Representatives both passed bipartisan resolutions condemning the U.N. action.

And in what may have been the bluntest denunciation of all, Senator Bob Packwood declared: “Wherever Hitler may have been last night, I’m sure he drank a toast to the devil and rattled his cage!”

The passage of the anti-Zionist resolution sparked strong reaction among the U.S. public as well. Long-smoldering resentment toward the U.N. flared into mass protest rallies and demonstrations across the nation. Public approval of the world body — which had dropped from a high of 87% in 1959 to an all-time low of 34% earlier this year — has been even further eroded by the U.N. vote.

Increasing numbers of Americans are demanding the complete withdrawal of the U.S. from the United Nations. Some are even calling for the removal of U.N. headquarters from U.S. soil and its transplantation in Vienna, Geneva, or, more cynically, in Antarctica. At least, most Americans would like to see some sort of curtailment of the huge U.S. contribution to the U.N. budget.

“The U.S. has contributed more than one third of all funds received by the U.N. in the course of its 30-year history. This year Washington is footing 25% ($81.3 million) of the total U.N. budget of $325.1 million. At the same time, the Soviet Union, its allies, and many developing Third World nations remain heavily in arrears, refusing to pay their full share despite their continued utilization of the U.N. forum.

The U.N. carries on its books 65.4 million in overdue assessments against nations refusing to pay. Over one half of this — $36.4 million — is owed by the Soviet Union, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine, the three votes the Soviets have in the General Assembly.

This situation, coupled with what many see as increasingly irresponsible and reckless actions in the General Assembly, has seriously threatened continued U.S. participation in the world body. The recent public outcry has seemingly given credence to last year’s warning by then U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., John Scali, that a “tyranny of the majority” — the militant and nationalistic Third World majority bloc — threatened to undermine U.S. support of the world body.

Hollow Resolutions

In the debate over the worth of the United Nations, the widely respected activities of its specialized agencies — to which-over 80% of the U.N. budget goes — are generally not at issue. Such agencies as UNICEF (U.N. Children’s Fund), WHO (World Health Organization), and FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization) are playing a vital role in bettering the daily existence of the world’s impoverished.

The focal point of the controversy is the U.N. General Assembly. Once billed as the “town meeting of the world” where nations could gather for constructive dialogue and problem solving, that body is increasingly being used for purposes other than those intended by the architects of the organization. It is not uncommon these days to see the international forum being used for spreading of self-
serving propaganda, for attracting publicity, and for verbally attacking and embarrassing one’s adversaries.

The highly publicized appearances during the past year of Yasser Arafat, chief of the terrorist Palestinian Liberation Organization and a self-admitted murderer of women and children, and of U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, labeled a “racist murderer” by U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Oscar Estrada, have been widely cited as examples of the abuse of the General Assembly.

The reason for the increasingly dismal record of the General Assembly is easily understood. It is an axiom of international relations that nations do not generally bring to the U.N. forum disputes which they feel they can mutually solve. Such disputes are solved bilaterally or through a more regional forum such as NATO, the EEC, or the OAS.

If the involved nations, on the other hand, are totally and irrevocably bent on war, the U.N. is again generally ignored. “The West’s basic misconception,” observes veteran political observer Otto von Habicht, “is the belief that this organization is a mere facade of a pretense of peace. Everybody should have understood that if two countries are determined to fight, whichever of the initiators are not ready or willing to go to war. Since the U.N. has no real power to impose a settlement, it merely permits one or both parties to the dispute a marvelous opportunity to meet the challenges of a fragile world than it does today, and has never stood much need of reform.”

One Vote, One Mess

One major area singled out — by the United States, at least — as needful of change is the method of voting in the General Assembly. Over one third of the U.N.’s 142 member nations have fewer people than New York City! Yet each nation has fully one vote — no more, no less. The Maldives Islands (pop. 115,000), in other words, carry as much weight in the Assembly as does the United States or Britain.

Fortune’s analysis of the U.N. notes that under the present one nation, one vote configuration, “the nations that are dominant in the world — by wealth, power, even population — are a tiny minority, and the nations that are weak and unimportant are in a position of unassailable superiority.” Theoretically, the analysis adds, it would be possible “to assemble a majority in the General Assembly that would represent as little as 4.7% of the world’s population, 1.3% of Gross World Product, and an even smaller fraction of the world’s military power.” Voting reform, however, would entail substantive changes in the U.N. charter, one which would prove a nearly impossible task. The organization’s smaller members are not going to willingly relinquish their present voting advantages in favor, for example, of weighting votes by population.

