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Why God Permits Human Suffering

Look at the world today! War, famine, pestilence! Poverty, inequality, hunger, want! Sickness, disease, suffering, death! Crime, graft, dishonesty, corruption! Insanity, degeneration, decay! Unhappiness, fear, wretchedness and woe!

How, so many are asking, can a supreme, all-powerful God of Love permit it? Why is he permitting civilization itself to crumble?

Some are saying, "God isn't fair!"—or "Is there a God, after all?" But what do you suppose men would say if God took away their right to think and do as they please? For God could never stop this awful carnage without forcing men to act according to his will—denying them a free will of their own!

It is men's ways, so contrary to God's ways, that have brought this unhappy state. And they have brought on all the world's sorrows and anguish in spite of the pleadings of God. He says, "Your ways are not my ways."

God's ways, had they been followed, would have led inevitably to peace, happiness, prosperity and joy. God revealed to the first humans his ways. He pleaded with the human family.

Suppose God had taken the only alternative. Suppose he had forced men, against their wills, to have lived according to his laws?

Can't you almost hear the defiant, rebellious, stiff-necked human race indignantly screaming at the Almighty, "You can't cram your religion down my throat!" For it is a matter of religion. Can't we see that, had God followed that course, more than ever men would have shouted, "God isn't fair!"

For nearly 6,000 years men have lived in defiance of God's laws. Had God denied them this right to be wrong, men would have accused God of injustice, demanding freedom to follow their own ways.

God's plan has for its purpose the creating of perfect character in beings who are separate entities from God yet members of the very family of God. Character cannot be created automatically by fiat—it must be developed through experience!

In the beginning, Satan appeared to contest the wisdom of God's law. This law is, simply, Love for God and love for neighbor, as defined in the 10 broad principles of the Ten Commandments. A fundamental, spiritual, eternal law. The philosophy Christ taught is that it is more blessed to give than to receive. But Satan argued for the getting way. Competition, he argued, is the lifeblood of activity. Vanity spurs to action. And so, in Satan's philosophy, self-desire, competition, strife, provide the root-principle for accomplishment. The way of getting is the way to progress and advancement.

Had not God permitted this selfish way to be tried, tested and demonstrated, God's creatures could argue throughout eternity that they had been denied the better way.

And so God turned over to Satan six days of one week, consisting of six one-thousand year days, in which to demonstrate the falsity of this way—the way of greed.

During this 6,000 years Satan was permitted to retain dominion over all the earth. "Six days," God said, "thou shalt labour, and do all thy work"—his work of deception and
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THE INTERESTS and objectives of the United States and the West European countries are increasingly diverging,” warns Pieter Denkert, president of the European Parliament.

The “sheer number of disputes between the United States and Western Europe has gradually eroded... mutual respect and confidence,” writes President Denkert in the Winter 1983-84 edition of Foreign Policy magazine.

Conflicts over trade policy constitute a major and growing irritant between the United States and its European allies.

Add to trade problems an equally serious dispute—the approach that the West should take toward the ever-increasing power of the Soviet Union.

How to Deal With Moscow

In simplest terms, many West Europeans do not share the perspective of the administration in Washington toward the Soviet Union. In Europe there is a growing feeling that President Ronald Reagan is imposing his world view on Europeans. They see him as attempting to enlist them in a new crusade against communism everywhere.

Europeans contend Americans are unpredictable in the conduct of foreign affairs. They cite as clear evidence the widely divergent policies of former President Jimmy Carter and Mr. Reagan.

Europeans claim a more pragmatic view of world affairs, a more sophisticated and realistic approach toward the Soviet Union. This perspective is perhaps best summarized by former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany in the weekly Die Zeit:

“By virtue of nearly 1,000 years of common history, the Europeans know the Soviets better than people can be expected to in Georgia or California. This European know-how should be put to good use. The Europeans want not just military security but also détente and cooperation with the Soviet Union.”

From the American perspective, however, Western Europe is too weak, too accommodating to growing Soviet power.

The editors of one of Britain’s leading weekly magazines, The Economist, in the cover story of the January 21 issue, set about the task of explaining to Europeans “why a lot of people in America do not understand Europe’s way of looking at the world.” The editors displayed on the cover of the magazine the caricature of a European male, under the title “How to recognize a European (through American eyes).”

The artist drew attention to various parts of this composite European’s anatomy with such notations as “Angry eye on Reagan,” “Blind eye to Russia,” “Bleeding heart,” “Limp wrist,” “No guts,” “Weak-kneed,” “Cold feet” and “Knee jerks.”

No doubt many in Europe would take great exception to such a portrayal. But that was exactly the point the editors of The Economist were making: that the caricature represents the growing perception Americans have of Europeans. And, in the field of international relations, perceptions often count more than realities, which can be quite different.

Stockholm Conference

In general, Europeans are worried over the freeze in U.S.-Soviet relations. The freeze has led to the sus-
sension, on the part of Moscow, of both the Euromissile and strategic nuclear arms control talks.

The new Cold War atmosphere between East and West was very much in evidence at the 35-nation Conference on Confidence-and-Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CSDE). The conference was held in Stockholm. This writer was in attendance.

The conference was convened to deal with rather small and technical items, such as the notification of troop maneuvers on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It is hoped that such so-called “confidence-building measures,” if agreed upon by the delegations that are to carry out the task over the next two to three years, can lead to implementing solutions to more significant East-West issues.

The way the conference started, it was immediately obvious that little was going to be achieved, at least in the short run.

In his unusually stern remarks on the opening day, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz delivered an unequivocal condemnation of the division of Europe since 1945.

The West had not erected this barrier, maintained Mr. Shultz. He then emphasized: “Let me be very clear. The United States does not recognize the legitimacy of the artificially imposed division of Europe. This division is the essence of Europe’s security and human rights problem and we all know it.”

The following day was Moscow’s turn. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko delivered a blunt speech highly critical of U.S. policies worldwide.

With regard to Europe, Mr. Gromyko complained that “militarism, enmity and war hysteria are being exported to Western Europe along with the missiles” — a reference to the new Pershing II and cruise missiles being delivered by the United States to its West European allies.

The two speeches did little to lay the groundwork for confidence-building measures.

### Eastern Europe Worried

With the Cold War seemingly on again, the nations of both Western and Eastern Europe find themselves being squeezed uncomfortably between the two superpowers — and, as a consequence, closer to each other.

In Stockholm the East bloc foreign ministers dutifully echoed Mr. Gromyko’s words. But it is known that nearly all the Warsaw Pact countries, too, are concerned over rising tensions on the Continent. Especially worrisome to them are announced Soviet plans to place new intermediate-range missiles in Eastern Europe to counter the NATO deployment.

