Egyptian President Anwar Sadat is having boldly scrapped his nation's policy of depending on the United States for military and economic aid. Washington's friendship treaty with the Soviet Union, the response could well determine the future of Egypt — and the entire Middle East.
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Having boldly scrapped his nation's friendship treaty with the Soviet Union, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat is counting on the United States for military and economic aid. Washington's response could well determine the future of Egypt — and the entire Middle East.

Illustration by Allen Merager
Here in Rome the big news is the Italian political crisis. Combined with other events, this could lead to an explosive world crisis such as never shook this world before.

It's not my intention to report the news, but explain what it means, where it may lead, and how it may shake up your life! News reporters and newscasters may report the news. But they cannot explain it! They do not know what is prophesied.

Here, first, are the briefest highlights of the explosive situation at the moment.

In Rome violence is mounting. Communists are now predicting a win in the forthcoming national election. It's the struggle between communism and capitalism.

In big print on the cover of *Newsweek*, on newstands here recently, was the question: "ITALY ON THE BRINK?" with the picture and inside cover story of Communist leader Enrico Berlinguer.

Put this together with the Communist uprisings in Spain, Portugal, and other European countries and you have a more explosive situation than is realized!

Put all this together with the mounting troubles within the Roman Catholic Church — and put this together with BIBLICAL PROPHECY — and the stage is all set for the greatest crisis of troubles in the history of this world.

Within the Roman Catholic Church, more and more priests and nuns are defying the church's traditional authority and are marrying. An ever-increasing number of lay Catholics in America and Europe are defying the church edict on marital sex relations.

The Vatican must know that unless this drift away from church authority is broken by sharp and drastic action, disintegration threatens the largest church or religion in the world.

Biblical prophecy indicates the strong possibility right now of a sudden, sensational, world-shaking, drastic move by Pope Paul or the possibility of his abdication and the emergence of a new pope of iron will who will propose what the nations of Europe have all wanted, but have been unable to bring about — a politically united Europe.

The political leaders of Europe have been unable to bring this political union about. But an offer from the pope to use the power of his office to join the nations together in a resurrection of the "Holy Roman Empire" would bring it about.

If antireligion communism wins political dominance of Europe as the present trend indicates, that would just about sound the death knell of Roman Catholicism in Europe.

This unprecedented situation now calls for sudden and drastic action. It would mean a common currency for a union of ten nations in Europe. It could mean one military force, which would be as strong as the armed forces of the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. — or maybe even stronger.

The loss of Europe's faith in America to protect her from the Soviet Union is another trend leading directly to such an eventuality as I have described.

Sooner or later such a European union will take place. I have predicted this for 43 years!

It will astound and dumbfound the whole world when it happens. The time is now RIPE!
"The Soviet Union is trying to bring us to our knees. But I will get on my knees before no one but Allah."

— Anwar Sadat to the Egyptian parliament, March 14, 1976

SADAT JOLTS THE KREMLIN!

by Garner Ted Armstrong

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat boldly scrapped his nation's friendship treaty with the Soviet Union. But will he get the aid he needs from the United States? Here is a first-hand report by the Editor of The Plain Truth, based on an exclusive interview with the president of Egypt.

In the wake of two Sinai disengagement agreements with Israel, the feeling in Cairo is that war with Israel is no longer inevitable and that a lasting Middle East peace may now be within grasp.

A meeting with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat leaves little doubt that this is his — and his people's — ardent hope.

"I think this is the first time in the 27 years since the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict that there is a possibility of real peace in the area," the 57-year-old president declared during our hour-long conversation at the Presidential Palace in Cairo on March 6.

Peace is an integral part of Sadat's master plan for Egypt's national reconstruction. Drained by years of costly war, the impoverished nation is seeking to rebuild its war-shattered economy and provide a better life for its 37 million poor. Renewed fighting would only serve to further devastate the economy.

But in the unpredictable Middle East, no nation can afford to forego guns for butter. Egypt — despite her desire for peace — realizes she cannot concentrate on rebuilding her devastated economy at the expense
of maintaining adequate military preparedness.

Consequently, Sadat’s recent surprise move against the Soviets has placed him in a precarious position.

**Bold Move**

At the conclusion of a lengthy address before Egypt’s People’s Assembly (parliament) on March 14, Sadat dropped an unexpected bombshell, declaring sternly: “The Soviet Union is trying to bring us to our knees. But I will get on my knees before no one but Allah!”

He then demanded that parliament immediately nullify Egypt’s 5-year-old treaty of friendship and cooperation with Moscow, which he disdainfully termed “a scrap of paper.” The request was immediately and overwhelmingly approved by the assembly.

Sadat cited Moscow’s continuing failure to provide promised military support — new arms, aircraft, and vital replacement parts — as the primary reason for his action. Previously a heavy supplier of arms to Egypt, the Kremlin had provided her with virtually nothing since the 1973 Mideast war, while continuing to heavily aid Egypt’s radical Arab rivals, Syria and Libya.

Further attesting to his resolve to sever all military ties to the Kremlin, Sadat also cancelled vital Soviet naval rights in Egyptian ports.

**Kremlin Motives**

Sadat’s actions clearly caught an embarrassed Kremlin off guard. The Soviet news agency Tass weakly passed off the treaty’s cancellation as merely an affirmation of a relationship which had become “paralyzed” by Sadat’s continuing unfriendliness. The Kremlin has asserted that Egypt’s huge unpaid debt for previously delivered goods was the main reason for Moscow’s slowdown in arms deliveries.

Sadat’s private feelings, however, more accurately reflect the true situation. He believes that Moscow’s delaying tactics were designed to create unrest within Egypt which the Kremlin hoped would lead to Sadat’s overthrow and the emergence of a more radical, pro-Moscow leader. It is no secret that

(Continued on page 4)
Moscow has looked with disfavor on Sadat’s cooperation with Secretary Kissinger’s step-by-step Mideast peace diplomacy.

In any case, Moscow’s actions have resulted in a wholesale turn to the West by Egypt, undoing President Nasser’s eastward leap in 1956 following the refusal by the U.S. to provide arms to Egypt and financing for the Aswan Dam.

Stormy Relations

Only days prior to his cancellation of the Soviet treaty, President Sadat expressed to me his government’s long dissatisfaction with Moscow’s vacillation and briefly recounted the tension-ridden history of Soviet-Egyptian relations during the past 5 years.

“There have been great difficulties,” he explained. “[Former Egyptian President] Nasser had visited the Soviet Union secretly in January 1970 ... and they had promised him certain arms. He returned home in very high spirits, and told me all the details.”

“When Nasser died [a few months later],” Sadat continued, “I asked the Soviets why they didn’t send [the promised arms]. They thought Nasser hadn’t told me about it. So during my secret visit to the Soviet Union on March 1-2, 1971, I told them the full details. We had a very hot discussion there... But in spite of that, they still didn’t send anything.”

President Sadat further related that prior to Nasser’s death in September 1970, Egypt on a number of occasions had asked the Soviets for a friendship treaty, but the Kremlin, for reasons of their own, had repeatedly refused. But then in May 1971, the Soviets suddenly became agreeable, and Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny traveled to Cairo to sign a 15-year treaty of friendship. But the treaty, to Egypt’s disappointment, produced no appreciable increase in military assistance.

“I visited the Soviet Union four times as president — one secret visit and three declared visits,” Sadat told me. “In those meetings we had very hot discussions. We differed because they didn’t provide us with the materiel that they had promised to Nasser... and later to me.”

Sadat explained that Moscow’s failure to provide Egypt with advanced offensive arms finally resulted in his order for the expulsion in July 1972 of some 20,000 Soviet military advisers from Egypt. This, for the most part, ended the Soviet military presence in Egypt and further cooled the already-icy Soviet-Egyptian relations.

But the treaty still remained in effect, and further attempts were made by Egypt to elicit Soviet aid.

Now, Russia’s continued failure to respond to Egypt’s needs has finally resulted in the complete termination of the 1971 treaty.

Weapons From America?

Sadat’s bold move has finally cut Egypt adrift from Moscow’s orbit and has cleared the way for increased cooperation with the West. With bridges to Moscow now burned irrevocably, Sadat has actually created a new dependence on the West.

The Egyptian president noted in his March 14 address that, within one year to 18 months, much of the Soviet hardware presently in Egypt will have deteriorated into scrap for lack of replacement parts and proper maintenance.

Sadat therefore desperately needs alternate military aid to replace the Soviet equipment and keep his forces up to date.

Sadat’s recent visits to West Germany, France, and Italy — aimed, in part, at finding new arms sources — produced some results, notably in France. But the only place he can obtain the quantity and quality of weaponry he needs is in the U.S.

At this writing, the Ford Administration appears to have won sufficient congressional support to proceed with its plan to sell Egypt six C-130 transport planes as a kick-off deal.

Not surprisingly, the prospect of U.S. arms sales to Egypt has triggered a vociferous outcry from Israeli and American Jews, who feel that the sale of the C-130s would only be the beginning of a long list of arms sales to Egypt by the United States.

Many analysts, however, feel that when the alternatives are carefully considered, U.S. military aid to Egypt might actually serve the best interests of all concerned — including Israel — in the long run.

How?

Just prior to my visit with Sadat in early March, he had completed a tour of six wealthy Persian Gulf nations. (Continued on page 41)
Italy’s Red Tide

ROME, April 21, 1976: According to popular legend, Rome celebrated its twenty-seven hundredth birthday today. But it's not a very joyous occasion.

Throughout Italy the signs of national decay are everywhere — political violence and terror, nationwide strikes, tumbling stock prices, political kidnapping, violent street crime, and corruption of the highest officials of the government. Overall hovers a generally inept and corrupt bureaucracy, incapable of pulling the nation together.

Now for the first time in thirty years, Italy’s formidable Communist Party may soon have an official role in the Italian government — if elections take place this June as expected.

The specter of Communists entering a government of Western Europe has haunted both free Europeans and Americans since the end of World War II. Although ostensibly the Communist Party of Italy (PCI) has made every effort to carve out an independent position in foreign policy from that of the Soviet Union, Western leaders fear that, should it ever gain firm control, it would abandon its moderate and independent position and fall under the dictates of the Soviet Union.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has been totally opposed to any new Italian government in which the Communists would even have a part, such as the long-sought PCI goal of a “historic compromise” between it and the Christian Democrats. Kissinger has made ominous and melancholy statements about the effect of such a development upon all of Western Europe and the whole Western alliance.

Even though Italy’s Communist leaders have proclaimed they would continue to support Italian participation in NATO, and although they deny any interest in NATO “secrets,” Western military experts seem convinced that an Italian Communist victory would spell the end of NATO, at least as it has been structured during the past three decades.

It is, of course, clear that something must be done in Italy to restore a government that will begin to cope seriously with all of the grave economic and political problems which confront the Italian people.

It is commonly believed by many observers of the Italian political scene that a program of extreme national austerity must be undertaken immediately and that such can only be accomplished with the cooperation and participation of the Communists, who have a good track record in running their many municipal and regional governments. It is only through such an all-out national effort, crossing even ideological lines, they believe, can Italy’s deteriorating economic slide into oblivion be halted.

Meanwhile, the Italian people in Rome seem to be fiddling as Rome burns. Never have the boutiques been more crowded. With the lira falling in value daily, Romans seem eager to unload their depreciating currency for life’s luxuries while they are affordable. Each day sees yet another scandal hit the headlines — producing only more popular contempt, scepticism, and disrespect toward the government.

Throughout the nations of Western Europe, internal problems continue to mount. Britain, under new Prime Minister James Callaghan, has seen the pound sterling plummet to its lowest level in history ($1.80). Conditions in Portugal and Spain are clearly unsettled. In France, President Giscard D'Estaing has seen his popularity fall to its lowest level since he took office almost two years ago. (One will recall that he was victorious over the opposition Socialist-Communist alliance by the slimmest of margins.) Today the socialist party of France is stronger than ever before.

As if U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger didn’t have enough to worry about in Europe, he has now embarked on a trip through black Africa in an effort to shore up American positions in that troubled continent.

Next month, Plain Truth Editor-in-Chief Herbert W. Armstrong and I will spend three or four weeks in Africa, including the Republic of South Africa. Last year Mr. Armstrong was aware of the important changes about to take place in the balance of equilibrium of black Africa, and we spent considerable time in Ethiopia and Kenya. Immediately thereafter we announced plans to visit Nigeria, but they had to be postponed because the Nigerian government which, on the surface, had appeared to be very stable, suddenly was overthrown in a coup d’état. Even Mr. Kissinger finds himself unable to visit Nigeria on this present swing through Africa because his security cannot be insured.

Mr. Armstrong’s message month after month in Plain Truth for more than 40 years has clearly and vividly projected world events far in advance of their occurrence, as have the writings of others in this publication. We will always strive to bring you the real meaning of the news. □
An Overview of Major News Events and Trends

COMMUNISTS NEAR POWER IN ITALY—AS EUROPE’S UNITY DRIVE FALTERS

Amid unprecedented economic and social chaos, Italy is preparing for an early general election that could mark a major turning point in modern European history.

The collapse in late April of the wobbly Christian Democratic government of Premier Aldo Moro—Italy’s 38th government since the end of World War II—has forced President Giovanni Leone to dissolve parliament and call a national election to break the political impasse.

The election is to be held June 20 and 21—a year ahead of schedule. The upcoming balloting could open the door for Communist Party participation in the next Italian government—a prospect which is sending shock waves throughout the Western alliance.

At the same time a “Red Tide” is surging in Italy, the dream of a “United States of Europe” has almost faded from view, eclipsed by the forces of economics and unquenchable nationalism.