Beyond any possible structural and procedural reform, the United States itself, it has been suggested, can do much to straighten out the General Assembly. Ambassador Farouk M. Al-Otaibi’s “get tough and speak out” policy is widely hailed as a step in the right direction. “It’s time for the United States to go into the United Nations and start raising hell,” Mqonathan said in an interview earlier this year.

He added that he is opposed to a U.S. withdrawal from the U.N., insisting that the world body can be made to work if the U.S. displays a new spirit of initiative and vigorous leadership.

American economic retaliation — withholding aid, for example — against nations participating in irresponsible General Assembly actions, combined with skillful maneuvering to break up bloc voting by playing nations one against another, could go far toward setting the Assembly back on the right track.

Otherwise, continued reckless actions on the part of various blocs and interests in the U.N. could wreck the organization altogether — and despite all its limitations and drawbacks, this is viewed as undesirable even to most of its critics.

Should the Arab and allied blocs, for example, succeed in denying Israel the right to participate in the General Assembly, the U.S. would retaliate, at minimum, by severely slashing its appropriations to the U.N. And as its single largest contributor, even a token reduction of U.S. payments would cause hardship in the organization.

Furthermore, should the U.S. — whose support, in the words of Henry Kissinger, is “the lifeblood of the organization” — ever be driven to completely sever its ties, it could no longer even hold forth the pretense of being a viable organization of any real worth.

Beat the Swords Into Plowshares

The original framers of the U.N. charter had a noble aspiration. A mechanism for international discussion and cooperation on problems of global significance is even more essential today than it was three decades ago. “Worldwide organization,” observed President Ford on the occasion of the U.N.’s 30th anniversary, “is necessary to deal with worldwide problems.”

U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim also noted that the “problems facing the United Nations are, in the main, problems common to all nations and regions, and it is not possible to resolve them any more by pure nationalism, or even regional, responses.”

But in a world of sovereign and diverse nations, the U.N. is simply limited in what it can do. It is doing just about all that it can reasonably do. One is simply an association of sovereign states — an instrument of international diplomacy with many limitations and shortcomings.

Only when nations, in a spirit of mutual understanding, abandon their selfish aims and petty quarrels and learn to cooperate for the good of all, will a truly effective world government be possible.

Inscribed on a marble wall at the U.N. headquarters in New York City is a portion of the ancient prophecy of Isaiah 2:4, symbolizing the ultimate goal of the U.N.: “They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

The world will soon see the realization of its centuries-old dream of permanent peace, but not through the efforts of man.
A fourth essential has been added to the age-old necessities of life. Besides food, clothing, and shelter, we must have energy.

In the 30 years since World War II, we Americans have used more energy than all our forefathers combined. We've invested it for example, in a 15,000 miles long, connecting every city in the nation. It's the largest man-made object in the world - more machines, which made more - unused it to make machines, which made energy was available in great plenty. Everything was made possible because one of the most potentially devastating problems ever to face the American people.

The Energy “Inconvenience”

On October 17, 1973, most of the oil-producing countries of the Mideast placed an embargo on oil shipments. The shock waves from this action reached around the world and were followed by economic and social disruption in most of the industrialized nations.

The valves were reopened in March 1974, and oil began to flow again. But the world was no longer the same. The embargo was an exclamation point - a dramatic dividing line between the past era of cheap energy and the era of expensive energy into which we have entered.

Before the traumatic embargo of 1973, the U.S. was expected to use more energy in the period 1970 to 1982 than it did throughout all of its entire previous history. Indeed, even after the embargo and under the most optimistic circumstances, the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) still expected U.S. energy consumption to roughly double during the next 25 years. If no new initiatives are taken to develop alternative sources or conserve energy, the ERDA estimates consumption might rise by 150 percent. A previous estimate by the Federal Power Commission had forecast energy consumption tripling by the year 2000.

One study asserts that America will need to build a new power plant every 25 days for the next 20 years if our energy consumption is not controlled. Yet, energy authority Frank Murray believes that even this estimate may be too conservative (see accompanying interview).