### Atlantic Rift Widens

In Western Europe, there is a growing perception that the United States is equally to blame for the worsening conditions, especially in the aftermath of the deployment of the first of the new missiles.

Perhaps this perception was best summarized by the lead editorial in the January 3 Financial Times of London. It said: “The American shield now looks, to a significant and vocal minority, more like an American threat. . . . In military and economic terms . . . the Atlantic appears to be getting wider.”

Just how wide the Atlantic is becoming was best displayed by the activities at another conference, this one a three-day closed-door meeting in Brussels, Belgium. This conference immediately preceded the more publicized Stockholm affair. Delegates to the Brussels meeting consisted of former government officials who still are highly influential in their respective countries.

The headline in the January 16 Times of London summarized the net result of this high-level get-together: “Bitter Speeches Betray a Mutual Loss of Trust by Europe and America.”

The Brussels conference was entitled “The Future of NATO and Global Security.” But, revealed France’s former Foreign
Minister Jean François-Poncet, "every one of us knew that the real title was 'Atlantic Disagreements' and... we got it."

What several participants described as "a growing crisis of mutual understanding" surfaced in speeches by two former U.S. cabinet members, Henry Kissinger and James Schlesinger, and West Germany's former chancellor, Helmut Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt lashed out at what he called the "self-contradictory behavior" of the U.S. government toward the Soviet Union. He further warned that Washington's "egoistic economic policies" such as maintaining high interest rates and running up huge annual budgetary deficits could soon ruin the Western alliance system.

William G. Hyland, of the United States, a specialist on Soviet affairs and a former member of the U.S. National Security Council, said that Mr. Schmidt's speech was a prime example of "the growing gap between the United States and Europe that could end in catastrophe."

Mr. Hyland told the Europeans that disenchantment was also mounting in the United States, where one now hears the argument that remaining in NATO may not necessarily be in U.S. interests. He referred to an unnamed American general, one known for outspoken views, who has taken bets that the United States will quit NATO by 1990—just six years away—in retaliation to the Europeans' refusal to "take on" the Soviet Union.

Mr. Schlesinger, the former U.S. Defense Secretary, lectured the European NATO allies on what he said was their lack of support of the alliance. He also said it was time for the European allies to read a bit of American history, which gives a warning against "entangling alliances"—advice offered to the fledgling American republic by its retiring first president, George Washington.

At this remarkable conference, said Mr. François-Poncet, there was "a strange but uncomfortable feeling of drifting apart between the United States and Europe. The mood is bad."

**Divorce from America?**

The verbal cross fire in Brussels adds yet more substance to the dangerous feeling, on both sides of the Atlantic, of "let's go our separate ways."

"Europe, more than any other continent, is predisposed today to peaceful cooperation... because the economies, cultures and histories of its peoples are closely intertwined."

*Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko*

The generally pro-American columnist for the *Sunday Telegraph* in Britain, Peregrine Worsthorne, wondered whether the time might not be ripe for Western Europe to consider an amicable "early divorce" from the United States.

Mr. Worsthorne observed in his November 13, 1983 column that there is a "reduction in fear of the Soviet Union" among West Europeans despite the continuing Soviet military buildup. The commonly held view on the Continent is that the Soviets are having such economic difficulties in their own Eastern bloc that a Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe is simply out of the question.

The Europeans, Mr. Worsthorne added, are not nearly as interested, as is the United States, in combating communist inroads in Central America or other parts of the world. That is Washington's own business, seems to be the prevailing notion. Meanwhile West European nations might consider reaching "an understanding" with the Soviet Union with regard to Europe's security.

Influential circles in the United States as well are wondering out loud whether there should not be a new order of things. The lack of West European support over the U.S. military intervention in Grenada is cited as a prime example of Allied unconcern for U.S. security interests in the Western Hemisphere.

To make matters worse, the West Europeans unanimously went along with a U.N. General Assembly resolution condemning the U.S. action.

"The lesson," fumed *New York Times* columnist William Safire, "is that our NATO partners are interested exclusively in... [being] protected by American troops and America's nuclear umbrella while reserving the right to undermine American security everywhere else. That removes the 'mutual' from mutual defense..."

"If that is the case," continued Mr. Safire with a surprising proposal, "the time is coming for an independent European defense, with the U.S. offering for sale the latest intermediate missiles but not the rental of our troops... 'Wayward sisters, depart in peace,'" Horace Greeley told the seceding states [before the U.S. Civil War of 1861-1865]."

**Drift from Europe, Shift to Asia**

Mr. Greeley, it should be noted, was famous for another piece of advice: "Go West, young man, go West." The United States is economically and, even ethnically, "going West."

Influential U.S. business leaders confidently predict that America's future is in the Pacific world. Statistics bear them out. In 1982-83, for the first time in history, overall
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After the War of Independence in Israel in 1948-49, I had a dream to develop cooperation and promote friendship between Jewish and Arab youths in the newborn state of Israel.

I wanted to work toward the elimination of the hatreds that had developed during the war.

We had to begin anew—to build bridges between Jews and Arabs, to foster mutual understanding and knowledge of our different cultures.

At that time I served as world head of Youth Aliyah, a movement created to rescue and rehabilitate Jewish children who had miraculously survived the Holocaust in Europe, and those who had lived under adverse conditions in the North African and Arab countries, where tension was created between the Jewish and non-Jewish population after the War of Independence. To implement my dream, I envisioned a center to be established for the educational and cultural programs that would be developed toward this goal.

The Dream Fulfilled

Others were dreaming of ways to foster international understanding in Israel. One such group, who were good friends of Youth Aliyah, was an American Interfaith Committee under the leadership of Dorothy and Murray Silverstone (20th Century Fox Film Company President). They had collected funds to build an International Cultural Center for Youth in Jerusalem (ICCY).

I envisioned it becoming a national institute, bringing to Israeli youths the cultural inheritance of other countries through music, films, lectures, exhibits and visits, a center that could serve the whole country.

By building this center in Jerusalem—a city close to the hearts of Christians, Moslems and Jews—it might serve as a model for similar institutions in other countries to overcome narrow-mindedness and extreme nationalistic approaches.

The idea appealed to Murray Silverstone, who brought it before the
New York committee, and in the spring of 1960 my dream became a reality. In Emek Rephaim (the Valley of the Giants) a large white walled building, set in garden and trees, opened its gates to youths, educators and tourists visiting the city of Peace from all over the world.

Soon, other centers around the country were established to become affiliated with the main one in Jerusalem. Two annexes were established, in the eastern part of the city and in the Old City, where the majority of Moslems and Christians reside.

On Mount Carmel near the city of Haifa, we founded a center in the largest village of the Druze population. It fosters our programs for children and adults in the Druze villages in the area of the country known as the Galilee.