“European unity is now a punctured tire, likely to stay flat and unrepairable for a long time to come,” says a leading West German newsman. “Europe is in bad shape…in several respects the Nine [Common Market members] have reached the end of the easy road to a more perfect union.”

Reasons for the gloomy assessments are clear and unavoidable. One need look back no further than the most recent Common Market Summit Conference this past April 1 and 2, which ended up as a total failure. Convened originally to try to reach a formula on how the nine states were to be represented in a popularly elected European Parliament, the conference ended up deadlocked on this key issue.

Neither could decisions be reached on other outstanding problems such as inflation, unemployment, and—most critical of all—how to deal with a mounting fiscal crisis brought on by the sinking British pound and Italian lira.

The mood of the nine heads of state at the meeting was variously described as “gloomy,” “bleak,” and “morose.” “The sense of frustration was intense,” wrote the New York Times’ Flora Lewis, “not only because there are no prospects now for European unity but also because they [the heads of state] feel that, while the might of the Soviet Union is growing, the United States is leaving a vacuum that Europe cannot fill.”

Writing in the April 12 New Yorker, analyst William Pfaff makes it plain that the step-by-step method of uniting Europe via the process of economic integration has reached a dead end. The leap from customs union to political union is apparently unbridgeable. He writes: “Europe plainly has all the unity it wants—or all the unity it can bear. The calls regularly heard for new initiatives, the plans and studies made, the timetables proposed serve as universally acceptable substitutes for action that no one intends to take.

“Europe will not form a political union, because Europe cannot possibly agree on what it wants to become. A united Europe has one, and only one, obvious form to take: that of a federation dominated by West Germany and France…. But
Franco-German hegemony is not the Europe that the Dutch, Danes, Belgians, and Italians have in mind, to say nothing of the British and Irish...."

"Unity by degree" has run full steam into age-old nationalism. And now, Communist parties in Italy and France threaten to gain power, upsetting what little unity has been painfully achieved over the past two and one half decades.

It is now clear that unity in Europe will have to be hammered out on a different anvil.

In this respect, the statements of Pope Paul to a gathering of European bishops last October 18 takes on added significance: "We think that only the Christian civilization, from which Europe was born, can save this continent from the void it is experiencing.... And it is there that our mission as bishops in Europe takes on a gripping perspective. No other human force in Europe can render the service that is confided to us, promoters of the faith, to reawaken Europe's Christian soul, where its unity is rooted."

---

**PANAMA CANAL CONTROVERSY HEATS UP**

In recent presidential primaries former California governor Ronald Reagan has repeatedly charged that the administration plans to surrender the U.S.-built and operated waterway to the control of the regime of Panamanian strongman General Omar Torrijos.

President Ford, for his part, has called Mr. Reagan's statements irresponsible and said that if negotiations with Panama were broken off, "a recurrence of the bloodshed that took place in 1964" could result.

The Ford Administration has judged that it would be in the interest of the United States to reach a compromise over the canal, and the territory through which it runs, whereby the United States would retain access and defense rights, but give up political jurisdiction. Mr. Reagan has labeled any such compromise as giving in to "plain blackmail."

While much of the argument surrounding the canal generates passionate emotions on both sides, three major areas of controversy have emerged — sovereignty, defense, and U.S.-Latin relations.

- On the first issue — that of sovereignty — does the U.S. "own" the Panama Canal and its accompanying zone in the same sense that it owns Alaska?

According to the terms of the 1903 treaty between the U.S. and Panama, Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity the use, occupation and control" of the zone and authorized it to exercise "all the rights, power and authority within the zone... which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory... to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

In implementing the treaty, the United States proceeded to acquire outright ownership of all land and other property in the Canal Zone by purchase from the individual owners. The rights exercised by the United States in the Canal Zone are derived, therefore, from a grant by the government of Panama and purchases from the individual property owners.

The unusual phrase "if it were sovereign" has caused untold confusion. But clearly the United States has the right unilaterally under the treaty to retain full control of the zone as long as it wishes to do so!

The Panamanians realize full well the meaning and intent of the treaty. That is why they want to tear it up and write a new one. Unusual wording notwithstanding, there is no doubt who owns and who has exclusive rights to the canal and its zonal buffer: the United States.

Panama, it is recognized, has "tutelary" or "residual" sovereignty only, that is, should the United States choose to leave, the area revert to the nation which made the original grant — Panama. When Panamanians claim — as they often do — that the zone is part of "their territory" or is "their greatest natural resource," this rhetoric can be understood in only the most theoretical, not legal, terminology.

- On the issue of defense: It is claimed by some that the canal is indefensible. William Miller, who was Barry Goldwater's running mate in 1964 and is now campaigning for President Ford, notes that the American Joint Chiefs of Staff estimate that it would take 30,000 marines to protect the canal against insurgent attacks on the part of the Panamanians. He argues that, in the post-Vietnam era, defending the canal against a guerrilla war wouldn't be worth the cost in American and Panamanian lives.

American opponents of any new treaty point out that there already are 10,000 American troops in the Zone, and an extra 20,000 or 30,000 would not be an unbearable price to protect an American possession, particularly when one realizes that Panama has no national army, only a 6,000-man national guard.

Panama's primary agitation force is composed of several thousand university students, whom Torrijos claims to be holding in check — at least until after the elections.

The big question on defense is this: Is the United States willing — it is certainly able — to defend property that is clearly its own against any and all threats?

- U.S.-Latin Relations: The conventional wisdom in American diplomatic circles is that U.S. relinquishing of jurisdiction over the canal is a "test of maturity" and that continued American possession of the canal represents a "colonialist" enclave deep in the heart of a sovereign nation.

But there is another view, although it hasn't received much attention in the media. This view takes into account the Latin preoccupation with the concept of machismo, or manliness. Specifically, it holds that if the United States were to demonstrate the national will and strength necessary to keep the canal, it would earn for the U.S. at least a begrudging respect from Latin nations — perhaps not publicly, but privately.

**Loss Would Be Great**

The canal is still very important to the United States, both com-
mercilely and militarily. Two thirds of all ships transiting the canal — over 13,000 a year — sail to or from American ports.

On the military aspect, London’s Economist believes that the U.S. can afford to surrender the canal because it now has a two-ocean navy. The problem is, the size of the American navy is shrinking. The U.S. fleet has been almost halved in less than eight years — from 900 ships in 1968 to around 450 today. The Soviet navy, on the other hand, has grown rapidly to between 1,000 and 2,000 ships, depending on how one counts certain kinds of vessels.

The great disparity between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in total ships makes it even more important that the U.S. navy be able to shift what relatively few ships it does have to wherever they are needed, making the canal comparatively more valuable militarily than in recent years.

At present, there are more than enough votes in the U.S. Senate to block the ratification of any new treaty with Panama. Yet the bulk of those votes usually side with the Ford administration on other matters, and therefore may be subject to administration pressure. Furthermore, it is rumored that only 20 of the 38 senators who are on record as opposing the new treaty are really “hard core.”

It is very possible that what has been called “the most ambitious engineering undertaking in the history of mankind,” built and maintained at a cost of $7 billion in U.S. tax money, one of the greatest symbols of American technical and economic power, will soon come under the jurisdiction of General Omar Torrijos Herrera and his 1½ million citizens.

---

**AMERICA’S NEW AFRICAN POLICY**

In an eleventh-hour attempt to revive the crumbling American image in Africa, U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger embarked on a sudden late-April tour of a half dozen black African nations.

A major objective was to put on record the strongest American policy statement ever issued in support of black African demands for majority rule in white minority controlled areas of the southern part of the continent.

In a Lusaka, Zambia, speech that amounted to a U.S. declaration of psychological, economic, and diplomatic warfare against Rhodesia, Kissinger declared: “The Salisbury regime must understand that it cannot expect United States support either in diplomacy or in material help at any stage in its conflict with African states or African liberation movements.” He emphasized further, “On the contrary, it [Rhodesia] will face our unrelenting opposition until a final settlement is achieved.”

Kissinger threatened Rhodesia with congressional repeal of the so-called Byrd amendment which allowed the U.S. to import Rhodesian chrome in violation of United Nations sanctions. He also said that U.S. citizens would be warned against traveling to Rhodesia or encouraged to leave if residing there now.

In addition to his warnings to Rhodesia, Kissinger warned the government of South Africa that it had less time than it thought to put an end to apartheid, its policy of separate racial development. He urged the South African government to announce a long-awaited timetable for self-determination in South West Africa.

**Fear of the Soviets**

Behind the sudden strong U.S. support for black majority rule in southern Africa lies the remarkably swift victory of Soviet-backed forces in Angola in mid-February.

To Washington’s way of thinking, it is necessary to get on the black liberation “bandwagon” before it’s too late — before more of Africa falls into Marxist hands, and billions of dollars of U.S. investments are lost and American access to the continent’s invaluable strategic raw materials is cut off.

It is for this reason that, shortly after his strong stand on Rhodesia, Kissinger stopped in Zaire, the former Belgian Congo. Zaire is an immense mineral storehouse whose full potential has barely been tapped. It is obvious that Kissinger is pressing Zaire to link up in a “special relationship” with the U.S. similar to the new ties which Kissinger forged with Brazil, another mineral-rich power, on his recent swing through Latin America.

**What Happens to “Majority Rule”?**

Unfortunately, Kissinger’s new African realpolitik is a big gamble from two perspectives. No one can predict what will happen to American commercial assets in sub-Saharan Africa, especially the Republic of South Africa, which at over $1½ billion represents the single most important investment in any country on the continent.

Secondly, support for majority rule in no way precludes a bloody future for both blacks and whites in southern Africa. The new policy portends neither more freedom, democracy, nor civil rights for nations considered by blacks as yet “unliberated” from their colonial past.

The truth is, of the 49 countries in Africa, most of whom received independence after World War II, 15 are under direct military rule, and 29 have one-party civilian governments. Only 5 nations — two of them being Rhodesia and South Africa — have multiparty political systems. Three out of four Africans live under authoritarian regimes.

In other words, in most black African nations, the highly espoused ideal of one-man-one-vote black majority rule through the electoral process quickly breaks down to a complete farce of the democratic process. It becomes, as economist-columnist Milton Friedman puts it, “minority rule by a black elite that controls the one party permitted to exist.”

Nevertheless, in the rush to salvage what’s left of a U.S. role in Africa, to block further Soviet advances, and to guarantee continued access to raw materials vital to American industry, these facts, it would seem, must be set totally aside for the sake of political and economic expedience.

Undoubtedly this is the reason why Secretary Kissinger chose not to speak out equally as strong against the one-party black minority regimes in some of the countries he visited.
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BOOKS FOR SALE in Bucharest: Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Ceausescu — the pantheon of Romanian communism.

YUGOSLAVIA & ROMANIA

COMMUNISTS WHO THINK FOR THEMSELVES

by Gene H. Hogberg • photos by Dexter H. Faulkner & the author

Two nations tucked into the southeast corner of Europe are vigorously pursuing their own individual paths to communism. The big question is: How much longer will Moscow permit them to do so?
LAND OF “CONSUMER COMMUNISM”: Striking new buildings (left) characterize Novi Beograd, or New Belgrade. “Car remover” (right) clears the narrow streets of the older part of the Yugoslav capital of illegally parked cars. Surging automobile ownership presents a major problem.

Last spring two Plain Truth editors visited the nations of Eastern Europe on a tour sponsored by the National Press Club of Washington, D.C. Here is Part II of their story.

S

eeing Belgrade again after 13 years was a striking experience. When I first visited the Yugoslav capital in 1962, automobiles were old and relatively few, clothing was expensive and of poor quality, and the city itself looked provincial and old-worldly.

But all this has changed now. Long lines of Mercedes trucks and Yugoslav-made Fiat automobiles clog overburdened streets and highways. The citizens of Belgrade appear as well dressed as their counterparts in Western Europe.

Most remarkable of all, Novi Beograd — “New Belgrade” — a giant cluster of modern apartment complexes, barely begun in 1962, has mushroomed on the plains across the Sava River from the old city. The buildings are not like the ugly bandbox prefabs so common to the Soviet Union and the rest of “socialist” Europe. These have style, taste, even a certain amount of flair.

All this is evidence that Yugoslavia’s unique brand of highly unorthodox “consumer communism” has produced some rather remarkable results.

Worker Self-Management

Two years after he declared Yugoslavia’s independence from Stalin in 1948, President Josip Broz Tito — now in his 85th year — installed the concept of “worker self-management.” Industry is almost exclusively state owned, but only loose central planning emanates from Belgrade. The different public enterprises compete with each other and with imported goods from the capitalist West.

In-plant workers’ councils direct production every step of the way. They debate and agree on production targets, and they elect (and often advertise in the newspapers for) supervisory personnel.

Western economic experts, comparing the Yugoslav model to the traditional state monopoly economies elsewhere in Eastern Europe, generally come up with praise. Their major criticism of the system is the amount of time consumed by the endless council meetings. Someone added it up to being the equivalent of roughly one working month per man per year.

Yugoslavia has two major economic problems common to much of the West — inflation and unemployment, the latter at 10% being an anathema to ordinary Communist economies where the right to work is usually guaranteed in state constitutions. And, like neighboring Italy, Yugoslavia has a “southern” problem. The republics of Montenegro and Macedonia are limping way behind prosperous republics of Slovenia and Croatia in the north.

As far as agriculture is concerned, here again the Yugoslav model is unique for a Communist state. Today peasants hold eighty-five percent of Yugoslav farmland, owning eight out of ten tractors, one in every three combines. The private farmers are responsible for at least seventy percent of all farm production.