The fact is that the developed Western world, especially the United States, has been on an energy-guzzling binge of unprecedented proportions for over 30 years. The U.S. has 6% of the earth’s population, but uses 35% of all the energy consumed in the world. Most of that energy comes from fossil fuels. In fact, petroleum fuels account for 75% of U.S. energy consumption. Last year Americans burned up some 3 billion cubic feet of natural gas and 6.3 billion barrels of oil.

Is Energy Independence Possible?

Experts say it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to become totally energy independent. The U.S. imports 36% of the oil it uses, while the proven reserves in the U.S. have been steadily declining since 1971. Every day, the U.S. consumes some 17 million barrels of oil, but domestic production is only about 9 million barrels. And the gap is not narrowing; it's widening.

Increasing scarcity at home is underscored by the fact that petroleum producers have been sinking more holes into American soil than at any time since the mid-1960s; yet very little new oil is being discovered. Last year the number of wells drilled in the U.S. rose 15% above the 1973 level to 32,000, but the nation produced 7% fewer barrels per day (8.4 million) than the year before. In the first quarter of 1975, 8,568 wells were drilled, 22% more than during the same quarter of 1974; yet, production has shown only a minuscule rise.

Actually, oil companies have had less money to spend for drilling since Congress eliminated most of their depletion allowance, causing their profits to drop. Exxon, for example, reported a 34.4% decline in net profit from the second quarter of 1975, compared with 1974.

The plain truth is that there may just not be much oil left in the continental U.S., at least not in amounts large enough to justify an all-out drilling drive in the search for oil. The U.S. Geological Survey recently cut in half its estimate of recoverable oil left in the U.S., setting the figure at 82 billion barrels. Oil from the Alaskan pipeline may feed America’s demands for a few years — but that’s it.

Offshore oil offers some potential, but even there disappointments have occurred. The Destin Anticline off the coast of Florida looked so lucrative that oil companies bid a record $1.49 billion for leases on it. But, after drilling 14 dry holes, Exxon, Shell, and three other producers pulled out their rigs.

The Gas Gap

The U.S. is also facing a looming shortage of natural gas, the leading energy source after oil. Natural gas provides fuel for an estimated 60% of U.S. industry, 55% of all American homes and about 33% of the nation’s total energy consumption. Shortage of natural gas threatens to become America’s number one worry.

The Federal Power Commission predicts that in the year ending next April, gas shortages will cut 45% deeper than in the previous 12 months. This will give rise to a serious crisis this winter, even if weather is only normally cold. It could mean devastating loss of jobs and closing of plants, seriously affecting the economy. The economic recovery we all hope for may very well be foiled in the bud due to increasing energy shortages.

Now, as winter is beginning, the Federal Energy Administration is saying that the nation’s network of interstate gas pipelines will be 1.3 trillion cubic feet short of the 9 trillion cubic feet needed for the winter. Large shortages, ranging up to 30%, are forecast for portions of the mid-Atlantic coast from South Carolina to New York.

Sooner or later, the U.S. will run out of oil and natural gas for heating and transportation is alarmingly acute. But oil and gas are not used only as fuel; they are also used in making a myriad of Petrochemicals and plastics which directly affect our daily lives. Literally thousands of products — including carpets, paints, pesticides, fertilizers, drugs, and synthetic fibers — come directly from petroleum. Such products are often virtually unmistakable without petrochemicals.

Since oil and gas are absolutely essential for so many important products, a new and often overlooked dimension is added to the energy crisis. If we continue to squander precious petroleum by using it as a common fuel, we will lose more than an energy source. We will also be unable to manufacture the countless by-products made from oil and gas. They simply will no longer be available, and the repercussions throughout our economy and in our lifestyle may well be calamitous.

Energy Policy?

Yet, U.S. energy policy is stymied by endless wrangling between Congress and the White House. We’ve witnessed a potentially disastrous year-long conflict between the Ford Administration and the Democratic Congress on energy policy. The lack of leadership is appalling.

As 1976 approaches and our energy supplies become increasingly uncertain, the need for sound and effective leadership has never been greater.

Our Energy Options

In the final analysis, the U.S. and other industrialized nations face three choices:
ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

PANACEAS OR PIPE DREAMS?

As supplies of oil and natural gas dwindle, a number of alternative energy sources are being seriously considered for providing future power.