We opened a center in the Arab village of Baka-el-Garbia in the central area of Israel known as the Triangle, and two centers to serve the Moslem population in the Galilee in Tamra and Magdal Krum.

Today the Israel Ministry of Education and Culture places a high value on the ICCY's educational achievements. The exhibits produced by the ICCY's staff travel in mobile units to 650 schools in towns and villages around the country, serving as a museum on wheels.

Consistent with its spirit of brotherhood, about half of the ICCY's staff are Arabs, who apply their skills to the activities in the community centers in East Jerusalem, as well as in the branches of the heavily Arab populated areas of Israel.

In addition to the after-school activity programs in the main Jerusalem center, folk dancing and folklore programs keep the building open until close to midnight. Each year thousands of local and foreign visitors attend the entertaining and cultural programs featuring Yemenite ethnic dances, Arab drumming, Israeli folk dances and community singing.

This past summer 30 members of the ICCY's folk song and folk dance groups joined 20 other Israeli performers to tour southwestern France and Switzerland. They performed at folklore festivals, community centers and homes for the aged. We are proud of the Bronze Medal awarded to our Yemenite dance ensemble for their performance in the community of Dijon, France.

**International Cooperation**

To encourage others to work toward peace and understanding, the ICCY grants monetary awards annually to outstanding candidates (one award is in the name of Herbert W. Armstrong).

Happily the ICCY itself was the recipient in April 1983 of the "New Outlook Magazine Peace Prize in Memory of Sylvia Shine" for its unique work in ongoing education toward coexistence between Arabs and Jews. We point with pride to the newly granted award, which we received, together with two other recipients, from the Speaker of the Israeli parliament (Knesset) in recognition of our work.

On the international scene, UNICEF and UNESCO maintain close cooperation with the ICCY and express their appreciation for our program in fostering international understanding among youths.
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COPING WITH THE TAX MAN!

by Ronald D. Kelly

The government requires you to pay taxes. But what about your obligation to God?

Few subjects animate our conversation more than taxes.

We've learned to live with them, but not without a great deal of grumbling, complaining and opinion about how high taxes are and how the government is spending them.

In the United States the annual taxation ritual takes place in April—about the time many of our readers are receiving this issue of The Plain Truth. American taxpayers assemble all their records to calculate whether they have paid enough to, or overpaid, Uncle Sam.

Books and magazine articles appear by the dozens to assist taxpayers in the preparation of their forms—a process that may take hours, even days.

In nations of the democratic world, taxes are the most important means of financing government and providing services for the people. Taxes are assessed on a percentage of income—generally on an increasing scale. The higher the family income, the greater percentage the government takes in taxes.

Most people feel the government taxes too much. But many governments are economically falling further and further behind and often resort to increased taxation in order to meet national obligations.

The vicious cycle continues.

The Origins of Taxation

Have you ever stopped to wonder where all this got started? How nations started to tax the population in the first place?

Interestingly enough, the earliest record of the ruler of a government taking a percent of income goes back to ancient biblical times.

And the primary use of this percent of income was not civil, but religious. The collection was not known as a tax but rather a tithe, because the amount collected was one tenth of the income or increase of the individual or family. The English word tithe simply means a tenth.

The earliest biblical record of a ruler receiving tithes goes back to Abraham—about 1,900 B.C. The story is told in Genesis 14. Abram, or as he was then called, Abram, had engaged hostile forces who had captured his nephew Lot. Abram and his servants were victorious in the battle and successfully freed Lot, taking valuable spoils of war in the process.

On their return, Abram with his tired and thirsty troops stopped near a city called Salem (later named Jerusalem). The king of Salem, Melchizedek, brought bread, wine and refreshments to Abram and his servants.

But this Melchizedek was not only king of the city-state of Salem, he was priest of the true God. In his office of priest, he blessed Abram, who was one of the few men on earth who had been willing to be obedient to the Eternal God.

We read in Genesis 14:20 that Abram “gave him [Melchizedek] a TENTH of everything” (New International Version throughout, unless otherwise noted).

It was obviously Abraham's normal custom to tithe any increase he received. Abraham is described in the Bible as a man who obeyed God's voice, kept his charge, his commandments, his statutes and his law (Gen. 26:5).

Tithing is only one of the laws God gave man to live by—but Abraham was diligent in obedience to all of God's precepts.

Archaeologists have discovered that major nations or city-states in the Near East—before and after Abram's time—collected taxes or tithes of the people. No doubt this practice derives from God's earliest instruction.

But rulers of these other nations at that time did not serve or obey the laws of the true God. In fact, many of them sat in the office of king, and were even regarded as gods. They took to themselves the right to exact 10 percent or more from the people to finance their religions, their military and their governments.

God Calls His Nation

In the course of time, God directed the nation of Israel to the land he had promised Abraham. This took place shortly after 1450 B.C. Under Moses, the children of Israel were led out of servitude in Egypt. Then under Joshua they inherited the land of Canaan.

God gave important financial
instructions through Moses: “A tithe of everything from the land, whether grain from the soil or fruit from the trees, belongs to the Lord; it is holy to the Lord” (Lev. 27:30). Then God added, “I give to the Levites all the tithes in Israel as their inheritance in return for the work they do while serving at the Tent of Meeting” (Num. 18:21).

Tithing was always intended for God’s usage. As we already have seen, Abraham paid tithes to God’s priest Melchizedek. When the nation of Israel was established, the tithe was to be paid to God, who in turn paid the priesthood of Levi for their service. The primary function of the Levites was religious service and education.

Israel Demands a Change

In the land of Canaan, Israel served under a system of judges. Of course the Levites directed religious matters. All the surrounding nations were ruled by kings and all practiced pagan religious rituals.

After some 400 years the people of Israel desired a king to be like other nations. Samuel had for many years served as judge and priest. He was shocked that the people wanted to forsake God’s government and choose their own. He had witnessed the way the kings of surrounding nations treated their subjects. But the people insisted and God permitted them to set up a monarchy under King Saul.

But Samuel warned the people: “This is what the king who will reign over you will do: He will take your sons and make them serve with his chariots and horses. . . . He will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive groves and give them to his attendants. He will take a tenth of your grain and of your vintage and give it to his officials and attendants. . . . When that day comes, you will cry out for relief from the king you have chosen…” (I Sam. 8:11, 13-15, 18).

In other words, Samuel knew carnal human leaders would abuse the tithing system. There would be military conscription. Property would be confiscated for the state.

The prophecy of Samuel came to pass.

Under David and Solomon the nation of Israel prospered. But with the prosperity came added taxes. In the time of Solomon, God permitted the construction of a magnificent temple to be the center of religious worship.

But Solomon added a burden of additional revenues or taxation to construct his own palace, thrones, stables and vineyards.