All this shows how much Yugoslavs of all ranks have at stake in preserving their unique political and economic system.

Most observers feel that the system will face its greatest challenge in the period which must inevitably come to pass some day with the “retirement” of modern Yugoslavia’s chief architect, Tito himself. (No one dares to speak of his “death.”)
TOUGH TALK TO THE SOVIETS from two powerful Eastern leaders: Romania's Ceausescu, left, asserted at last fall's European Security Conference that all European nations had the right to be "fully masters of their own destinies and to build their own future as they wish, without any outside interference." President Tito of Yugoslavia, right, taking a stroll at the Helsinki meeting, told delegates (but again with Russia clearly in mind): "We demand unconditional respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country."

Collective Presidency

To carry on the ship of state afterwards, Tito has created an eight-man collective state presidency. The eight are to represent Yugoslavia's six republics and two autonomous regions.

Since no national—truly Yugoslav as opposed to regional—figure has emerged to pick up Tito's mantle, the collective concept is the way he has chosen to deal with the centrifugal force of regional nationalism, which always lies just below the surface of Yugoslav politics. Four years ago, for example, Tito felt compelled to crack down hard on separatism in his own native Croatia which he felt, if left unchecked, would have threatened the whole federal system.

A flare-up of separatism would play straight into the hands of the greatest feared threat of all—direct Soviet intervention to forcefully return Yugoslavia to its former place in the Eastern bloc. By playing off one nationality against another and heating up a national crisis, rival, clandestine, pro-Moscow Communists would be all too willing to issue the invitation to the Red Army to "restore order." And that would be the end of Yugoslavia's twenty-eight years of independence.

"All-Nation Defense"

Not that Yugoslavia would be that easy a mark. Her army, relying heavily on tactics successfully developed in the rugged mountain warfare days of World War II, is tough and well-equipped. To stay that way, Belgrade is considering the resumption of American arms purchases. A new jet fighter is being built in conjunction with neighboring Romania.

And beginning last fall, a course in "all-nation defense" against future attack was begun in selected universities to provide graduates who will teach the subject in all schools—from elementary to university level.

"The involvement of women and youngsters is in itself a calculated deterrent to an invader who might not want to risk the international opprobrium that the slaughter of innocent women and children would bring," a Western military specialist said. "The all-nation defense idea would essentially be a holding operation to allow the military to organize full-scale resistance."

One thing is for certain. If Yugoslavia were ever brought back into the Moscow-dominated East European bloc, the ramifications would be immediate and disastrous for the West. NATO simply could not survive with a Yugoslavia in the Warsaw Pact—one reason being that the Soviet navy would be able to use Yugoslav ports on the Adriatic just across from politically unstable Italy.

There is an old saying that when something moves in the Balkans, Europe quivers. This is why the post-Tito era looms so large for all of Europe.

Romania's "Tito"

No two neighboring countries could be more dissimilar in so many respects than Yugoslavia and Romania—the next stop on our trip. Yet the two share one very important common factor: a powerful political personality at the helm.

What Tito has been to Yugoslavia for many years, Nicolae Ceausescu since 1965 has been to Romania. Critics in other East bloc countries claim that a "cult of personality" has been constructed around the 58 year old leader. And not without
WITH MODERN BELGRADE skyline in the background, ancient Kalemegdan Fortress overlooks Sava River.

some justification. Ceausescu is not only Romania's party chief, but also president, commander-in-chief of the army, and director of Romania's economic policy.

If a "personality cult" can be measured in terms of the number of pictures and posters of the person in public, then Mr. Ceausescu would rate very high. Ceausescu pictures in Romania are what Lenin posters are in the Soviet Union.

Tight Reins

Mr. Ceausescu is a powerful figure at the head of a regime that, despite many Western ties, brooks no opposition and maintains, in stark contrast to Yugoslavia, very tight internal control.

One sensed the difference immediately upon landing at Bucharest's airport on a flight from Belgrade.

On the apron sat three new Boeing 707s — illustrating Western economic ties. But viewing the marching (and at times double-timing) soldiers sporting submachine guns both on the outside of the airport as well as in the lobby, one quickly grasped he had entered a country with very rigid controls.

Bucharest airport was also the only port of entry where we have ever been searched on the way in! And for some curious reason, we were loaded onto an airport tram upon leaving the plane, even though we would only have had to walk about 100 feet to reach the terminal door. The trip was so short that the tram driver circled back around the plane to make the journey seem longer. The entire run was conducted under the watchful stare of armed sentries.

The price of Romania's progress, it was apparent, is curtailment of freedom — even for tourists.

But the men at the apex of Romanian politics have set their course. To their way of thinking, tight controls in all spheres of society are necessary to guarantee Romania's sovereignty.

Resisting Russian Pressure

Mr. Ceausescu does not enjoy the privilege of his country being completely independent as is the case with Yugoslavia. Romania is a member, though a somewhat balky one, of the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact, as well as Comecon, the East-bloc trade grouping.

But Mr. Ceausescu has steadfastly refused to allow Warsaw Pact maneuvers on Romanian soil or to grant the Russians a military supply corridor to Bulgaria. No Soviet troops are stationed in Romania.

Ceausescu has also refused to accept a decision to create an integrated command structure in the Warsaw-Pact, or a central headquarters staff such as NATO employs. As a result the Warsaw Pact remains a loosely coordinated grouping, almost entirely under Soviet control.

In some respects then, Romania is to the Warsaw Pact what France is to NATO — in the alliance, but dragging its heels on the command-structure issue.

As a further irritation to Moscow, Ceausescu has continually called for the simultaneous abolition of both the Warsaw Pact and NATO — an idea the Russians don't accept. Moscow stressing that NATO has to be dissolved first.

Economic Self-Determination

In the broad field of trade and economics, Romania has been even more of a thorn in the Russian side.

Ever since he took over the reigns of power, Mr. Ceausescu has vigorously pursued a Romania-first policy begun in the early 1960s.

The Romanians have steadfastly determined to push their own rapid industrialization program, rather than just being the garden spot and gasoline pump for the East — the twin roles the Russians wanted to give them in Comecon.

The reason for Mr. Ceausescu's intransigence is very clear: It is only (Continued on page 14)
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Clockwise from above: an apprehensive young citizen of Bucharest clasps father's thumbs while balancing on a bicycle; woman at an open-air village museum repairs relocated Romanian farm house in traditional manner; in front of the national theater, women gardeners tend to a flower patch. Women work side by side with men on many heavy projects in Romania's intensive industrialization program; balloon salesman makes change for customers. Simple pleasures make do for a population continuously asked to sacrifice individual goals for national advancement.
THE OIL FIELDS OF PLOESTI, about an hour's train ride north of Bucharest. Petroleum and petroleum products are key elements in Romania's growth-oriented economy.

through a high level of self-sufficiency, he maintains, that a small state can uphold a position of some independence within an alliance dominated by a big power.

He maintains, furthermore, that there must be total equality of national communist parties, never subservience.

How to Stay in Power

In many other respects, Romania and in particular Mr. Ceausescu have been able pretty much to have their own way, Soviet displeasure notwithstanding.

In the whole East bloc, only Yugoslavia has a greater proportion of its trade with the West. A major key to that westward trade lurch was establishing diplomatic ties with West Germany, which was accomplished in 1967, to the chagrin of Moscow which until that time was the only Eastern country which formally recognized Bonn.

The next year, Romania refused to join the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In 1971, Ceausescu made another daring political foray — a visit to mainland China, the chief Soviet rival for international communist leadership.

The Romanian head of state has so far played his cards masterfully.

In power for eleven years now, he has learned, says one Western diplomatic source, "not to spit in the eye of the Kremlin any more than you have to." Ceausescu too has learned from the Hungarian and Czech experiences that there are limits to what one can do.

The major factor in his favor is a political one. Ceausescu has always made it clear to the Russians that, despite pursuing his own diplomatic and economic goals, the authority of the Communist Party in Romania will never be diluted. Such was not the case with Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Dubcek regime was rapidly liberalizing its political machinery.

Ambitious Plan

Few realize just how rapidly the Romanian economy has grown in recent years — and what its leaders are shooting for in the future. The goal is nothing less than to join in the ranks of the fully developed nations by the early 1990s.

Not bad for a nation that up to the outbreak of World War II was one of the poorest countries in all Europe.

Even in 1950, Romania's per capita income was only $80 — about the level of Bangladesh today! If it weren't for her abundance of petroleum, it wouldn't even have been that high. By 1973, the figure had jumped tenfold to $800; by 1990 it is expected to rise to $3,500.

As of late 1975, Romania's annual growth rate was a remarkable 14%. One third of her GNP is plowed back into industrial investment every year. Chemical and petrochemical industries — Romania's industrial base -- are growing at a 20% annual clip. Industry will continue to suck workers in from the farms, which still employ 45% of the labor force.

Just by watching the crowds swirling at Bucharest's North Railway Station, one realizes very quickly from their appearance that a heavy percentage of them were working in the fields not very many months ago.

Consumers Pay

Obviously, with such an all-out effort, somebody has to pay. In this case, it is the Romanian consumer.

Wholesale purchasing of Western technology, plus heavy foreign debts, means that the best of what Romania produces has to be sold, in turn, to the West.

Romania's collective farms (and small private plots which, it is rumored, also will be pressed into the service of the state) produce high-
quality apples and tomatoes. But you’ll never see them in the food stores of Bucharest. They are all packed for export, leaving only bruised fruit behind.

The same with meat. Inside a Bucharest store, we noticed about two dozen varieties of unappealing, extremely fatty sausage, but no red meat. That’s for export only. Although Romanian fishermen catch 40 varieties of Black Sea fish, most of the output never stays home.

Canned goods included fruits from Communist China. These had to be purchased to balance the China account. (Meanwhile, hundreds of tons of Romanian peaches are sold elsewhere.) Locally produced canned items had quite a few labels slapped on crookedly, some even upside down. Wines looked to be of a utilitarian nature. The best stuff is again sold abroad.

The current five-year plan doesn’t hold out any more promising prospects for the man on the street either. Little wonder one Romanian businessman remarked (privately, of course): “We’re all getting a little tired of continuously being told to work for the next generation.”

“Sonnenfeldt Doctrine”

For the past few months, however, Romania’s leaders — and those in Yugoslavia as well — have been much more concerned about this generation. And uppermost in their concerns are hints of what they consider to be a significant policy reversal by Washington toward the whole of Eastern Europe.

Their fears surround the revelation of a secret briefing held in London in December for American ambassadors by a top state department official, Helmut Sonnenfeldt.

Mr. Sonnenfeldt said that the United States should encourage an “organic” relationship between Russia and the East Europeans.

The clear implication was that closer ties between Moscow and her client states would prevent any future uprisings in the bloc, which could produce such consternation and irrational behavior in Moscow that a major East-West blowup leading to World War III could occur.

His choice of the word “organic” was an unfortunate one. Sonnenfeldt has since admitted. He meant to say, he said, something like a “more tolerant,” “more complicated” relationship that would allow the Eastern Europeans more latitude for their national aspirations.

Nevertheless, the very idea that the United States seems to be going way beyond the “spirit of Helsinki” in recognizing the Soviet Union’s “natural role” in Eastern Europe has angered the two most independently minded East European states, Yugoslavia and Romania.

The Communist Party newspaper Borba of Yugoslavia hinted strongly on April 14 that relations with the United States could be endangered if Washington did not respect Belgrade’s “independent and nonaligned policy.”

The Romanian Communist Party newspaper Scinta added the same day: “It can be assessed that the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, by its whole essence, is a doctrine of denying the peoples’ right to independence, free development, a doctrine of domination and oppression ... a doctrine of dividing the world into zones of influence among the big powers.”

If the “Sonnenfeldt Doctrine” indeed represents new U.S. policy toward Eastern Europe, it is certainly not based upon strength, but upon acquiescence to the Soviet Union. Washington, which now seems to find the cases of Yugoslavia and Romania “uncomfortable” in its bigger detente dealings with the Soviets, will only do itself harm in the long run if it turns its back on these two peoples.

(To be continued)
CREATION... PRODUCT OF A DIVINE IDEA If any one word describes the awesome universe in which we live, it is probably "design." Cogent evidence of order and design can be found in the vast stellar systems of the
"When you get out there a quarter of a million miles away from home, you look at earth with a little different perspective. The earth looks big and beautiful and blue and white, and you can see from the antarctic to the north pole and the continental shores. The earth looks so perfect. There are no strings to hold it up. No fulcrum upon which it rests. You think of the infinity of space and the infinity of time... I didn't see God. But I am convinced of God by the order out in space. I know it didn't happen by accident."

Eugene A. Cernan, Apollo 17 astronaut

heavens and in the beautiful jewel we call Earth. Design is also found in the wondrous hidden potential of the smallest seed and in the marvelous molecular code of life. The handiwork of the Creator is clearly seen...
... in the winsome grin of a bottle-nose dolphin...

... in the extraordinary symbiotic cooperation between the colorful clown fish and the deadly sea anemone...
... in the kaleidoscopic color and minute detail of a bird's feather...

... in the hair spring trigger of a venus fly trap...
... in the purposeful organization in a colony of honey bees...

... in the microscopic structure and beauty of the smallest crystal...
“Anything as well ordered and perfectly created as is our earth and universe must have a Maker, a Master Designer. Anything so orderly, so perfect, so precisely balanced, so majestic as this creation can only be the product of a Divine Idea . . . .

“There must be a Maker; there can be no other way.”