Coal is a prime candidate for meeting America's future energy needs. Truly staggering amounts of energy are locked up in North American coal deposits. The U.S. has 1.3 to 2.0 trillion tons of coal, of which 390 billion tons are considered readily recoverable. At current levels of consumption, the U.S. has a 1,600-year supply of coal.

But coal is bulky and expensive to ship. It requires large storage facilities, and much of it is high in sulfur and other impurities. Moreover, despite extensive research, scientists have not found a truly reliable way to clean the stack gases of coal-burning electric generators.

Yet if the technologies for coal gasification and liquefaction can be developed on a commercial scale, the one-time king of American energy might return to the throne.

Nuclear fission also holds promise. Already, 56 nuclear plants generate over 8% of the electrical power in the U.S. One pound of uranium, with present technology, will supply as much heat as 50,000 pounds of coal going into a coal-burning plant. Proponents of nuclear power claim that nuclear-generated electricity is also less expensive than electricity generated by fossil fuels.

Opponents maintain that the dangers from reactor accidents, radioactive wastes, and nuclear terrorism preclude the widespread reliance on nuclear power.

If the dangers and risks of nuclear power can be overcome, however, it may provide much needed electrical power in the future. But so far, the controversy over the risks of nuclear power has not been resolved.

Solar power is another potential alternative energy source. Solar energy is free; it's available in every country, its technology is understood, and it is clean and safe. It has no political overtones, and there are no ways to steal it, monopolize it, or deplete it.

The power of the sun's rays is enormous, averaging about one kilowatt per square meter of surface. At high noon on a clear day in June, the sunshine falling on New York City is the equivalent of the energy produced by all the power plants in the entire world at peak performance. It is estimated that 3,600 billion billion BTU's reach the surface of the earth each year, while only 1 billion billion BTU's are projected to be needed for world consumption by the year 2000.

If only two tenths of one percent of the land in the U.S. were equipped with conversion devices capable of a ten per-
 INTERVIEW WITH FRANK X. MURRAY  
ENERGY EXPERT  

What power sources can we count on in the future? Will conventional play an important part in tomorrow's energy picture? To find out, Plain Truth interviewed a representative from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Plain Truth: Mr. Murray, are we facing a long-term energy crisis or is the current problem merely a temporary inconvenience to the American people?

Murray: I think the general public has simply not grasped the seriousness of the energy crisis. We have experienced a fundamental change in our basic energy requirements. And the public has not really recognized the fundamental nature of this change and become willing to accept the necessary changes in their life-styles, the inconvenience, and possibly even some degree of hardship. I think people have tended to wish the problem away and have been unwilling to squarely face the facts.

Plain Truth: A lot of people are saying that the United States doesn't have a national energy policy. Is this true?

Murray: In a sense, that's correct. I think what we're doing now is struggling to form a national energy policy. There's a lot of conflict and disagreement both on basic objectives and on how one should go about obtaining them. I think it's going to take us some time before we truly arrive at what we call a national energy policy.

Plain Truth: What percentage of our energy requirements is supplied by the various fuels we are currently using?

Murray: Basically there are three main sources: coal, oil, and gas. About 45% of our current energy needs comes from petroleum; another 30% comes from natural gas. Those two make up about 75% of our current energy consumption. The remainder of our energy sources come from either coal, hydroelectric, or nuclear power.

Plain Truth: Do you expect these percentages to change radically in the next few years?

Murray: No, not in the next few years. The system that we have evolved over the last eighty years is so large and complex, and so thoroughly interwoven throughout our economic and social systems that it's very difficult to change it rapidly. There are tremendous up-front costs. That's why imports will undoubtedly continue for many years.

Plain Truth: How much of our total energy needs is imported?

Murray: We currently import somewhere between six and seven million barrels of petroleum every day. This is about 40% of our petroleum consumption. We also import a significant amount of natural gas. In total, we probably import in the neighborhood of about a fifth of our total energy requirements right now.

Plain Truth: Is the United States more dependent upon foreign sources today than five years ago?

Murray: In terms of petroleum, we're importing almost twice as much as we were in 1970. That's not a very comforting fact, and it's unlikely to change in the near future. In fact, assuming that there is a significant economic recovery in the next six months to a year, it's probable that those imports will go up, not down.

Plain Truth: What impact will the Alaskan pipeline have on our energy supply?