The population of Israel became restless under the increasing burden.

While you may not always cheerfully pay taxes, it is an obligation you have for living in your country.

After the death of Solomon, his son Rehoboam became king. Solomon’s servant, Jeroboam, had also become a powerful political figure—primarily among the northern 10 tribes of Israel.

As a representative of these peoples, Jeroboam counseled Rehoboam, “Your father put a heavy yoke on us, but now lighten the harsh labor and the heavy yoke he put on us, and we will serve you” (I Kings 12:4).

Even the older advisers who had served under Solomon urged Rehoboam to lessen the taxation and other burdens (verse 7).

But Rehoboam and his young advisers wanted to surround themselves with luxury even surpassing Solomon. His decision: “My father made your yoke heavy; I will make it even heavier. My father scourged you with whips; I will scourge you with scorpions” (verse 14). So he increased the taxes and the labor demands.

Under Jeroboam the northern 10 tribes seceded and established their capital at Samaria. In one sense of the word it was a tax revolt.

The nations of Israel and Judah remained separate ever since. After their national captivities in the 8th and 7th centuries B. C., only a part of the House of Judah returned to live in their native land. The northern 10 tribes migrated from the Middle East and their national identities were lost to the world.

Jesus on Taxation and Tithing

By the time Jesus of Nazareth was born, the Middle East was under Roman control. In fact, taxation had something to do with the location of the birth of Jesus. “And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed” (Luke 2:1, Authorized Version).

Roman law on occasion required every resident to return to the area of his or her family origins for the purpose of taking a census and paying taxes. Joseph and Mary made the trip from Nazareth to Bethlehem in order to keep the Feast of Tabernacles and to meet the Roman census-taxation requirement. And so it was that in Bethlehem Jesus was born.

More than 30 years later Jesus was confronted with the question of paying the Roman tax—a tax most felt unjust and exorbitant.

There had been more than one tax revolt among the Jewish populace. It had even become a subject of religious debate among factions of the Jews.

On one occasion some of the religious leaders, attempting to trick Jesus, asked: “Tell us then, what is your opinion? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?” (Matt. 22:17).

If Jesus spoke against paying taxes, they could turn him over to Roman officials for his rebellion against Roman law. And if he favored it, he could be viewed as holding pro-Roman feelings.

But Jesus had a calm and wise answer no one could refute: “Show me the coin used for paying the tax,” he requested. “Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?” ‘Caesar’s,’ they replied. Then he said to them,
'Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's' ” (Matt. 22:19-21).

The Roman government, whether right or wrong, had the authority to collect taxes. Jesus did not justify a tax revolt. If Caesar had demanded a tax, then the tax was to be paid. But Jesus was careful to point out one must not neglect his duty to God while fulfilling one's tax obligations to the nation or the state.

On another occasion Jesus commented on tithing. As we have seen, tithing had been the means God set up to finance his work since the days of Abraham.

In the days of Jesus the Jewish religious leaders had been careful to impose strict adherence to ritual, custom and tradition. But they often overlooked the spiritual intent of God's law.

For example, on the subject of tithing, many among the Jews had been practicing a very zealous and meticulous procedure to determine their tithes. But they were neglecting other important matters of major spiritual significance. Addressing this problem Jesus said: “Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You give a tenth of your spices—mint, dill and cummin. But you have neglected the more important matters of the law—justice, mercy and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former” (Matt. 23:23).

Many of them had spent so much time counting out tiny grains of spices or mint leaves, they didn’t have time to serve their fellowman. But they could proudly point to how precisely they counted out exactly 10 percent of their dill.

Jesus showed tithing is an important obligation to God—be careful to do it—but don’t neglect other important responsibilities to fellowman.

Taxing Proliferates

As the years passed, tithing and taxation were practiced in a variety of ways. Because the Roman Catholic Church dominated the religion of the Western world for many centuries, the collection of religious tithes and offerings often rested in the hands of the clergy.

In addition to religious offerings, the people were often subjected to a variety of taxes by the state. Import duties, property taxes, inheritance taxes, transportation taxes and market fees were but a few of the methods used to finance wealthy landlords and government officials or members of ruling families. Often these taxes were collected in goods and produce.

In the rural sections of England today there still stand old buildings called tithe barns. Many don’t know the derivation of the term. It comes from the practice of collecting goods for distribution to the government, the church or to needy people.

A prime reason to collect taxes has been to finance the military. In many modern nations the social functions of medical care, payment to widows and orphans, unemployment benefits, disability payments and retirement also are paid out from a variety of taxes collected by the government.

The tax rates have steadily increased till taxes now constitute a major portion of most families' budgets.

In the United States the first federal income tax was imposed late in 1861, the time of the American Civil War. It was 3 percent of income over $800. It was rescinded, along with other Civil War taxes, in 1872.

Before then, as students of American History well know, an important contributing factor to the Revolution of 1776 had to do with taxation. The Boston Tea Party and the cry against taxation without representation led to the American Declaration of Independence.

It has not been easy to tax the American public. The income tax as we now know was not instituted till March 1, 1913.

The 11th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica makes an interesting observation in the subject of taxation. This edition was printed in 1911. Britain had just come out of the South African War. Of course some of the taxes of the day were used to fund that war.

The Britannica noted: “The important points in this connexion appear to be: (1) Very large appropriations can be made by the state from the revenue of its subjects without permanent injury. The community thereby suffers, but the land and fixed capital remain, and when the high government expenditure ceases individuals at once have the benefit. . . (2) A state which in ordinary times appropriates one-tenth or some less proportion of aggregate individual incomes is much stronger relatively than a state absorbing one-fourth . . . or higher proportion” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, article, "Taxation").

I wonder if modern tax officials would agree?

But What About Tithing?

Tithing one tenth of a family’s gross or, if in business, adjusted gross income has always been God’s instruction. We addressed at the beginning of the article the subject of tithing in the days of Abraham during the ancient priesthood of Melchizedek. Tithing continued to be the means God instructed to finance his work—in the period when the Levitical priesthood served God and now the New Testament Church.

But there have been times when people were careless about the tithe.

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, some of the people grew lax. Ezra, Nehemiah, Zerubbabel and Malachi had to stir them back to action.

One of the important lessons the

(Continued on page 30)
The Great War is over. Four brutal, bloody years of conflict leave Europe devastated.

The armistice is signed on November 11, 1918. Voices around the world proclaim this was “the war to end all wars.” It is a joyous day for the victors. But for the vanquished, it is a dark and painful time. The victorious Allied nations dictate a peace treaty they will live to regret.

On June 28, 1919, the Treaty of Versailles is signed in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles Palace, near Paris. Germany is formally given all blame for the war. She is stripped of all her overseas colonies, demilitarized, and strapped with near impossible reparations payments.