Dr. Wernher von Braun

... and in the ability of the human mind to recognize and appreciate the genius of a Creator God.
Now that you've had a chance to look over the new Plain Truth magazine, we hope you'll agree it's better than ever. As you can see, we've returned to the popular, full-color, news-magazine format. Now 48 pages, each issue is packed with hard-hitting, incisive articles from Plain Truth's unique perspective.

The Plain Truth is unlike any other publication in the world. It keeps you ahead of the times by analyzing world events in the light of Bible prophecies. Major events now taking place in the world were being predicted 35 years ago in The Plain Truth. And the real, big news is yet to occur in the near future. In addition, The Plain Truth points the way to more successful living and offers practical solutions to the problems of everyday life.

Throughout the year, we'll be giving you a wide selection of stimulating, thought-provoking reading. Here's a small sampling of articles already in the works:

- Why Parents Are Running Away from Home
- What Does the Bible Say About Astrology?
- Noah's Ark — FOUND?
- Euthanasia — Do We Have a Right to Die?

We'll be happy to keep sending you the magazine, but you must let us know right away that you want to continue receiving it. Just return the attached envelope with the appropriate boxes checked.

As you may know, The Plain Truth has always been supported by the contributions of concerned readers. In the past, however, we have not informed our general readership of our financial needs. But now, spiraling publishing costs make it increasingly difficult for us to make this quality magazine available to all who want and need it. So we must take you into our confidence and ask for your support.

Can you contribute $5.00 or more to The Plain Truth with your renewal?

Your generosity will be greatly appreciated. Your contribution (tax-deductible in U.S.) will help make it possible for us to continue the magazine in its present format and will help make The Plain Truth's benefits available to others less fortunate. Of course, those who cannot afford a donation at this time may still feel free to request the magazine.

But whatever your decision, we must hear from you as soon as possible.

WHAT OUR READERS SAY:

I enjoy your magazine — possibly more than any other I have ever read on a continuing basis. It offers more "eye-opening" explanations for some of the commonly ignored and unexplained inconsistencies in our time than I have ever read — before or since. I get a lot from your editorials and articles. Keep up the good work!

James R. Peterson
Blackfoot, ID

Even though we have TV and radio, we still don't get as much as what comes into our home through your wonderful magazine.

Mrs. Rose K. Bender
North Hollywood, CA

I get more joy, more pleasure, and more satisfaction out of reading The Plain Truth and The Good News than the local newspapers. So here is my contribution for The Plain Truth. I would be lost without it. Thank you very much.

Nellie Anderson
Shreveport, LA
We'd like to send you this important new booklet as a token of our appreciation for your contribution, which helps make The Plain Truth possible.

Note: If you've already subscribed or renewed in 1976, or are one of our active co-workers, it is not necessary for you to renew at this time.
WAYS TO ENRICH YOUR MARRIAGE

by Gary Alexander

Why unhappy marriages? Why divorce, desertion, and marital unhappiness after a young couple exchange vows of "to love until death do us part"? Here are five practical steps you can take to be one of a shrinking minority — the happily married couple.

D ivorce lawyers, marriage counselors, and sociologists usually list three to seven major problem areas in a marriage. Here is a discussion of the five most prominent ones.

By reversing the major, underlying problem in each area, you will be attacking the root cause of most marriage problems.

I. Learn to Communicate

Marriage counselors list communication at the very top of needed marriage skills. One divorce lawyer went so far as to say: "It has been my experience that in at least 90 percent of all divorce cases, the reason for the termination of the marriage, if it had to be resolved in one phrase, would be 'lack of communication.'"

Hugo A. Bordeaux, executive director of the Marriage Counseling Service, Baltimore, Maryland, said: "All over America, husbands and wives cannot talk to each other. This, I am convinced, is our Number One marriage problem . . . ."

But why this gulf between a husband and wife who talked before they were married and, chances are, for months after they married? Is there nothing left to talk about?

No, that isn't the problem.

The real difficulty is neglect. The husband no longer seems interested in the wife and vice versa. The husband may be more engrossed in his favorite TV program, hobby or job. How can this be overcome? Only in one way. Both husband and wife must learn how to show true love and concern for each other.

Genuine love is outgoing concern. It is pointed away from self. It is a desire to help, to serve, to give to the one who is the object of that love. And no one ever "just happened" to give his life away or share his time, labor, thoughts, cares, hopes, and dreams with another human being. It takes work.

For you, step number one could well be to turn off that television set each night (or limit viewing to an hour or so each evening). Take time to discuss the day's activities, "small talk" along with the important developments. Bring the whole family into the discussion.

Communication is not just quiet discussion in stilted circumstances. It begins the moment you wake up, and it lasts all through the day. Husbands, call your wife from the office if possible. Take her for a walk. Don't be afraid to pitch in with household chores when the need arises. Spend an evening reading together. Comment to each other on what you're learning. Say "I love you." Each one of these is unselfish communication at its best. In short, love one another.

II. Build Compatibility and Companionship

"But we're not compatible," answer millions of unhappy couples. "We just don't have anything in common."

Chances are, before they were married, most couples thought they had everything in common. Never were two people so ideally matched, most couples thought. But why the idea now that they are incompatible?

"Incompatible" is probably the most frequently mentioned but least understood of all terms regarding marriage problems. Of course, no two persons are perfectly compatible or wholly incompatible. Only by living with a person do you learn his or her habits and peculiarities. Compatibility is not a birthright, but an adjustment. The greatest adjustment is to expand your own way of life to include another's way of life. Too many men and women want the other party to do all the adjusting.

Compatibility is a process that grows. The degree to which a couple increase their compatibility is the degree to which their marriage will become rewarding.

If you really feel you have nothing in common, make a list of all enjoyable things that you have done or haven't done but you wish you could. List between 10 and 25 items. Ask your spouse to do the same thing, separately. When you have both completed this, compare lists. In most cases there will be at least one common point of interest between you — probably several. Use that activity as a building block for doing things together.

The more a couple think and do together, the more compatible they
become. Struggling together against misfortune or to reach common goals is basic to marriage solidarity.

A survey of 250 happily married wives disclosed that the overwhelming reply to the question "What do you like most about your husband?" was "companionship."

Yet, so often couples lack this solid feeling that they are companions together throughout life.

Remember, no two people have exactly the same likes and dislikes. But that is not necessarily a handicap to a happy marriage. Two people of quite different natures are sometimes strongly attracted to each other. Many authorities say these complementary marriages sometimes have even more potential than the carbon-copy pairings.

The solution once again is an outgoing interest for one's partner. Happiness in marriage on this point is determined by how much two people are willing to overlook differences and strive to be of one mind on all matters.

"If two people start out with tremendous differences and resolve them over a lifetime of living together, they have a strength inside each of them and between them that nothing can take away," wrote one marriage counselor.

There are two more kinds of incompatibility most often mentioned in the divorce courts: sexual incompatibility and financial incompatibility. Let's now take a close look at how to overcome them.

III. Develop Sexual Compatibility

There is no end to the publishing of books about sex — from the excruciatingly factual manuals to the torridly unfaithful best-seller novels.

Marriage manuals, sex studies, and do-it-yourself divorce guides have, as usual, topped the recent best-seller list. Uncoupling promised us a civilized no-fault divorce, while The Intimate Enemy provided a sort of Geneva Convention for those who decided to fight it out together.

Meanwhile, the ubiquitous sex manuals — both popular and pornographic — told you everything you never wanted to know about sex and didn’t think to ask.

They all sold well, due to the dismal state of bed and board in America, but many of these volumes merely aggravated the marital woes which they were urging us to escape.

About half of the 45 million married couples in the U.S., it is claimed, are "sexually incompatible to some degree." It is "the great cause for divorce in this country," according to the now-famous research team of Masters and Johnson. Others estimate three fourths of all married couples are sexually troubled, with only about 10 percent of these due to physical malfunctions.

But aren't all those "love guides" helping these couples out of their ignorance? Not necessarily so.

Dr. Stephen Neiger, executive director of the Sex Information and Education Council of Canada (SIECCAN), said, "Most of the troubled couples who come to see me for counseling have read three or four books on how to make love, and have been so damaged by them that they're forced to seek professional help!" He found that 9 out of 10 books on lovemaking were "garbage... misleading information sold in the guise of authoritative knowledge."

Dr. Paul Popeneo, general director of the American Institute for Family Relations in Los Angeles, agrees with this analysis. He explains that much sex literature "may be useless or harmful for one of four reasons: (1) Some of it deals so largely with abnormalities and perversion that it confuses the average young person. (2) Some of it is so vague and general that it is not applicable. (3) Some of it is what might be called mechanistic... and (4) some of it is what might be called perfectionist. It sets up a standard which few will need to attain."

This by no means condemns proper knowledge about sex. The Victorian Age shrouded our great-grandparents in ignorance. And it wasn't bliss! But on the other hand, the pendulum has over-swung to the point where voluminous physical sex knowledge is published without the all-important missing dimension.

Couples go into marriage believing sex is the elixir of life, balm for all ills, fountain of youth, the be-all and end-all of marriage. But it often doesn't work out as the manuals say it should.

What is wrong? It usually involves the missing ingredient in sex — an outgoing concern for your mate. Sex is merely the height of physical communication and companionship shared in the supreme expression of that love.

Marital sex matures as the couple increase in true love for each other. In fact, a fulfilling sexual relationship is impossible apart from an outgoing, physical expression of love — not a selfish expression of lust.

IV. Achieve Financial Compatibility

Financial problems in marriage are really only an effect of husbands and wives not communicating (point one). Finances are cited as a major cause of divorce, but they are only an effect of the other problems listed above. Many people live happily on a small salary when they communicate and make a cooperative effort. Financial arguments are usually based on home government — "How much credit?" — and "Who controls the money?" Often both partners want control, or perhaps neither does.

Experts cite finances as one of the major problem areas in many marriages. A Redbook survey found that "nearly 60 percent quarrel about money." The Donelsons, a husband-wife team of marital lawyers, wrote, "...husbands and wives fight over too much just as frequently as they do over too little" (Married Today, Single Tomorrow, pp. 10-11). In other words, they disagree over how the money is to be used.

Lewis M. Terman, in his voluminous research of marital conditions, listed "money matters" in the top position of husband-wife complaints. Dr. Popeneo, director of the American Institute for Family Relations for over 45 years, clarified this point in a Plain Truth interview: "Most of the so-called causes of divorce are actually symptoms rather than causes. Financial difficulties are very common, but people don't break up from these difficulties if they're happily married. Few people are really happily married if they quarrel over finances rather than simply working the problem out together."
Practical points in handling finances include first of all communication of needs, accompanied by a willingness to share. Once again this means having outgoing concern for the other mate.

One primary consideration involves the setting up of a family budget. This encourages communication, consideration of both partners’ needs, and agreement on priorities.

The main principles of budgeting include paying necessities first, avoiding excessive credit purchases, and -- an important factor for marital happiness -- allowing each partner pocket money for which he or she is not accountable to the other. Many women complain they can never buy the least item for themselves or their children without an accounting to their husbands. Meanwhile, hubby stops to buy snacks, drinks, or trinkets whenever he likes. Of course, there are also wives who want to spend freely and at the same time expect their husbands to account for every penny.

Who should manage the finances? This is the crux of most financial arguments. The husband should probably take the lead in setting up the budget. Depending on the circumstances, a wife might keep the records and pay the bills. Organization and individual duties will vary with each family. There is no set pattern. But, whatever is done, it should be done together. Sharing financial duties promotes family harmony. It builds stronger family ties in every way. It doesn’t matter which person stubs the checks or pays the clerk if they both communicate and cooperate.

Some men dress in the latest styles, while keeping their wives in shabby out-of-style clothing. This is not financial responsibility or compatibility. If the wife has expensive tastes for furnishings, home, clothing, and transportation, and the husband makes only half as much money as she wants, this is not financial compatibility. Both need to give in. Both should learn to do without luxuries until the husband has worked hard enough and long enough to earn them. And the husband should study and work hard in his occupation so he can advance financially. As children become less dependent upon Mom, perhaps she will choose to work or resume a career as well.

In our rapidly changing economy, one more financial consideration is important. As Dr. Popeneoe says, “Handling the finances should be reviewed regularly, in the light of changing conditions and the changing needs of home and family.” Be aware of financial news enough to know when to buy a home, a car, children’s clothes, etc. Study the cost of living (and the cost of borrowing), and counsel widely before making major purchases or budget changes.

Finances are a very important subject for every household in this affluent society. For more information, write for our free booklet, Managing Your Personal Finances.

V. Allow For Differences

Men and women are different in literally every cell of their bodies (due to male and female chromosomes), different in height, weight, figure, skeletal structure, metabolism, strength, some internal organs, ability to bear children -- and temperament! It is not a matter of superiority or inferiority in any of those fields, but a matter of difference. The wise married couple learns how to appreciate and enjoy these differences.

A much-misunderstood book by George and Nena O’Neill explains how to make the most out of these inherent differences, while building a firmer and more devoted partnership. They called it Open Marriage.

Basically, open marriage grants each partner a degree of independence within the marriage unit. Each mate gives his partner the freedom to pursue his or her own private interests -- jobs, hobbies, friends, and even finances when necessary -- independent of the other’s control. A mate is not treated as a “possession,” with the accompanying mistrust, jealousy, inequality, or role playing. Instead, each partner grants mutual trust, equality, personal privacy, identity, and full “personhood” to the other.

The authors of Open Marriage do not advocate extramarital “living together,” divorce, or communal marriage. They believe in the merits of the marriage, home, and family, but more as a unit for personal expression than as a regimented role-playing prison.