Murray: The pipeline capacity has been stated at about two million barrels per day. In terms of our current production, this would be about a fifth of our domestic produced petroleum. So it is significant.

Plain Truth: Where does nuclear energy rank as an alternative energy source in comparison to fossil-fuel types?

Murray: Basically, nuclear power is used for the generation of electrical energy. This in some degree limits its applicability to the current economic system with its investment in consumer and industrial goods that use fuels other than electrical energy. Of course, the problems with it are generally known, as are the problems with fossil fuel. So one has to trade one against the other.

Plain Truth: Would it be better to bequeath to our children adequate power with the responsibility of caring for radioactive wastes than to leave them deficient in energy?

Murray: This is the crux of the dilemma we face with nuclear power, as well as with other forms of energy. How does one weigh the present benefits from the energy which we would obtain or from the power we get versus the future long-run cost? Personally, in terms of waste disposal, I feel a little more optimistic than I do about some of the other problems with nuclear energy. I think within 100 or 200 years we will find a way to effectively utilize these very waste materials which are giving us such a problem.

Plain Truth: What about coal?

Murray: Coal has some problems associated with it as well. They involve both the mining (strip vs. underground) and the air pollution associated with burning the coal once it gets out of the ground to be used. Neither of these things is trivial, if one intends to increase the amount of electric power which is provided by coal. They can both become very significant.

So you're confronted with a dilemma between the environmental problems associated with the use of coal and the environmental problems associated with another. These are the types of things that societies have to weigh and evaluate.

Plain Truth: Do you think that nuclear fusion is a likely prospect in the near future?

Murray: Fusion energy is really in its infancy. So far it must continue to prove that fusion power in a commercial sense is many years away. Probably one really ought to think in terms of decades rather than years.

Plain Truth: Is it true that if we keep increasing our demands as in the past few years that we'll need to complete one new power plant every 25 days for the next 20 years?

Murray: That's probably a conservative estimate compared with some that I've heard. We may well be faced with that situation if we continue to increase our energy consumption the way we have in the past. Of course, the whole point of this discussion is that we must go on now, and in the future, from the point of view of energy saving and from the point of view of conservation.

Plain Truth: What can the average citizen do to conserve energy in a meaningful way?

Murray: I think the biggest thing the average citizen can do is to reorient himself, to view his actions and activities in terms of their energy consumption. In other words, he should be energy conscious.

There are many little things which he might do. We did many of them — if you'll recall — in 1974 during the oil embargo. People were asked to turn their thermostats down, and most of them did.

People were asked to car pool, and they did; and take the bus, and they did. But somewhere along the way we lost our commitment. It had a lot to do with things that took place shortly thereafter involving Watergate and involving the confidence that people had in their government. There was a very unfortunate sequence of events because I think we lost that edge which we had in 1974. But I think conservation is very important. I think we have to learn to make it a meaningful part of our everyday life.
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Taking a cue from the motion picture, "Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore," the National Organization of Women (NOW) set aside Wednesday, October 29, as a national women's strike, to be known as "Alice Doesn't." Women were asked to cancel all their normal activities — shopping, working, and even sex — to demonstrate how much "the system" depends upon them.

The move resembled the theme of the ancient Greek play, Lysistrata, in which the women of Athens tried to force their menfolk to stop a war by withholding their conjugal dues. But the modern version wasn't nearly as successful: Employers and husbands across the country reported almost no deviations from the normal flow of life. It seems most women weren't even aware that they were supposed to strike. In the end, Alice did.

Ironically, there was another departure from the story line of Lysistrata. The participants in the NOW campaign cancelled their activities not to protest a war, but rather to escalate a war — the war for equality of the sexes.

The Equality of the Sexes

To most people in our increasingly secular, equality-worshipping society, sexual equality would seem to be a laudable goal. But the worthiness of the goal depends upon what is meant by "equality." If the feminists mean the recognition of equal ability and provision for equal opportunity to use that ability (whether through the home, education, or career), then the goal is indeed a worthy one.

This type of equality may have been the original goal of Women's Lib (and, in fact, still is the goal of many sincere women), but it is not the kind of equality that the movement is demanding today. Women's Lib today is concerned with something far beyond these matters. Its goal is the abolition of all sex roles.

As Ms. Karen DeCro, newly elected president of NOW, proclaimed in her campaign slogan, "Out of the mainstream and into the revolution!"