The harsh terms of surrender imposed on defeated Germany will prove to be the seeds of a greater, more horrible war to come.

Il Duce

In Italy, a troubled postwar period has begun.

Despite her membership in the Triple Alliance, Italy had declared her neutrality on the outbreak of World War I. In the spring of 1915, Italy joined the Allies and declared war on Germany and Austria. Victory in 1918 fueled Italian hopes for territorial rewards.

But Italy’s expectations are bitterly disappointed. Though a victor, the country gains little from the Treaty of Versailles. It is stripped of all her overseas colonies, demilitarized, and strapped with near impossible reparations payments.

Among the discontented is Benito Mussolini. Son of a poor blacksmith, Mussolini was born in 1883 in the north Italian town of Predappio. An aggressive and ambitious child, he once declared to his startled mother, “One day I shall make the whole earth tremble!”

Formerly a journalist and schoolmaster, Mussolini fought as a corporal in World War I. He was seriously wounded in February 1917.

After the war, Mussolini launches a movement that becomes, in 1921, the Fascist party. Mussolini is il Duce—“the leader”—of the ultranationalist, anti-Communist organization. His followers are mostly jobless, disgruntled war veterans. They adopt the black shirt as their uniform.

The Fascists derive their name from the fasces of Imperial Rome—an ax wrapped in a bundle of rods symbolizing unity and power. The fasces was carried by Roman consuls as the sign of their authority.

March on Rome

Italy is plagued by increasing disorder. Unemployment, strikes, riots and general unrest tear at the fabric of society. The government is unable to establish order. Italians look for a way out.

Mussolini—now a member of the Italian parliament—seizes the opportunity. A gifted orator, he catches the imagination of the crowds. Posing as a defender of law and order, he capitalizes on the fears of middle-class Italians.

Late in October 1922, the blackshirted Fascist militia makes its dramatic march on the city of Rome. King Victor Emmanuel III permits them to enter the city on October 28. The government is brought down.

On October 29 the king calls on Mussolini to form a new government. Il Duce makes his entry into Rome on the 30th. The next day he becomes the youngest prime minister in Italian history at age 39.

Mussolini’s play for power has succeeded. Tired of strikes and riots, the Italian people give him complete support. Mussolini is handed full emergency powers.

Fascism has come to power in Italy. By degrees, Mussolini tightens his grip on the country and transforms his government into a dictatorship.

Weimar Republic

Meanwhile, in defeated Germany, a democratic government has replaced the old Empire. It is referred to as the Weimar Republic, because the assembly that
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 Mussolini joins his Black Shirts shortly after their successful March on Rome in October 1922 (left, below). Premier Mussolini reads the Lateran Treaty prior to signing it on February 11, 1929 (left, above). Cardinal Gasparri, Pope Pius’ representative, looks on. Adolf Hitler, Germany’s new Chancellor, appears with aging German President Paul von Hindenburg in March 1933 (middle). A young Adolf Hitler serves time in Landsberg Prison in 1924, where he writes Mein Kampf (right).
adopted its constitution in 1919 had met at the city of Weimar. Many Germans cannot accept their country’s defeat. The war leaves them humiliated and disoriented. The Weimar Republic is plagued from the start by a host of political, economic and social problems. Germans quickly discover that it is easier to write a democratic constitution than to make it work.

The constitution ensures the representation of small minority parties in parliament. Innumerable separate parties are formed. As a result, government majorities can be formed only by coalition—temporary alliances of parties. The fragile governments thus formed are victims of continual disunity and bickering among “partners.” Small parties often hold the balance of power, stalling and blocking legislation.

Mein Kampf

In 1921, the son of an obscure Austrian customs official becomes president of one of Germany’s many small parties—the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP). He is a frustrated artist named Adolf Hitler.

As a corporal, Hitler was awarded the coveted Iron Cross for personal bravery in World War I. Now he gathers a small following of fellow veterans bent on overthrowing the humiliating Treaty of Versailles and restoring Germany’s honor. He is strongly influenced by the career and philosophy of Benito Mussolini.

Hitler is impatient. He plots to seize power in a coup. In November 1923, he stages the Beer Hall Putsch at Munich, an attempt that fails to overthrow the Bavarian government. He is arrested and imprisoned for nine months at Landsberg, of fellow veterans bent on overturning the humiliations of the Treaty of Versailles. The strutting Duce is overwhelmed by his dreams of Roman grandeur.

After Mussolini survives an assassination attempt, the secretary of the Fascist party announces to cheering crowds: “God has put his finger on the Duce! He is Italy’s greatest son, the rightful heir of Caesar!” Following the example of ancient Rome, some of Mussolini’s Fascist supporters even call him “divine Caesar.”

Ancient images fill Mussolini’s mind—and urge him relentlessly on toward his “destiny.”

Secret Negotiations

Italians are overwhelmingly Catholic. Mussolini realizes that some effort must be made toward settling the long-standing “Roman Question.”

Since 1870, the Popes have been in self-imposed exile in protest against the usurpation of Papal territory by the forces of King Victor Emmanuel II. The impasse between Italy and the Vatican persists.

Il Duce knows enough history to realize he could not emerge unscathed from a head-on confrontation with the Papacy. He sees advantages to be gained in an alliance with the Church.

Mussolini wants to be able to say that his is the first Italian government in modern history to be officially recognized by the Pope.

Accordingly, Il Duce seeks to create the impression that he is a devout Catholic, though since boyhood he has not been a churchgoer. Privately he scorns the rites and dogmas of the Church. An avowed atheist in his youth, he had once written a pamphlet titled God Does Not Exist!

For its part, the Vatican is at first sympathetic toward fascism. Though Pope Pius XI (1922-1939) is critical of fascism’s use of violence, he considers Mussolini as preferable to all alternatives.

Secret negotiations now prepare the way for a dramatic reconciliation.

Lateran Treaty

Italy’s reconciliation with the Vatican comes on February 11, 1929. Mussolini represents the king. Cardinal Gasparri represents Pope Pius. In a solemn ceremony at noon in the Lateran Palace in Rome, three historic documents are signed:

The Lateran Treaty gives the Pope full sovereignty and temporal power over the 110-acre Vatican City, now the newest and smallest sovereign country in the world. Diplomatic relations between the newly created state and the kingdom of Italy are established.

A separate financial agreement compensates the Vatican for its surrender of claims to the old Papal States.

A concordat defines the position of the Church in the Fascist state. It establishes Catholicism as the official religion of Italy. Many hail the reconciliation as one of the most significant events in the modern history of the Church.

Even Mussolini considers it one of the greatest diplomatic triumphs of his career. He derives immense personal prestige worldwide.