In such a marriage, the wife will grow to respect her husband much more than in a “closed” or oppressive marriage, and gradually she may voluntarily submit part of her freedom to him, joyfully, not out of fear of him or his legalistic due. Even in a troubled marriage, the mates may again learn respect and love for each other because they are once again exhibiting the unique individuality that first attracted one to the other before they were engaged.

In effect, the couple may return to the heady days of their courtship and romance, rather than the dull days of sameness which can kill the greatest of romances.

A few years ago a survey of 622 urban housewives revealed that they considered their roles to be mother, homemaker, and wife -- in that order. In fact, a third of the women never even mentioned their roles as wives, the only role of the three to which they vowed “I do” years earlier. A properly “open” marriage -- where each mate has opportunity to realize his full potential -- can help reverse that trend.

Your Marriage Can Be Happy

A strong family unit truly is the building block of a great nation. “A strong monogamous family and the highest culture” have historically always gone together, according to Dr. Popeneoe. “...if one deteriorated, so did the other!”

If every couple practiced these five points, the ascending divorce rate would immediately begin to decline, and perhaps almost vanish. It is gratifying to know that thousands of formerly unhappy marriages have been revived and enriched when the points discussed in this article have been faithfully and thoroughly applied.

ACT NOW...

TO KEEP YOUR NEW PLAIN TRUTH COMING
SEE PAGES 22-23
IN SEARCH OF A REAL CHRISTIAN

Believe it or not, one of the world's strangest, rarest creatures is an individual called a Christian. This challenging article takes you on an imaginary search for a person who matches the biblical definition.

by Garner Ted Armstrong

Millions upon millions of people feel they are Christians, that is, they are believers in the Christian religion, as opposed to the beliefs of Islam, Buddha, or Judaism. But once beyond the vague label of "Christian," all similarity stops. "Christians," it seems, come in every conceivable brand, stripe, and description — every size, shape, and ideal.

"Christianity," having undergone an evolution in meaning from the first century to the maze of confusing, conflicting beliefs and practices claiming the same title today, is an increasingly difficult word to define. Hundreds upon hundreds of organizations claim the title "Christian"; yet they may be so opposed to one another — not only in theology and theory, but also in some cases in active internecine warfare — that they constitute the bitterest of enemies.

In search of Christians

But suppose you were to conduct an experiment. By using the Bible definition of "Christian" — meaning the plain, simple, impossible-to-be-misunderstood scriptures clearly defining just what is meant by the name — suppose you embarked on a search to find such people?

First, you would foreground yourself by going through your Bible, carefully noting the many scriptures that define the word "Christian" — especially combing the New Testament which contains the very heart, root, and core of the teachings of Christ. You may even want to consult a dictionary or a popular encyclopedia.

Fine! You are now ready to begin. But how would you do it, and where would you look?

Should such a search begin with the large, multimillion-member organizations whose steeped edifices dot the land? Or instead among tiny, struggling missionary groups? Or perhaps among the various newly organized youth groups claiming to be God's own children?

Would your search also take you into health food stores or to communal settlements tucked away in secluded hills? Would it lead you into busy offices on Wall Street? Would it bring you face-to-face with military barricades manned by soldiers armed with submachine guns? Just such a scene was captioned "Christian gunfire" in a recent newspaper picture.

God's Dilemma

Should you have conducted your search during the darkest days of World War I, you could have seen the following scenario:

Picture it in your mind's eye. An American soldier crouching in an Allied trench in Europe slowly comes into full focus. Shells are shrieking overhead, and the night is punctuated with the shatter and spatter of machine-gun and rifle bullets. This soldier is scared half out of his wits. Tears are streaking the mud on his face, and a rosary is in his right hand. He is earnestly praying to God for physical salvation, for protection from his enemy, and for victory in the war so he can go back home to mom, girl friend, and job.

About three hundred yards to the east is the enemies' trench. In this one you suddenly see a young, blonde, good-looking kid with a straight nose and startling blue eyes. He's sporting one of those funny-looking helmets with a little spike in the top of it. He, too, is crouched in the corner half-crazed with fear, carefully cradling a rosary in his hands. And he happens to be praying the same prayer to the same God.

God's got a problem here. How would he decide which one of those boys was going to live? Which one of them is a real Christian?

In the Middle Ages

Your search takes you back to the Middle Ages. Surely you could find a true Christian then. Just look for the sign of the cross; or maybe the flashing blade of a blood-soaked sword catching the glint of the dying sun as it was dismembering the body of yet another "infidel." Look into the dungeons of medieval "Christianity," where hapless victims were put to death on the rack or burned at the stake. Some professing "Christians" of that day could be found ringing a town square of a tiny village hamlet, their eyes protruding in sadistic delight at the death cries of an alleged "witch," as the hooded executioner tossed his blazing torch at her feet.

True believers? True Christians? Where to find them — how to search — where to begin?

A Christian Scene?

An imaginary time-machine instantly ushers you back into the twentieth century. It's the middle of winter — 1976. You are escorted by automobile into the best residential area of a large American city in the Middle West. The sun is sinking low in the sky, but it's still daylight.
You are simply amazed at mile after mile of beautiful streets graced with large, fine, costly homes. Finally you come to a stylish, modern house with a big, beautiful bay window facing the street. You can't help but peer through it into the large family living room. Several empty cocktail glasses are over on the coffee table. A piano is over in one corner. Dad is playing a familiar tune, and Mom is leaning over his shoulder. The next-door neighbors are gathered around the piano, and the kids are playing around a beautiful green tree carefully laced with hand-made popcorn strings. You see the inviting glow of tiny tree lights with their many-hued colors. Ribbons and wrapping paper complete with two inches of snow are scattered here and there about a floor filled with all sorts of modern gifts and toys. And over the door is the obligatory mistletoe.

It's a lovely, white Christmas Eve complete with two inches of snow outside on the grass. But is it Christian? Is Christmas Christian? Did Christ celebrate Christmas? Did the original apostles? If you're interested in this subject, write for our free booklet about Christmas.

"See Your Easter Bonnet With All Your Frills Upon It"  
Irving Berlin's "Easter Parade" is one of the most beautiful melodies ever written. You can't help but begin to hum it. But what about all that is associated with this lovely tune? What about lent, ashes, rabbits, colored eggs, white shoes, and Maundy Thursday? Do all these things constitute the proper paraphernalia for the observance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ? Is Easter observance the mark of a true Christian? What about sunrise services?

By now it's early spring, and you are still diligently searching — carefully considering and sifting through all of the evidence. You find yourself in a huge, outdoor bowl somewhere in Southern California. Your bright red eyes would tell anyone when you got up. You peer sleepily at the gray faint hint of the false dawn in the East. You're on the outer fringes of a vast throng of perhaps eight thousand people. On the stage in the far distance is a man who is obviously religious. He's all decked out in garments specially designed for a religious ceremony.

It's just beginning to dawn, and everybody is in their favorite religious posture. Many are kneeling and clasping their hands in silent prayer. You are visibly impressed, but you still have to ask yourself: Is this Christian? You remember reading something about a similar occasion in the eighth chapter of Ezekiel. And you begin to wonder.

Still Searching
You take time out for a plane flight back east. You watch the passengers for lack of anything better to do. It's after takeoff, and the "No Smoking" sign has gone out. The fellow seated next to you quickly whips out a well-marked Bible, adjusts his reading glasses, and begins to read studiously, all the while making obvious red-and-blue marks with a flourish. You ask yourself if he is the rare person you are looking for; or is he simply a religious fanatic?

Some "true believers" are identified by shaved heads and long robes, while others are singled out by huge beards, flat-brimmed hats, square-toed shoes, and a rejection of twentieth-century life.

But are all these postures of righteousness the mark of a true Christian? There must be some reliable set of credentials.

"Ye Shall Know Them by Their Fruits"
Jesus explained to his disciples how to recognize the difference between a false prophet and a true one and by extension how to recognize anyone who represents God. He declared: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. . . . Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. 7:16-17, 20).

What kind of fruits are we talking about? Paul explains that the fruits of the holy spirit are "love, joy, peace, longsuffering [patience], gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance [self-control]. . . ." (Gal. 5:22-23). These are the fruits a true Christian should possess.

Jesus said: "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me you can do nothing." (John 15:5). It is only through Christ that a Christian can produce the spiritual fruit that marks him as a true follower of his. But there is much more to the story.

Christianity, a Way of Life
Believe it or not, Christianity is a full-time job. It's a profession, not just a "belief." It's what you do all the time, not what you do now and then, or when the mood strikes you, or when the social pressures build to the point of unbearable degree, thus sending you off "to church" once or twice a year, or to "confession" for a fresh shot of righteousness to replace the faded, dulled coating you're presently wearing.

Isn't it strange that millions of professing "Christians" do not seem to know that Christianity is a way of life? It's a way of thinking, acting, talking, working, playing, loving — a way of doing!

The Sermon on the Mount
Christ's teachings concerning love of enemies, turning the other cheek, and the precepts of the "Golden Rule" are so well known that they seem a commonplace, almost a casually repeated part of modern-day "Christianity."

Millions of professing Christians hear sermons preached from the famous "Beattitudes" found in the fifth chapter of Matthew. They are inspired, encouraged, and perhaps a little chagrined now and then as they listen to beautifully delivered, carefully phrased, sanctimoniously pronounced dissertations about the "poor in spirit," or "the merciful" or the "pure in heart."

Of course, all those concepts, when rightly understood, are all absolutely required of every true Christian. But Jesus Christ knew in advance that his teachings would be watered down, spiritualized away, and trampered underfoot in a maze of confusion and conflicting beliefs. He knew and forewarned that men would profess his name — would claim to be "Christian" — but would adamantly refuse to obey what he said.
"Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" asked Jesus (Luke 6:46). Jesus knew people would "believe on him," adore his person, and yet _pervert or ignore_ his message. "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many [not just a few] shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many" (Matt. 24:4, 5).

Continually, God's Word shows that there is a huge, unbridgeable gap between those _who profess the name_ "Christian" and those who are willing to _live_ a Christian life.

**Is Today's Christianity Really Christian?**

The disciples were first called "Christians" at Antioch (Acts 11:26). The word "Christian," as applied to these men and women, meant something shockingly different than it means to the millions today. If you could know how utterly, completely, and absolutely different they really were, it would boggle your mind.

They kept customs almost universally _abhorred_ by so-called "Christians" today! Their entire lifestyle was different. They kept God's true sabbath — the seventh day of the week — proved both by many scriptures in the book of Acts and throughout Paul's writings, and attested to by profane history. (Write for our two free booklets on the Christian sabbath.)

They observed God's true holy days, the _annual_ sabbaths. They dedicated their lives to _doing the work_ of preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God as a witness to the dying civilization of their time.

History proves there was a _total change_ in what "Christian" meant at Antioch and what it came to be called by the third century. It took bloodbaths to change some of it — to _force_ people, as the years went by, to abandon the customs Christ had taught and the early apostles had kept and taught others to keep.

Jesus had said to the religiousists of his day: "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition ... This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:6, 8-9). Did you grasp what Jesus said? It is possible to prostrate yourself before God in worship and yet do it all in vain!

**Turning Grace Into License**

Even before the close of the New Testament writings, Jude had to write: "... It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares ... ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness [license or permission to do evil], and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude 3, 4).

From the very days of Christ until now, the movement to turn grace (forgiveness, unmerited pardon, mercy upon repentance) into lasciviousness has continued. Today, millions of professing Christians seem to reject God's law. Thousands of their ministers fail to teach obedience to even Christ's clearest commands! Many say there is _nothing you must do_, therefore calling Christ a liar when he said: "... If thou wilt enter into life, _keep the commandments_" (Matt. 19:17).

God's Word makes it clear that to be a Christian you must repent of having broken God's law. All have sinned (Rom. 3:23), and the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23). Christ paid the penalty by shedding his life's blood in our place. But acceptance of his shed blood does not mean license or permission to live an _unrighteous_ life. "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, _in turning away every one of you from his iniquities_" (Acts 3:26).

Iniquity means lawlessness. Sin is the breaking of God's law (I John 3:4), and we must stop transgressing that law (in all of its points, as Christ magnified it and made it much more binding in the "Sermon on the Mount"). The apostle Peter said on the day of Pentecost: "Repent, and _be_ baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

**The Best Biblical Definition**

It is the spirit of God that makes the difference. And you either have it or you don't! It's that tangible.

It is _only_ by receiving the holy spirit that you _become_ a true Christian. "For by _one_ Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (I Cor. 12:13).

Probably the best and most concise biblical definition of a Christian is found in Romans: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, _if so be_ that the Spirit of God dwell in you. _Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his_" (Rom. 8:9).

It is the holy spirit that is the missing ingredient. No real, lasting, permanent spiritual fruit may be borne without it. With it your whole _life_ can be _changed_! Without it, you're not all there.

You were born to be begotten with God's spirit. That may sound a little strange to some of our new Plain Truth subscribers. But it's _true_! You are spiritually incomplete unless and until you have followed Peter's advice in Acts 2:38:

The holy spirit changes your _whole_ perspective. It changes your outlook, your point of view, your opinions, your very thought processes, your reasoning. It changes your attitude, it lifts your spirit, it enlivens, it energizes, and it vivifies.

It is the most precious, priceless, bountiful blessing a loving Father could ever give you — a part of his very own life. It truly makes you a real Christian! □

**RECOMMENDED READING**

The fundamentals of Christianity require an in-depth explanation. The Plain Truth editors further recommend, as additional reading, a booklet written by Garner Ted Armstrong. The title is _What Is a Real Christian?_ This free publication goes thoroughly into such subjects as the Sermon on the Mount, what real repentance is, and water baptism. If you are at all interested in Christianity, you cannot afford to be without this booklet.