This seemingly innocuous statement exposes the basic problem with many leaders of the Women's Lib Movement who want to overthrow society. Gay Pauley, UPI's woman of the year, said it very plainly: "We have only scraped the surface in the worldwide liberation movement. The revolution now has real momentum and will not cease until the patriarchal system in most of our cultures is overthrown."

The key phrase, "patriarchal system," as used by women's libbers, means more than an overbearing, middle-aged male and his extended family. It means a whole system of morality — much of it grounded upon biblical principles — which acts to preserve and protect the family unit as the building block of society.

MS: Marxist Sisters?

 Appropriately, the women's movement adopted the clenched fist — the same symbol that the Black revolutionaries and the Marxists use as one of their symbols.

The movement, as it now stands, wants to overthrow more than discrimination against women. It wants to overturn all of the sexual distinctions that make up a part of civilized culture, both Western and Oriental. And they will indeed fight to do this. Women's Lib has more in common with Marxist revolutionaries than just the symbol of a fist. Some of the more radical writers in the magazine Ms. were virtually plagiarizing Marxist speeches when they write about "oppression," "liberation," "exploitation," and "sexism." Perhaps the letters MS should stand for Marxist Sisters. Indeed, the avowed leaders of Women's Lib — Germaine Greer, Gloria Steinem, Betty Friedan and many others — hold extremely left-wing political views.

Just as the average Marxist scorns changes which make society function better, so the Women's Lib militants call for a society far different from one which simply pays equal wages and allows women to rise to their fullest extent. They want a society without the dreaded "patriarchy" and the "traditional middle-class morality," which often rests on a biblical base.

The Example of Mrs. Thatcher

The Women's Lib response to the political rise of England's Margaret Thatcher is a perfect example of their twisted ideology. Mrs. Thatcher should symbolize what the movement says it supports: an able, extremely bright woman, who, through brains and hard work, makes the best use of her talents to rise to the head of the Conservative Party in Britain. Obviously, the members of the Women's Lib Movement should applaud Mrs. Thatcher's rise in her party's hierarchy. Do they all? No, the militants aren't pleased at all.

While the majority of moderate feminists rally behind the example of Mrs. Thatcher, the radical spokespersons of the movement denounce her middle-class morality and lack of revolutionary views. Mrs. Thatcher doesn't want a society where human distinctions are blurred and "persons" are blended into an egalitarian soup. She is in favor of traditional middle-class values like thrift, responsibility, diligence, and hard work, values which one might apply to either male or female.

The radical libbers' rejection of Mrs. Thatcher makes one wonder: Are they against masculinity, or are they just uncomfortable with morality?

The pattern that emerges is unmistakably Marxist. The Soviet Union, a bastion of male chauvinism where the women hold full-time jobs and also take care of the family, is rarely condemned by them. Instead, feminist leaders speak of the "decline of capitalist economies" as if they were Marxist theoreticians.

Marxism in Mexico City

At the International Women's Conference held last summer in Mexico City, the theme was not equal opportunities for women, but the promulgation of an international welfare state, whereby the "declining capitalist economies" would be soaked for the benefit of the Third World.

At that same conference, Third World spokesman Luis Echeverria called for the obliteration of the traditional feminino role — whether voluntarily accepted or not! "It is essential to avoid encouraging women, on the basis of a mistaken concept of freedom, voluntarily to continue to accept the marginal role which has been imposed upon them."

Echeverria's remarks were a call for enforced "freedom." In effect, he asserted that women are not free to decide to be what they want to be, but that they should conform to the revolutionist's conception of "liberation." Most women are interested in equality and liberation, but these Third World ideologies cast those noble words into a disguise for blatant totalitarianism.

The end result of such sexual freedom is the abolition of moral codes and the eventual death of the family unit.

Sexual Suicide

George Gilder, in his book Sexual Suicide, notes that the family is the mainstay of civilized society. Societies without a family system remain on a primitive level, and those technological societies who began with a family system, but later decided to weaken the family's influence, often are totalitarian in nature.

A family unit necessitates roles and purposes of some sort. No person will stick to a family with all its demands on time and labor unless there is a purpose for his efforts. When the radical feminists call for complete sexual freedom and the abolition of any roles (whether they are traditional or non-traditional makes no difference), they are advocating the destruction of the family and society as we know it.