But the agreements by no means end the friction between the Church and the Italian government. In 1931, Pius XI will express his strong disapproval of Fascist methods in his encyclical Non abbiamo bisogno.

Chaos in Germany

Meanwhile, the situation is deteriorating rapidly in the world economic arena.

With the collapse of the New York stock market late in October 1929, the world enters a new period of economic and political turmoil. Germany is hit particularly hard.

This is just what Hitler needs. The time for his final drive for power has arrived.

Increasingly hard times fuel the fires of political pandemonium. Economic disasters trigger wide-
spread social chaos. By the end of 1931, more than six million Germans are unemployed; by 1933, more than eight million.

Germany is heading toward national bankruptcy. Tensions move toward the breaking point. The ongoing disunity of the political parties makes a drastic solution of the crisis inevitable. Germans seek a strong deliverer.

A born political orator, Hitler uses the economic crisis as a stepping-stone to power. He gives Germans new hope. He promises them stability, power, Lebensraum. The confused multitude of German parties are unable to unite against him.

The National Socialist (Nazi) movement gains supporters. In the 1932 elections, Nazis nearly double their popular vote, winning 230 seats in the Reichstag (37 percent of the total number). They are the largest party in parliament.

Hitler has proved himself unequalled in his ability to exploit events to his own ends.

The Third Reich

On January 30, 1933, Hitler is asked to form a government. After years of careful planning, he has at last become Chancellor.

The Weimar Republic is finished. A modern-day interregnum—a "time without an emperor"—it has lasted but 14 years.

The Third Reich has begun.

Hitler's emergence as Chancellor is hailed enthusiastically by the Italian press. Mussolini naively views Hitler as his Fascist protegé, someone he can control and utilize for his own purposes.

Hitler asks the Reichstag to pass an enabling bill, giving his government full dictatorial powers for four years. The parliament passes the sweeping legislation, and the Nazis assume complete control of Germany.

In 1934, the offices of Chancellor and President are merged. Hitler assumes the title of Fuehrer und Reichskanzler.

In short order, the German dictator reinvigorates a demoralized country. He strengthens the shattered economy, reduces unemployment and raises the standard of living.

But Hitler's aims far transcend his own country's borders. He is convinced he has a great mission to perform. He feels destined to become ruler of a great Germanic Empire. He holds an unshakable conviction that the Reich will one day rule all of Europe—and from there will seize the leadership of the world! A new order will emerge in the world, with the German "master race" at its head!

Hitler compares himself with Charlemagne, Frederick the Great and Napoleon. From his mountain fortress in Obersalzberg, overlooking Berchtesgaden, the Fuehrer has a panoramic view of the Untersberg. It is in this mountain, as legend has it, that Charlemagne still sleeps, and will one day arise to restore the past glory of the German Empire. "You see the Untersberg over there," Hitler tells visitors in a mystical tone. "It is no accident that I have my residence opposite it."

Concordat with Vatican

Like Mussolini, Hitler—a Catholic by birth—sees a need to come to terms with the Vatican.

On July 20, 1933, the Vatican signs a concordat with the Nazi regime, protecting the rights of the Church under the Third Reich. Pope Pius XI hopes that Hitler will discourage the extreme anti-Christian radicalism of National Socialism. For Hitler, the concordat gives his new government an outward semblance of legitimacy.

But relations between Berlin and the Vatican are strained. Pope Pius has no illusions about Nazism. He authors several protests against Nazi practices.

On March 14, 1937, Pius issues his encyclical Mit brennender Sorge ("With Burning Anxiety") against Nazism. It charges that the German state has violated the 1933 concordat, and vigorously denounces the Nazi conception of life as utterly anti-Christian.

About the same time, Pius—an outspoken adversary of communism—issues another encyclical, Divine Redemptoris, denouncing the Bolshevik campaign against religion. It pronounces the political philosophy and the atheistic ideology behind Marxist doctrine as contrary to the Divine Will and intrinsically evil.

New Roman Empire

In Italy, Mussolini has been vigorously pursuing his vainglorious dream of a modern Roman Empire.

In 1896, Italy had suffered a humiliating defeat in Ethiopia (Abyssinia) at the hands of King Menelik II. Italian forces were crushed by an Ethiopian army at the Battle of Adowa. Ten thousand Italians lay dead. The defeat was disastrous to Italian expansion in Africa.

The humiliation has not been forgotten. The memory of Adowa still lives. The score must be settled.

Mussolini, the modern Caesar, casts eyes toward Ethiopia. He sees its conquest as a means of restoring Roman grandeur.

On October 3, 1935, the Italian dictator launches his first foreign military adventure. He invades the kingdom of Ethiopia as the League of Nations weakly stands by.

After months of fighting, Adowa is avenged. Il Duce's African venture is a success—a "Roman triumph." The armies of Emperor Haile Selassie are defeated.

On May 9, 1936, Italy formally annexes Ethiopia. King Victor Emmanuel is proclaimed Emperor of Ethiopia. A month later, a decree incorporates Ethiopia with the existing Italian colonies of Eritrea and Italian Somaliland into a single great colony, Italian East Africa.

Mussolini now proclaims another resurrection of the Roman Empire. "At last Italy has her empire," Il Duce declares to an enormous crowd from the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia.

"Legionnaires!" he continues. "In this supreme certitude raise your insignia, your weapons, and your hearts to salute, after fifteen centuries, the reappearance of the empire on the fated hills of Rome."

Though a great success at home, Mussolini's Ethiopian adventure isolates Italy from the Western democracies. As a result, Mussolini turns to Hitler as an ally. In October 1936, the "Berlin-Rome Axis" is formed. Hitler and Il Duce forge an agreement to coordinate their foreign policies. As in the days of
Otto the Great, Germany ties its destiny to Italy!

In the same year, the two dictators enter the Spanish Civil War on the side of General Francisco Franco's Nationalist forces. There they test new weapons in preparation for a much greater conflict to come.

Prelude to War

While the fight is going on in Ethiopia, events are happening in quick succession in Germany.

In a daring move, Hitler orders German troops to march into the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland, established by the Treaty of Versailles. It is March 7, 1936. The French fail to call Hitler's bluff.

A year earlier, Hitler had unilaterally abrogated the disarmament clauses of the Versailles treaty and had begun to rearm openly.

In March 1938, Germany occupies Austria, which is quickly incorporated into the Greater German Reich. In September, Hitler demands and receives the cession of the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia (“my last territorial claim in Europe,” he says).

Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain of Britain yields to Hitler's demands, hoping against hope that concessions to the dictator will promote “peace in our time.”

On May 22, 1939, ties between Hitler and Mussolini become even closer as the two form a 10-year political and military alliance—the Pact of Steel. The Italian press proclaims, “The two strongest powers of Europe have now bound themselves to each other for peace and war.”