In addition, these biblical subjects are all regularly covered, as a matter of course, in the Good News magazine. Your free subscription only awaits your letter.
In 1970, a virulent blight attacked the American corn crop. Millions of acres were devastated, resulting in a crop loss of fifty percent or more in some states, and a loss of nearly twenty percent of the total U.S. corn production. The “southern corn blight,” as it was called by most, came as a stunning demonstration of the genetic vulnerability of many currently grown crops.

“We were sitting around fat, dumb, and happy,” recalls Dr. William Caldwell, geneticist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. “The hybrids were producing well and all of a sudden the disease hit. We didn’t believe it could happen, but it did.”

The fact is that modern agriculture is depending on a relatively small number of genetically uniform crops to supply all of mankind’s food. Yet such uniformity can lead to pandemic disaster when drought, pests, and disease take their inevitable toll. And therein lies one of the most perplexing dilemmas of twentieth-century agriculture.

Genetic Uniformity

Concern over the quality of man’s domesticated plants is not new. The founders of the United States recognized the value of plants in fulfilling the food and fiber needs of a nation’s people. Thomas Jefferson’s belief in the value of “a useful plant,” expressed over two hundred years ago, is equally applicable today.

Indeed, when man first began to cultivate wild food plants thousands of years ago, the introduction of a new variety of crop often meant the
THE STARTLING VULNERABILITY OF MAJOR U.S. CROPS

Following the 1970 corn blight epidemic, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences prepared a report on the "Genetic Vulnerability of Major Crops." Their findings were sobering, if not alarming. Many U.S. crops are so genetically uniform that they are precariously vulnerable to catastrophic disease epidemics.

- 100% of all the millet in North America is from 3 varieties of seed.
- 96% of all peas comes from 2 varieties of seed.
- 76% of all snap beans comes from 3 varieties of seed.
- 72% of the potatoes comes from 4 varieties of seed.
- 71% of the corn is from 6 varieties of seed.
- 69% of the sweet potatoes comes from 1 variety of seed.
- 60% of all dry beans comes from 2 varieties of seed.
- 53% of the cotton comes from 3 varieties of seed.
- 65% of the rice comes from 4 varieties of seed.
- 56% of the soybeans comes from 6 varieties of seed.
- 42% of all sugar beets come from 2 varieties of seed.
- 95% of the peanuts comes from 9 varieties of seed.
- 50% of all wheat comes from 9 varieties of seed.

In most cases, the total number of U.S. varieties potentially available far exceeds the number currently being utilized: in the case of wheat, 269; corn, 197; potatoes, 82; soybeans, 62; peas, 50; and so on.

A Multibillion Dollar Business

MOST VALUABLE CROPS IN U.S.

Agriculture in the United States is a highly lucrative but vulnerable enterprise. Listed below are the 15 most valuable crops grown on U.S. soil. Note that the corn grown by U.S. farmers has a value of some 7 billion dollars, and that the value of alfalfa exceeds the total value of U.S. wheat production. When disease and pests strike, they consume crops worth tens or hundreds of millions of dollars. Indeed, the 15 crops listed have a value of $25 billion! Thus, a mere 1% shortfall of just these crops translates into a $250,000,000 loss. The danger of such losses is magnified by the fact that virtually all the leading crops in the U.S. are based on a very narrow genetic base.

From USDA statistics (1973)

difference between starvation and plenty.

"The genetic diversity of our crops is a national wealth which the varied racial and ethnic members of our nation have brought from their homelands, and acclimated from colonial times to the present in fields and gardens across the country," says Garrison Wilkes, Associate Professor of Biology at the University of Massachusetts. Boston. "Just as each group contributed aspects of its culture, so too have they added to the total genetic resources of our basic food plants."

However, Wilkes told The Plain Truth that he is deeply concerned over the future of our plant resources. Says Wilkes: "Today, instead of continuing to expand, these plant genetic resources are beginning to contract."

Why the contraction? The answer is that modern agriculture has placed such a premium on high-yielding, uniform crops that many otherwise acceptable varieties are no longer planted.

W. H. Gabelman, a University of Wisconsin plant breeder, analyzes it this way: "In our society, the communications media keeps farmers well informed on new varieties. A farmer makes sophisticated decisions on the basis of this information, and since he has to make a profit, he will choose the top-yielding variety. If there are only a few choices available, you get one or two varieties that dominate, leading to uniformity and possible vulnerability."

Other authorities point out that the great emphasis on "efficiency" and lower costs of production forces farmers to use high-yielding varieties. Demands for efficiency are really demands for uniformity, since efficiency can only be maximized with high-yielding hybrids. To achieve efficiency, the farmer must substitute machines for men. But machines can't think; they can't discriminate between a green tomato and a ripe one, for instance. Thus it is essential that varieties be uniform and that they ripen at the same time so a machine can do the harvesting.

Seeds are also sown by machine, again requiring uniform size. The seeds must germinate and grow vir-
tually simultaneously, or they leave space for weeds to grow in the row where the cultivating machine cannot go.

In short, the pressure for uniformity is often overwhelming. The result has been that a large percentage of the available acreage of each crop is planted with a limited number of varieties. For example, one hundred percent of all the millet grown in North America is from three varieties of seeds. Ninety-six percent of the pea crop is planted with only two pea types. (See accompanying box.)

"There is only one gene, as far as I know, that produces stringliness in green and wax beans," says Dr. James Horsfall, plant scientist at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven. "If a fungus mutation comes along that likes that gene, we’ve had it.

"For a crop-disease epidemic to occur, the weather must be right, the crop variety must be vulnerable, and a parasite must be present. We can’t manipulate the weather very well; we can’t manipulate the parasite," says Horsfall. "The only thing is to manipulate the host [crop]."

"And hanging over all crops in all countries — ‘like the sword of Damocles’," says Horsfall, "is the danger that reliance on a single genetic variety or two can lead to devastating losses from disease."

Wilkes agrees. "In advanced agriculture such as ours, the prey is at very high density, and conditions are ideal for insects, nematodes, bacteria, viruses, fungi, and rodents," warns Wilkes. "The price for the maintenance of high yields is an arsenal of insecticides and fungicides, along with the need to constantly change the genetic material and breed for resistance against the latest problem that threatens the yield."

**A Lesson from History**

Fortunately for the United States, the effect of the 1970 corn blight was limited to higher food costs; there was no starvation in the United States due to the blight. But such a crop failure in other countries such as Guatemala or Kenya, where the people obtain half of all their calories from corn directly, would have been disastrous.

In fact, history tells us that such disasters have already occurred. In the 18th century, the potato, a new food plant from South America, was introduced into Ireland. The genetic diversity of the species was small, but isolated from its diseases, the potato proliferated, allowing the Irish population to increase. Then, in the 1830s, with the population of Ireland increasing threefold to eight million, a previously unknown disease, caused by a fungus, attacked the potato crop. Within ten years, two million Irish emigrated, two million died, and four million remained, many in absolute poverty.

The Irish had inadvertently narrowed the genetic base of the crop, and there remained little or no resistance to the devastating fungus.

"At present," says Garrison Wilkes, "there exists an unstable ‘truce’ between our basic food plants and their pathogens. Genetic changes, either mutations or new re-combinations, are constantly taking place in individual pathogens, and if a pathogen suddenly grows successfully on a previously resistant plant host, it will be able to spread across the entire plant population if the latter is genetically uniform."

Professor J. R. Harlan of the University of Illinois, an eminent American plant ecologist, is equally alarmed. "American agriculture is an imported agriculture." Harlan told The Plain Truth at a news conference during the 1976 American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in Boston. "Every crop we grow is based on a vulnerable genetic base."

Harlan also points out that a remarkable proportion of the human diet is supplied by four cereals: wheat, rice, maize, and sorghum.

"Imagine, if you can," says Harlan, "the scope of the disaster if one of these should fail, if some new and virulent disease should appear with which we are unable to cope in time. Surely it is imperative that we know all that we possibly can about all of the germ plasm within genetic reach in our major food plants."

**Genetic Erosion**

Yet the potential danger in over-reliance on genetically uniform crops does not stop with the specter of future crop failures. Indeed, if the possibility of an occasional crop failure were the only source of concern, it could logically be argued that such is the price we must pay for the vastly improved production of modern agriculture.

But an even greater problem is that the very success of the new hybrids has meant that they have been supplanting native varieties all over the world, and in many cases, the native crops — along with their genetic diversity — have simply disappeared forever.

"There is nothing biologically unsound about breeding for high yields, and using a narrow genetic base is a plant-breeding expediency necessary to obtain the most uniform, high-yielding seed in the shortest period of time," Wilkes reminds us. "But it is unthinkable not to preserve and maintain the ready reserves of genetic diversity that still exist in native agriculture for future plant breeding needs."

"Up to the present time, we have been able to return to areas of
INTERVIEW WITH DR. ERNA BENNETT
GENETIC RESOURCES EXPERT

Are the modern varieties of crops on which man depends for food vulnerable to sudden, catastrophic epidemics? To find out, Plain Truth correspondent Ray Kosanke of our Brussels Bureau talked with Dr. Erna Bennett, a U.N. expert on genetic conservation and resources.

KOSANKE: Much publicity has been given recently to the fact that the profuse varieties of plant life that man has used for centuries to breed his food crops are rapidly disappearing. What's causing this genetic erosion?

BENNETT: To begin with, we ought to realize that the process of genetic erosion is almost inevitably bound up with the process of agricultural improvement. Wherever agriculture is improved, the old varieties are replaced with new ones. The old stuff that the farmers have been growing in their own fields year after year for generations and generations has been replaced by new seed from plant breeding stations, from the agricultural credit banks, and from the agricultural extension programs. The long and the short of it is that everywhere that agricultural development takes place the old varieties disappear. It's a fairly direct relationship.

Q. Could you give some examples?
A. Certainly. The genetic diversity in flax in the 1940s in Turkey was very considerable, but by the late 1950s the diversity of flax had almost entirely disappeared from that particular area. Moving over to Greece, our own examinations there have shown that in 1930 about 80% of the wheat that was sown was indigenous wheat — native varieties sown from the surplus kept by the farmer from the previous year's crop. By 1960, this proportion had fallen to about 10%, but today it is falling to something almost negligible. The story is repeated endlessly almost everywhere.

Q. Why do you consider this erosion of genetic materials such a critical problem?
A. One of the things that we notice when we travel in primitive parts of the world where these modern varieties don't occur at all, or didn't occur at all until quite recently, is that there is no crop ever completely free of disease but there is no crop ever completely devastated by disease. Disease and variety live in a kind of genetic balance with each other. Now if we start to rely not just continental wide, but on an intercontinental basis on single varieties, the dangers of intercontinental epidemics are correspondingly greater.

The conclusion seems to me to be unavoidable that we neglect genetic diversity at our own risk.

Q. In the major bread basket areas of the world, such as the United States and Canada, are we getting into a dangerous situation by not having greater varieties of seed grains available?
A. We can definitely say that observers from many of the Near Eastern countries into which the high-yielding, disease-resistant wheats have been introduced in the last decade are coming back now with reports of wide-spread rust infections, though not yet of epidemic proportions. But we don't know what will happen in the future.

Q. What about the U.S. corn blight in 1970?
A. Here again is why we are so concerned about what is called genetic vulnerability. In the case of maize, you have an extremely narrow, extremely weak basis of resistance relying on one or several genes at the very most which are very, very quickly bypassed by the pathogen.

Q. What do you think are the major problems in collecting native seed specimens?
A. The problem basically is to go out and get the material. Clearly, the less developed an area is, the less a zone has been touched by modern conditions, the more important it is. Clearly, therefore, the explorer must aim to get away from every sign of progress.

Q. How long can the seeds for all of these different varieties be maintained?
A. That's a good question to which there simply isn't an answer yet, the reason being that studies of seed longevity are only now beginning to be conducted in a precise and reliable way.

The combinations of temperature and humidity and their effect on the viability of seeds of different species are only now being examined for the first time in a thoroughly methodical manner, so obviously it's going to be a long time before we know the results.

It looks as if certain species can be kept for several hundred years. Others, fruit seed, for example, keep very badly for only several months or less than a year.

Q. Some experts have suggested it may already be too late to save the majority of the primitive strains. Is this assessment accurate?
A. There are many that have already been extinguished, and we'll never know how many. In other words, when we make the final count, it will merely be the count of what we have managed to save from extinction.
genetic diversity, usually located in Third World nations, to collect germplasm for further breeding programs. Suddenly in the 1970s we are discovering Mexican farmers are planting hybrid corn seed corn from a Midwestern seed firm, that Tibetan farmers are planting barley from a Scandinavian plant breeding station, and that Turkish farmers are planting wheat from the Mexican Wheat Program. Each of these classic areas of genetic diversity is rapidly becoming an area of seed uniformity."

Continues Wilkes, "The reason for alarm and concern about the loss of native strains is the irreplaceable nature of the genetic wealth. The only place genes can be stored is in living systems, either living branches, such as the bud wood of apple trees, or in the living embryo in a kernel of corn or wheat. The native varieties can become extinct once they are dropped in favor of introduced seed. The extinction can take place in a single year if the seeds are cooked and eaten instead of saved as seed stock. Quite literally, the genetic heritage of a millennium in a particular valley can disappear in a single bowl of porridge."