At this point, the ultimate goals of the hard-core liberalizationist become clear: She seeks a society of absolute iron-clad equality, with no natural distinctions between human beings — no maternal duties, no moral codes, no middle class — a society which resembles the sterile egalitarianism of Huxley's Brave New World, the enforced sexlessness of Orwell's 1984, or the totalitarian state-run dormitories for raising children in Ayn Rand's Anthem.

Women — Speak Out!

Don't confuse the original, worthy goals of the Women's Liberation Movement (such as equal pay for equal work) with the totalitarian equality (the abolition of human differences) now inherent within the movement. The former makes society a little better, while the latter draws an arrow at civilization's frail heart, the family.

It's time for responsible women worldwide — including the liberated women striving for equal opportunity — to speak out against the dominant forces of the Women's Liberation Movement. If more women would discern the radical fringe, more men would accept more readily the reasonable requests of responsible women. If women seek to change society, but end up abolishing the family, they will be quite literally throwing out the baby with the bath water.
The Hollow Shell On the East River

The "Dis-united Non-nations" have done it again. They have voted to link Zionism with racism in what the U.S. Ambassador Daniel Moynihan labeled "an infamous act."

By now you've all heard about it. Perhaps you heard some of the rhetoric, on television newscasts. And by the way, did you notice who voted in favor of that resolution? Nations such as Yemen, South Yemen, the United Arab Emirates, Sri Lanka - in fact, virtually the entire of the Third World. Also on the list were such "powers" as Oman and Mall. And Säo Tomé e Príncipe. A lot of you don't even know where those nations are located. Säo Tomé e Príncipe, for your information, is nothing but a couple of islands just off the west coast of Africa, below the bulge of the continent. It's a former Portuguese colonial possession which, along with Angola and other Portuguese colonies in Africa, have recently achieved independence.

The vote - which passed by a margin of 72 to 35, with 32 abstentions - was interesting in another regard. On the anti-Zionism side it included such strange bedfellows as the Soviet Union and China. Isn't it amazing that these two bitter enemies can get together on one thing - their mutual contempt for the Jews?

The way of peace they know not; there is no judgment in their goings. - Isaiah 59:8

Before, the U.N. is a focal point of global controversy, bitterness, and racism. The United Nations was formed in the aftermath of a shocked world discovering the persecution and the extermination of six million Jews in Hitler's ovens. The United Nations was established in a time when world leaders vowed that such a holocaust could never again overtake free people anywhere in the world. Now the U.N., thanks to the force of the one-nation, one-vote principle and the mus­tering of huge bloc-voting majorities, has come full circle to condemn the very people who were the most vivid example of racial persecution.

The U.N. General Assembly has become nothing more than a shrill sounding board of anti-Semitic, and anti-Zionist propaganda. It has no power to impose a settlement upon any antagonists in any corner of the world. It has only the power to generate a great deal of rhetoric and a great deal of publicity.

I was surprised when I found that a recent poll said that U.S. public approval of the United Nations stood at 34%. But that was before these recent events. I would imagine at least 10% by the time the full impact of that resolution finds its way into the public consciousness. One thing is sure: The hollow shell on the East River is neither a step toward world peace or world government, nor is it, in fact, either "united" or even representative of "nations." I suggest New York City buy the U.N., with borrowed Arab money, and then default.

Prophecies for Our Time Now

Viewing all of the above, is it any wonder then that man and nations have not succeeded in their quest for world peace? Is it any wonder that since the establishment of "man's last hope for world peace" we have had wars and rev­olutions going on all around the world along with unbridled hatred, racism, and entrenched ideological, competition - and we're seeing more of these things, not less?

Centuries ago, a newscaster looked down beyond his day into ours. He talked about a time when nations would be going to war against nations, when coalitions - unions, groups of nations - would be going to war against other groups of nations, when the world peace...
What is real good news?
Is it good news when delegates from around the world gather to discuss the food crisis, but do nothing about it? Is it good news when men talk of peace but prepare feverishly for war? Is it good news when well-intentioned efforts to alleviate human suffering are more than offset by increased problems?

Good news is not really good unless it faces squarely the monstrous, onrushing trends that threaten to sweep mankind into oblivion, and tells us how these problems are going to be solved. There is a source of such news. You can read about it every month in a publication appropriately titled Good News. It's yours for the asking. Just return the coupon.