In August 1939, Germany and Soviet Russia sign a nonaggression pact, guaranteeing Soviet nonintervention in Hitler's ventures in the West. Hitler's eastern flank is now secure. The stage is set. A catastrophe is about to engulf the world!

In a final last-minute appeal to head off the outbreak of world conflict, the new Pope, Pius XII, declares on August 24, “Everything can be lost by war; nothing is lost by peace.”

But Hitler's plan is set. Casting aside all pretenses of peaceful aspirations, the German dictator accuses and attacks Poland on September 1. The peace of Europe is broken. World War II has begun—a struggle for the mastery of the world!

Papal Dilemma

Pope Pius XI died in March 1939. His successor as war breaks out in Europe is Eugenio Pacelli, now Pius XII.

Few Popes will be the subject of as much controversy as he.

In 1917, Pacelli had been sent as Papal nuncio (ambassador) to Munich to negotiate a concordat with the Bavarian Court. This accomplished, he was next sent to Berlin in 1925 with the same aim. After concluding the concordat with the Weimar Republic, Pacelli was recalled to Rome in 1929 and created a cardinal and Vatican secretary of state.

As Cardinal Pacelli, he drew up and signed the concordat with Hitler's Nazi Germany on behalf of Pius XI in the summer of 1933.

Pacelli's years in Germany gave him a fluency in the German language and a great love for the German people. In view of this, his proclaimed neutrality as wartime Pontiff will be questioned. After the war he will be accused of failing to denounce Hitler and neglecting to speak out publicly against Hitler's “final solution” to the “Jewish problem.” Some critics will declare that by remaining silent he became an accomplice to genocide.

Pledged to neutrality, Pius believes the Holy See can play a peacemaking role if it maintains formal relations with all the belligerents. Yet he is keenly concerned about the Jews.

Pius faces a terrible choice. He knows the capabilities of Nazism, having been closely associated with the anti-Nazi encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*.

In September 1943, Germans occupy Rome. The dilemma of Pius XII becomes even more acute. Nazi troops are now camped on his very doorstep. Public condemnation of Hitler could lead to reprisals, even invite a Nazi invasion of the Vatican. That would jeopardize the Holy See's diplomatic efforts on behalf of the Jews and end any influence the Papacy might have in favor of peace.

Pius issues repeated private protests against Nazi atrocities and is even involved in efforts to shelter Jews and political refugees. But he stops short of public denunciation. Faced with circumstances in which his public statements might further rouse Hitler and his associates against the Jews and expose German Catholics to charges of treason, he takes the side of caution.

In retrospect, sympathetic observers will assert that, under the circumstances, Pius did all he could against a powerful totalitarian government. Public denunciation would not have stopped the Nazi leadership anyway.

Shattered Empires

At the outset of war, Germany seems almost invincible. Hitler subjects a whole continent, directly or indirectly, to his power. Not since the days when the Roman Empire was at its height has one man ruled such vast expanses in Europe.

But Hitler's is an ephemeral empire. In 1941, the German dictator makes Napoleon's disastrous mistake of invading Russia. Operation Barbarossa is a fatal blunder. The tide of war begins to turn.

In the end, the Fuhrer and the Duce die within days of each other, their dreams of conquest and empire shattered.

Mussolini is executed by Italian partisans on April 28, 1945. His megalomaniac attempt to restore the Roman Empire ends in ruin. Hitler, it is declared, has committed suicide in his Berlin bunker on April 30, as his “Thousand-year Reich” crashes around him.

The war in Europe is over.

Italy is devastated. Germany lies in ruins. Some observers declare Germany will never rise again. Others say it will take at least 50, maybe even 100 years or more. Privately, some Germans are thinking that no defeat is final.

As the victors and vanquished alike pick up the pieces of their shattered and now-divided continent, a centuries-old concept again takes its rise in the minds of Europeans—the ideal of a United States of Europe. Europe slowly sets out on the path toward its final—and most crucial—revival.

(Next Month: “The Final Union”)
The Coming Messiah in Prophecy

by Eli Chiprout

Here is a subject that will surprise Jews, Christians and Moslems alike.

Most Christians assume that Jesus of Nazareth is God's promised Messiah. Most Jewish people assume that he is not.

Few people today give the subject much thought. They simply accept what they have been taught from youth.

I was brought up in Judaism. Since childhood I was told that Jesus of the New Testament is not from God. I was taught that God inspired the Hebrew Scriptures (what Christians call the Old Testament but what the Jewish people know as the Law, the Prophets and the Writings) and that no other scriptures are inspired. I accepted without question my teachings.

Then the challenge came. I read the Plain Truth magazine and found in it valuable principles for living my day-to-day life. Yet The Plain Truth often made reference to the teachings of Jesus in the New Testament. I glossed over these statements at first.

The more I read, however, the more I realized that I could no longer ignore the question of the New Testament.

This was a difficult challenge. I would be delving into questions foreign to my way of thinking. I faced up to the challenge—and found the answers to my questions.

I write here some of those findings that may surprise even readers of The Plain Truth.

What I Was Taught

The Hebrew Scriptures speak of a time when God will directly intervene in the affairs of man and establish his world-ruling kingdom on the earth. It will be a time of peace among nations, prosperity and great joy.

I found Christians disagreed among themselves about this doctrine.

Yet the Hebrew Scriptures make it plain that God revealed this to Nebuchadnezzar, king of the ancient empire of Babylon. Through an awe-inspiring dream and its subsequent interpretation by the prophet Daniel, God showed the king that the empire of Babylon was to be followed by three others: the Medo-Persians, the Grecian and the Roman empires. The Roman empire was to last through various transformations and resurrections until . . .

"And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; nor shall the kingdom be left to another people; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, but it shall stand for ever" (Dan. 2:44, Jewish Publication Society translation throughout, except where otherwise noted).

God's kingdom would put an end to man's government. It would bring God's government and last forever. Isaiah spoke of this time.

"And it shall come to pass in the end of days, that the mountain [kingdom] of the Lord's house shall be established as the top of the mountains [kingdoms], and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it" (Isa. 2:2).

It will be a time of regathering of scattered Israel (Isa. 27:13). God's rule will be established throughout the earth!

But, I asked myself, what did the New Testament, that was written in Greek, not Hebrew, have to do with these prophecies?

I continued with my study of Daniel. He wrote: "I beheld till thrones [governments] were placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit: his raiment was as white snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was
fiery flames, and the wheels thereof burning fire” (Dan. 7:9).

This is no other than God Almighty on his glorious throne!

Now we come to some eye-opening verses.

“I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of days, and he was brought near before Him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed” (verses 13-14).

Who is this “son of man”?

It is evident that God crowns him as king of the entire earth so that he may establish God’s kingdom and rule forever.