The Shrinking Gene Pool

A special U.N. report on the problem of plant genetic resources, prepared by the Food and Agricultural Organization, was released some four years ago. Dr. Erna Bennett, a U.N. biologist, conducted much of the research for the report. Bennett maintains that genetic erosion has continued to occur, almost unchecked, and that "continent-wide famines" may be the result in the next few years.

According to the U.N. report: "Modern agriculture with intensive cultivation and weed control and the widespread use of improved highly uniform crop varieties is wiping the primitive varieties out of existence; they are disappearing by the thousand every year."

Concludes the U.N. report: "If the primitive crops are not rescued, the science of plant breeding which has done so much to feed swelling populations over the past century will virtually come to a stop."

Too Little Too Late?

"The world is ripe for disastrous miscalculations," warns Harlan. "In view of the obvious limitations of our collections and in face of the current genetic 'wipe out' of centers of diversity, it may be too little and too late. We continue to act as though we could always replenish our supplies of genetic diversity. Such is not the case. The time is approaching, and may not be far off, when essentially all the genetic resources of our major crops will be found either in the crops being grown in the field or in our gene banks. This will be a risky state of affairs and will demand a great deal more time and effort on genetic resource management than we have ever devoted to it in the past."

"We need a sense of urgency in collecting and preserving our rapidly disappearing plant genetic resources," maintains Howard L. Hyland, principal plant introduction officer in the Germ Resources Laboratory of the USDA. "This must be a matter of great public concern if we are to insure the success of our future agricultural program."

How real are the dangers? What is the potential magnitude of the disaster that could result from failure of a major crop? "One might as well ask how serious is atomic warfare?" asserts Harlan. "The consequences of failure of one of our major food plants are beyond imagination."

Will crop failures and famine strike in the near future? God prophesied that ancient Israel — a nation which failed to heed him — would eventually suffer great catastrophes. "Thou shalt carry much seed out into the field, and shalt gather but little in," says God in Deut. 28:38. For ancient Israel, that prophecy came to pass. In modern times, our nation, like ancient Israel, may be heading for calamities we now only dimly perceive.

"The line between abundance and disaster is becoming thinner and thinner, and the public is unaware and unconcerned," concludes Harlan. "Must we wait for disaster to be real before we are heard? Will people listen only after it is too late?"
THE COSMIC CONNECTION

IS MAN ALONE?

by Robert A. Ginskey

"Somewhere across space giant instruments, handled by strange manipulative organs, may stare vainly at our floating cloud wrack, their owners yearning as we yearn."

— Loren Eiseley, The Immense Journey

Amid the excitement and celebration of July 4, 1976, a historic and intriguing event will take place on the planet Mars. After a half-billion-mile journey, the intricate spacecraft, Viking, will descend to the Martian surface and begin an unprecedented probe: an extraterrestrial search for life.

If all goes according to plan, U.S. television viewers should see closeup and panoramic still photographs of the Martian surface within hours after the Viking touches down. But more important will be the results of sophisticated experiments designed to detect life on the surface of the red planet.

If mankind should receive hard evidence that life exists elsewhere in the solar system, that startling revelation would be well worth the $1 billion cost. Indeed, the detecting of extraterrestrial life would undoubtedly be the most dramatic and profound discovery of recorded history.

The Viking mission to Mars is the latest in a series of probes designed to answer one of mankind's most persistent and provocative questions: Is man alone in the universe? Is life unique to the earth?

For millennia, man has mused over his place in the cosmos. The Copernican revolution 500 years ago changed man's conception of his physical location in the universe. But only recently, with the invention of powerful space-age rockets and the development of highly sensitive radio telescopes, has he been able to take positive steps toward resolving the question of whether life exists on other worlds.

A MESSAGE FROM MAN

Man's first written attempt to communicate with alien intelligence occurred in 1972, when a special aluminum plaque was attached to the Pioneer 10 space probe. Pioneer 10 was primarily designed to send back information about the planet Jupiter, but unlike all previous spacecraft, Pioneer 10 has a trajectory that will eventually carry it completely out of the solar system at a velocity of about 70,000 miles per hour. This is faster than any previous man-made object.

The small plaque carried by Pioneer 10 symbolically describes the origin of the spacecraft, and, among other things, it portrays a pictorial representation of a man and a woman.

But what are the odds that intelligent beings exist in other regions of the heavens? Is it likely? Or are the chances vanishingly small? Calculating the probability that man is not alone in the universe involves numerous factors (see box). Yet many scientists, as well as lay-
"A vast body of knowledge accumulated over billions of years awaits access by mankind, by any race that has the technological prowess to qualify for it . . . a priceless resource of understanding the universe. This body of knowledge might be termed our galactic heritage."

Would participation in a galactic community enhance the spirit of man? Or would contact with other intelligent life do little other than undermine the many religions that have focused on man as a unique and special creation of God?

Man's rendezvous with destiny may indeed lie in his communication with a superior being, but the final contact might be even more remarkable than we can now imagine.
men, are fascinated by the prospects that man may eventually find a universe virtually teeming with intelligent life.

The unimaginable distances in the universe seem to preclude direct travel by future astronauts to explore other worlds. Even if a spaceship moved at the limiting speed of light (186,000 miles per second), such space voyages would still take centuries or millennia in earth time.

**The New Telescopes**

However, developments in radio telescopes have now reached the point where man has the technical know-how and facilities to broadcast his existence throughout the Milky Way galaxy. In other words, if man’s most powerful transmitter were channeled into man’s largest radio telescope, its radio message could be monitored by present-day equipment on the other side of the galaxy — 100,000 light years or 600 quadrillion miles away!

The capability now exists for a very sophisticated search for intelligence on other worlds.

In 1960, astronomer Frank Drake used the giant radio telescope at the U.S. National Radio Astronomy Observatory to monitor radio waves from nearby stars in the hope of detecting signals from other civilizations. Drake’s experiment, called project Ozma, failed to pick up any strange (intelligent) signals, but the sensitivity of his equipment was not very high.

More recently, astronomer G. L. Verschuur scanned ten nearby stars for signs of life. His apparatus was so sensitive that it could find in five minutes what Drake’s equipment would have needed twenty days to detect. Verschuur’s apparatus could have picked up signals from Barnard’s star radiated by a 600-kilowatt transmitter acting into a modest 300-foot-diameter radio telescope.

(Continued on page 40)

**The Chances for Intelligence**

Is man part of a cosmic community of intelligent beings? How many civilizations might reasonably be expected to coexist in one galaxy? Scientists usually break this difficult question into seven basic factors that, multiplied together, will yield the expected number of such civilizations. These factors are:

- The average rate of star formation in the galaxy.
- The fraction of stars with planets.
- The number of planets per planetary system suitable for life.
- The fraction of suitable planets on which life exists.
- The fraction of life-bearing planets with intelligence.
- The fraction of planets with intelligent life that develop a technological phase and interest in interstellar communication.
- The average lifetime of a technological civilization.

None of the above factors are known with any precision, and they are often assigned widely differing values. For example, if a suitable planet exists, some scientists believe the probability is excellent that life will eventually evolve. Others believe that even in a favorable environment the chances against life evolving are astronomical. Similar disagreements exist for most of the remaining factors.

Exo-biologist Carl Sagan believes the number of technological civilizations is about 10 percent of the lifetime of such civilizations. This implies that the average lifetime of a highly technological civilization determines the number of currently existing civilizations.

Mankind already has an ominous ability to self-destruct; yet it has only been about 10 years since man has been capable of interstellar communication. If we fail to survive much longer, and if we are representative of other galactic civilizations, then the likely conclusion is that just one technological civilization currently exists in the Milky Way galaxy: ourselves. If so, a massive search for extraterrestrial intelligence will probably be a waste of time and funds.

On the other hand, if some technological societies have learned to survive indefinitely, then the number of technological civilizations presently in our galaxy is much greater. Sagan has calculated that if only one percent of all civilizations master the key to perpetuating themselves, then the corresponding number of civilizations in the galaxy today becomes about one million.

Yet even if other intelligent civilizations do exist, the vast distances between the stars pose an awesome and time-consuming challenge for any two-way communications between galactic communities.
But again, no unexpected signals were ever detected.

“Hello” from Earth

While many scientists have repeatedly listened for messages from outer space, it was only a little over a year ago that man deliberately sent a radio message to any intelligent civilization that might be in range of our largest and most powerful radio telescope.

To send the message, the famed 1,000-foot-diameter Arecibo radio telescope in Puerto Rico was enlisted. Equipped with a 450,000-watt transmitter, the Arecibo antenna was able to focus its power to an equivalent of 25 times all the man-made electrical power ever produced on earth.

Yet, for all its power, the message will be a long, long time en route — about 24,000 years. Sometime around the year A.D. 25,974, in the distant globular star cluster called Messier 13, it could just happen that one of the resident life forms will detect an unusual signal coming from earth. Being intelligent creatures, the alien residents should have no trouble breaking the code and receiving their first "hello" from a creature called man.

If earthlings are still here to receive a reply — another 24,000 years later — they will be about our sixteen hundredth generation of grandchildren.

Cyclops — the Biggest Eye

In spite of the difficulties of galactic communication, the prevalent belief that we are not alone in the universe has stimulated even more ambitious proposals for contacting what is often referred to as the cosmic community. The idea that man is a unique intelligence in the scheme of things is now being replaced by a belief that intelligent consciousness may exist throughout the universe.

Dr. Bernard Oliver, a strong proponent of space exploration, believes that "life in the universe may have been around for billions of years." To detect that life, Oliver and others propose a gigantic array of radio telescopes which would enable us "to listen in on the heavenly discourse of the galactic community."

The orchard-like arrangement of about 1,000 large antennae several miles wide would look like a multifaceted eye peering into space.

Hence the name: Project Cyclops. Such an enormous eye would be capable of communicating over distances of thousands of light years, but its cost would be about $1 billion a year for about 10 years.

Opponents of project Cyclops maintain the cost is entirely too high for what would probably be a futile experiment. On the other hand supporters claim the price is very reasonable, especially compared to the hundreds of billions presently spent for defense, or even compared to the present expenditures for cigarettes.

What could Cyclops achieve for mankind? According to Oliver, there are probably billions of races that are (or were) successful throughout the galaxy. "They constitute," says Oliver, "a priceless resource of wisdom and understanding of the universe."

"If all this is true," adds Oliver, "then a vast body of knowledge accumulated over billions of years awaits access by mankind, by any race that has the technological prowess to qualify for it. This body of knowledge might be termed our galactic heritage."

But what would be the result of contact with other intelligent life in the universe? Would it lift our horizons out of the sphere of our own petty rivalries and involve us in the common cause of life throughout the galaxy? Or, would a veil of secrecy be thrown on all such communication as each nation sought to gain control of this new and potentially dangerous source of knowledge?

Would participation in a galactic community, "enhance the spirit of man"? Or, would contact with other intelligent life do little other than undermine the many religions that have focused on man as a unique and special creation of God?

As man enters the last quarter of the twentieth century, his future clouded and uncertain, perhaps it is not surprising that he seeks to end his seeming isolation in the universe by attempting to communicate with other civilizations many light years away. Perhaps a more intelligent, knowledgeable being would have the scientific, cultural, societal, and yes, even the religious perspective to extricate mankind from a myriad of perplexing problems.

Man's rendezvous with destiny may indeed lie in his communication with a superior being, but the final contact might be even more remarkable than we can now imagine. And the irony is this: that Being may be only a prayer away. □
SADAT (Continued from page 4)

tions in search of political backing for his Middle East policies and cash and loans for arms purchases and national reconstruction. In addition to the billions he was promised in long-term loans, he was given hundreds of millions of dollars in cash for arms purchases.

This ready cash — if not spent in the United States — will undoubtedly be spent elsewhere. And if Sadat is forced to go elsewhere to spend his money, military analysts feel Washington will have lost its opportunity to become the major arms supplier to both Israel and Egypt, and with it the chance to eventually scale down the flow of arms to the region.

Also, Washington will have lost the accompanying diplomatic leverage which would have been valuable in orchestrating further Egyptian-Israeli peace accords.

Furthermore, observers point out, if Sadat does not get the quantity and quality of weapons aid that he desperately needs — which really can come from nowhere but the United States — his criticism of the Egyptian military and throughout the Arab world will have a powerful political weapon against him, which could ultimately result in his ouster. And that could spell disaster for America’s peacemaking efforts and possibly lead to a full-scale Middle East war!

With a moderate like Sadat at the helm in Egypt, Syria’s war-making potential is severely undercut. Damascus could never hope to defeat the powerful Israeli army without the assistance of Egypt on the western front. But should a man of the same temperament as Syria’s Assad or — worse yet — Libya’s Qaddafi take over in Egypt, war against Israel would almost be a virtual certainty.

National Reconstruction

Though Sadat is desperately seeking arms, he ardently hopes they will never have to be used. As I pointed out earlier, another war would be disastrous to his prime objective of rebuilding Egypt’s war-devastated economy.

Sadat has called upon his people to copy the example of the Germans after World War II in rebuilding the nation. But Egypt, like defeated Germany, needs outside aid and investment to pull off her Wirtschaftswunder. For unlike many of her Arab neighbors, Egypt has few proven oil reserves.

Egypt’s reconstruction task is an awesome one. The imbalance between resources and a fast-growing population is a serious obstacle in the drive to raise the national standard of living. The population of Egypt — already the most populous country in the Arab world — is growing at a rate of about 1 million a year.

Sadat needs massive foreign aid and investment to further modernize the Suez Canal, to get industry moving, to rebuild war-devastated cities, to assist and expand agriculture, and to improve transportation and communications.

During our conversation, Sadat told me of the agreement by Persian Gulf nations during his recent visit there to raise a substantial fund for the assistance of the Egyptian economy. But while aid from the oil-rich Arab states is helpful and appreciated, much more is required.

American aid and private investment is greatly needed, and Sadat hopes to see it on the increase. He expressed to me his “deepest gratitude to the American people, the American president, and the Congress for the help they are giving us.”

“I Trust Henry”

Speaking of the events which led to the signing of the interim peace accord with Israel, President Sadat also told me, “We needed someone we could trust, that is, someone in whom we could have confidence.” referring to U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Sadat declared, “I trust Henry.”

Regardless of varying degrees of public opinion directed toward Dr. Kissinger, his own personal honesty and integrity were the major factors in bringing about the present comparative calm in the Sinai. Little did I realize, at that time, that I would have the opportunity to convey Mr. Sadat’s sentiments to Dr. Kissinger personally within less than three weeks, when we met briefly in Dallas, prior to his speech before the Dallas Council for World Affairs.

Nevertheless, though he places great confidence in the skills of Dr. Kissinger, Sadat is enough of a realist to acknowledge the fact that the interim peace accord is just that, a temporary arrangement that cannot last forever without further movement. Thus, he stated recently that “shuttle diplomacy is dead” and again emphasized the need for the Geneva Conference at which the Palestinians will be represented.

If the United States does not recognize the genuineness of Sadat’s extended hand of friendship and fails to grasp the opportunity for vastly improving U.S.-Egyptian relations, then Sadat’s bold gamble may not succeed.

Egypt’s needs are primarily those of the human element: the simple necessities of food, clothing, and shelter for millions living on the barest edge of survival. What a pity the U.S. cannot consider supplying aid in the form of tractors instead of tanks; instructional equipment instead of airplanes; agricultural know-how in place of nuclear reactors; the equipment of peace and progress rather than the matériel of war.

Other Considerations

Egypt is but one element in the complex Middle East equation. Despite President Sadat’s laudable hopes and dreams and despite the positive U.S. response so far to his turn to the West, there are other important factors at work in the Middle East which could override all those considerations.

Bible prophecy indicates that one way or another, the Middle East is to become the primary focal point of world attention and concern and the tinderbox of an eventual conflict which is to ultimately climax in the prophesied end-time battle of Armageddon.

As The Plain Truth has urged over and over during the past forty years, keep your eyes on the Middle East! Events there will have a significant impact on your personal future and on the future of the entire world.
Let's Rediscover the Work Ethic

"W e are at a turning point in history. If we adopt a don't care attitude, we risk becoming a second-class economic power." Those are the words of I. W. Abel, former president of the United Steelworkers. Over two years ago, he called on American workers to improve lagging productivity by "cutting down on excessive absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, and overtime."

The average American worker today, it seems, is primarily concerned about more pay, more fringe benefits, better pension plans, insurance plans, and all types of other job benefits — while wanting to work less hours.

In short, too many Americans are far more concerned about the acquisition of material goods and longer vacations than about their jobs and the impact that good, solid, honest work has on the nation as a whole.

According to Lane Kirland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, "There has been a steady and consistent reduction in the commitment of men to work as a way of life." Instead, says this union official, "The expansion of paid leisure time will continue, and there may well be a greater tendency to choose leisure over additions to income, where that choice can be made."

A stunningly accurate forecast of these conditions exists in a book that most Americans don't even bother to read, much less heed. But the prophecy is there, nevertheless. "For this know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, . . . heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (II Tim. 3:1-5).

A striking paradox, isn't it? In the face of mounting national and worldwide dangers — during "perilous times" — men would, according to the Bible, become lovers of pleasures. Americans now spend anywhere from $50 to $150 billion annually (depending on which survey you care to believe) searching for pleasures.

Even the much sought after dollar has to play second fiddle to the desire for pleasure. In a study conducted by two marketing professors at Ohio State University and the University of Wyoming respectively, it was revealed that 55 percent of a cross section of the nation's public preferred additional leisure time over more money.

The modern "nonwork ethic" also reflects itself in the problem of absenteeism. According to UPI business writer Jack Brannan, "The average American worker is absent from the job nine days each year for reasons ranging from commuting problems to alcoholism, and including plain irresponsibility . . . .

One of the reasons for the high rate of absences, he found, was the "irresponsible attitude toward work, especially among younger employees . . . ."

God Works!
The once-proud American work ethic is deeply rooted in our forebears' religious teachings. As a Time essay of October 1972 pointed out: "The Puritans were Calvinists, and they brought the work ethic to America. They punished idleness as a serious misdemeanor. They filled their children's ears with copybook maxims about the devil finding work for idle hands and God helping those who help themselves . . . ."

But as predicted in the Bible so many centuries ago, religion has declined in America to a mere "form of godliness."

The American work ethic has been referred to as both the Protestant ethic and the Puritan ethic. Actually, neither of these terms is completely correct. The dignity of work actually originated with God! Jesus Christ of Nazareth said: ". . . my Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John 5:17).

This same God intends for humans to be engaged in profitable, rewarding work. The very first man was instructed to "dress and keep" the garden of Eden — not to let it become overgrown and run down with weeds (Gen. 2:15).

The Proverbs of Solomon are literally filled with admonitions about laziness and slothfulness.

Former President Eisenhower in his parting State of the Union message, January 7, 1960, told his countrymen: "America did not become great through softness and self-indulgence. Her miraculous progress and achievement flow from other qualities far more worthy and substantial: adherence to principles and methods consonant with our religious philosophy; a satisfaction in hard work; the readiness to sacrifice for worthwhile causes; the courage to meet every challenge to her progress.

America today desperately needs a great cause! She needs a noble, just purpose. She needs to catch the vision of a dynamic goal which calls for, and is worthy of, great sacrifice and hard work!"
# THE GARNER TED ARMSTRONG TELECAST

## U.S. STATIONS

### Eastern Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>WAKR-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WTEN-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpena</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WBKB-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WXIA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>WBFF-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WABI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton N.Y.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>WICZ-TV, 7:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WCBD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>WSOQ-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WLWT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WNOK-TV, 4:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WLWD-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>WJRT-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield N.C.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WNCT-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WFBC-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington W.V.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>WWOX-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WTTV-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonsville</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>WTLV-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WJHL-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WILX-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>WDRB-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WOR-TV, Rotating schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>WPHL-TV, 11:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WMTR-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WAWY-TV, 12 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>WPRI-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>WBAC-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>WSBT-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>WHYN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WSTV-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Central Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>KTYS-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KALB-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>KFRA-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>KBMT-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KFTR-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>WSNS-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KIII-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KTFT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>WDHN-TV, 8:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>KELP-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>WFEI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KTHI-TV, 12 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KSFM-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KGLD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KCKT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>WDAM-TV, 4:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>KHTV-3, 3:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>WYUR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WAFD-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>KHGI-TV, 11:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KCBD-TV, 12 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufkin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>KTRF-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCook</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>KOMQ-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WOTR-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KMDJ-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WTCN-TV, 9:30 a.m. Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>KTVE-TV, 12:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>WKAB-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WNGE-TV, 6:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WWL-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Platte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KNOP-TV, 6:30 p.m. Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KOCO-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KUTO-TV, 3:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WRAU-TV, 10:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>WREX-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KTAL-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>KMKEG-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Mo.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>KMTC-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>WICS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KCEN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mountain Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WTIV-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KRES-TV, 4:30 p.m. Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KFFB-TV, 10:15 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KYUS-TV, 6:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KXON-TV, 8:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KOAA-TV, 9:30 a.m. Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>KBIM-TV, 4:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KSL-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>KGUN-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pacific Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>KIMO-TV, 5:30 p.m. Wed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KTVF-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KHON-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>KLAS-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>KHJ-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>KPTV-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KTVN-TV, 3:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>KOVR-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>KSBW-TV, 5:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KHQ-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KSTW-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canadian Stations

#### Atlantic Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CJCH-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CJOJ-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CJCB-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CKW-TV, 2:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Eastern Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CKVR-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>CHCH-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>CKWS-TV, 12 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CFCF-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHNB-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CHOV-TV, 12 noon Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CHEX-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ST. JOSEPH — KUSN, 1270 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
ST. PAUL — KRLS, 950 kc., 8:00 p.m. daily.
*SAN ANTONIO — WOAI, 1200 kc., 5:00 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
SHERMAN — KTXO, 1500 kc., 5:30 p.m. daily.
SIoux Falls, S. D. — KIOV-FM, 104.7 mc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
SIoux CITY, IO. — KGJL, 1360 kc., 6:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
TEXARKANA — KOSY, 790 kc., 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
WATERLOO — KXL, 1540 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:00 p.m. Sun., 105.7 mc. FM, 11:30 a.m. Sat.
WATERTOWN — KATW-FM, 96.1 mc., 12:00 noon Mon.-Fri.

Mountain Time
ALBUQUERQUE — KOB, 770 kc., 11:00 p.m. daily.
*ARVADA — KXOJ, 1550 kc., 1:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
BLACKFOOT — KBLI, 690 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
BOISE — KAIN, 1340 kc., 6:55 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
BLACKFOOT — KBLI, 690 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
CASPER — KTWO, 1030 kc., 6:05 p.m. & 10:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
FARMINGTON — KRZG, 1280 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
FLAGSTAFF — KCLS, 600 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
MISSOULA — KGVO, 1290 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
DURANGO — KIUP, 930 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SAN FRANCISCO — KFMR-FM, 104.9 mc., 8:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SAN FRANCISCO — KFMR, 1200 kc., 5:00 a.m.
SAN FRANCISCO — KJVB, 990 kc., 10:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SAN DIEGO — KSDO, 1130 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
STE. AGATHA (French) — CJSA, 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Wed. & Fri.
STE. JACQUES — CKJS, 900 kc., 10:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
ST. JOHN'S — VOCM, 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
SYDNEY — CJSB, 1270 kc., 6:00 p.m. daily.
THETFORD MINES — CKLD, 7:00 a.m. Sun.

Pacific Time
ANCHORAGE — KYAK, 650 kc., 9:00 p.m. daily.
COVINA — KGB, 900 kc., KOB-FM, 98.3 mc., 11:00 noon Mon.-Sat., 9:00 a.m. Sun.
EUGENE — KATU, 1340 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
*FRESNO — KBIF, 900 kc., 1:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
FRESNO — KMJ, 580 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:30 p.m. Sun.
*LAGAS PEGAS — KTVI & FM, 970 kc., 9:23 mc., 6:30 a.m. daily.
LOS ANGELES — KLAC, 570 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
MEDFORD — KAGN-FM, 98.5 mc., 8:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
MEDFORD — KSHB, 860 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
OMAHA — KFOX, 920 kc., 6:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
ONTARIO — KSOV, 1380 kc., 7:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
PASCO — KOTY, 1340 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:00 noon Sun.
PORTLAND — KODI, 1440 kc., 6:00 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
PRESIDIO — KYXJ, 1520 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
SACRAMENTO — KRAZ, 1140 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
SAN DIEGO — KSRO, 930 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
SAN DIEGO — KSQO, 1130 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.

Canadian Stations

Atlantic Time
BAIE-VERTE — CKIM, 1240 kc., 6:00 a.m. daily.
CAMBELLTON — CKNB, 950 kc., 9:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
FREDERICTON — CNF, 550 kc., 10:05 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
GANDER — CKGA, 730 kc., 6:00 a.m. daily.
GRAND FALLS — CKCM, 620 kc., 6:00 a.m. daily.
MARYSTOWN — CHCM, 560 kc., 6:00 a.m. daily.
MONCTON — CKCW, 1220 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
NEWCASTLE — CFCN, 790 kc., 9:30 a.m. daily.
SAINT JOHN — CFBC, 930 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
ST. JOHN'S — VOCM, 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
YARMOUTH — CJLS, 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.

Eastern Time
BLIND RIVER — CJIN, 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
BRANTFORD — CKPC, 1390 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
CORNWALL — CJSS, 1220 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
DREDEN — CKDR, 900 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
ELLIS LAKE — CKNR, 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
FT. FRANCES — CFDB, 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
HULL — COKO, 7:30 a.m. Sun.
KENORA — CJRJ, 1220 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
KINGLAKE — CKGL, 560 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
LEAMINGTON — CJQF, 710 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
LINDSAY — CKLY, 910 kc., 10:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
MONTREAL — CFBM, 1410 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri.
MONTREAL (French) — CFBM, 1410 kc., 5:00 p.m. Sat. & Sun.

PLEASE NOTE
Many of the times listed above fall in heavy sports programming time slots; therefore they will be subject to occasional preemptions by these sports events. Please check your local TV guide or newspaper for possible time or day changes.

* denotes new stations or changes in airing times or days. For additional information call 800-423-4444 toll free.

The Plain Truth June 1976
The new *Plain Truth* magazine is published for you!

But you must act now to keep it coming.

For more than 40 years we have sent *The Plain Truth* free to all who requested it. We have given thousands of readers a unique insight into world news and human events, because *The Plain Truth* analyzes world news and human experiences in the light of Bible understanding — something no other magazine does!

It’s still our desire to make *The Plain Truth* available without obligation to all who request it. But spiraling publishing costs have forced us to slightly modify our subscription policy:

We must now ask our readers (those who are financially able) to make free-will contributions to help cover production costs.

Your contributions and donations — tax deductible in the United States — will help us to continue bringing you and others a fine-quality, meaningful magazine month after month.

**ACT NOW to keep your *Plain Truth* coming!**
See page 22.

GARNER TED ARMSTRONG, EDITOR