Is he a human being? If so, what human would be given such a high and mighty honor?

Let’s see what one can find out from the book of Isaiah about this coming ruler.

“For a child is born unto us, a son is given unto us; and the government is upon his shoulder; and his name is called Pele-joez-el-gibbor-abi-ad-sar-shalom [and the footnote in our translation explains: “That is, Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace”]; that the government may be increased, and of peace there be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it through justice and through righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts doth perform this” (Isa. 11:1-2, 4).

This child is to be a descendant of Jesse, King David’s father. In his time there will be peace and knowledge of God worldwide (verses 6-9). All nations will seek this “root of Jesse” (verse 10). Israel will be delivered a second time from captivity (verse 11).

This can only be that “son of man” mentioned in Daniel. There is only one time of worldwide peace mentioned in the Scriptures. Once it starts, it will last forever!

This world ruler is even greater than King David of Israel.

Daniel mentions that the righteous will be resurrected to glory from their graves (Dan. 12:2-3). These saints will also rule the earth under the great King (Dan. 7:18, 22, 27). I found most Christian commentators did not understand these verses.

The Hebrew Scriptures also explain that King David, one of the resurrected saints, will be ruler over all the tribes of Israel in the new government of peace (Ezek. 34:23-24, 37:24-25; Jer. 30:9).

But David recognized that this future world ruler was over him in authority. In Psalm 110, he calls this ruler “my lord.”

“The Lord saith unto my lord: ‘Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool’” (verse 1). It is clear from the above passages that David is talking about the great King to come. We already saw in Daniel 7 that this King comes near God’s throne in heaven.

Yet, this King is prophesied to be born in David’s lineage:

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous shoot, and he shall reign as king and prosper, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land.

“In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteousness” (Jer. 23:5-6). A similar scripture is found in Jeremiah 33:15-16.

On David’s Throne

One thing is obvious. David, God’s prophet, knew of this coming great King. God promised King David that his throne would last forever (II Sam. 7:12-13, 16). Many in the nation knew that David’s lineage would eventually produce the great King that was to rule forever.

Jacob, grandson of Abraham, many years earlier, prophesied of the great King springing from David’s tribe of Judah and taking the rulership (Gen. 49:10).

Other prophecies also spoke of him. This great King came to be called the “Messiah”—meaning God’s anointed.

Anciently, all kings of Israel were anointed with oil upon entering their position of rulership. The great King to come is no exception.

This King—the Messiah—has been the hope for Israel through the centuries. When the Scriptures speak of a great King, they almost always refer to this King. Psalm 72, for instance, speaks of a great King that would rule all other kings and nations (verse 11) and rule forever (verse 17).

Many Jewish references recognize that the Scriptures speak of a Messiah to come. Some modern commentators, however, do not admit this. Read for example this reference in the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia article entitled “Messiah”: “The hope for a future king who will redeem Israel and establish the Kingdom of God upon earth is not expressly found either in the Biblical or in the Apocryphal writings.”

Our ancient traditions state otherwise.

During times of hardship, Jews intently seized on the Messianic

Encyclopedia recognizes this is a reference to a greater King, the Messiah.

A Twig of Jesse

Isaiah continues: “And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse [King David’s father], and a twig shall grow forth out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. . . . But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the land; and he shall smite the land with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked” (Isa. 11:1-2, 4).

This child is a descendant of Jesse, King David’s father. In his time there will be peace and knowledge of God worldwide (verses 6-9). All nations will seek this “root of Jesse” (verse 10). Israel will be delivered a second time from captivity (verse 11).

This can only be that “son of man” mentioned in Daniel. There is only one time of worldwide peace mentioned in the Scriptures. Once it starts, it will last forever!

This world ruler is even greater than King David of Israel.

Daniel mentions that the righteous will be resurrected to glory from their graves (Dan. 12:2-3). These saints will also rule the earth under the great King (Dan. 7:18, 22, 27). I found most Christian commentators did not understand these verses.

The Hebrew Scriptures also explain that King David, one of the resurrected saints, will be ruler over all the tribes of Israel in the new government of peace (Ezek. 34:23-24, 37:24-25; Jer. 30:9).

But David recognized that this future world ruler was over him in authority. In Psalm 110, he calls this ruler “my lord.”

“The Lord saith unto my lord: ‘Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool’” (verse 1). It is clear from the above passages that David is talking about the great King to come. We already saw in Daniel 7 that this King comes near God’s throne in heaven.

Yet, this King is prophesied to be born in David’s lineage:
that most Christians haven't focused on.

The book of Isaiah talks several times about "the servant of the Lord." Most have failed to see whom this title is referring to. Julius Greenstone, in his book *The Messiah Idea in Jewish History*, says: "There is much divergence of opinion among modern commentators as to whom the prophet [Isaiah] meant by the designation 'the servant of the Lord.'"

God calls the people of Israel collectively his "servant" (Isa. 41:8-9). That is clear. Yet later God talks about a servant in totally different terms. Are we to assume that this also refers to Israel?

Notice: "Behold My servant, whom I uphold; Mine elect, in whom My soul delighteth; I have put My spirit upon him, he shall make the right to go forth to the nations" (Isa. 42:1).

And again: "He shall not fail nor be crushed, till he have set the right in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his teaching" (verse 4).

Are these verses talking about Israel or the Messiah?

In verse 5, God talks to this servant. God then promises to set him for a "covenant of the people, for a light of the nations" (verse 6).

Another reference to this servant is in chapter 49. Israel, God's servant, symbolically speaks first. Israel did not accomplish her task of being a light to the gentiles (verse 4).

The other servant speaks beginning in verse 5:

"And now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be His servant, to bring Jacob back to Him, and that Israel be gathered unto Him—for I am honourable in the eyes of the Lord, and my God is become my strength—yee, He saith: 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the offsprings of Israel; I will also give thee for a light of the nations, that My salvation may be unto the ends of the earth' " (verses 5-6).

This servant cannot be Israel. He is one who restores Israel. He is the one who restores Israel.

Isaiah continues describing the servant with verse 13 of chapter 52: "Behold, My servant shall prosper, he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high. According as many were appalled

The Suffering Servant

But now, notice the verse that follows in chapter 49. This great King to whom God Almighty will give the rulership of the earth, he is one "who is despised of men ... who is abhorred of nations ... a servant of rulers" (verse 7).

He is here called a "servant of rulers." What a title for the King of all the earth! But immediately, in this same verse, God says: "kings shall see and arise, princes, and they shall prostrate themselves ..."

Clearly, two events are mentioned here! One is when the servant, the Messiah, is abhorred, and the second when he is honored.

God says of this servant that he will help and preserve him and "give [him] for a covenant of the people" (verse 8). This is the same servant mentioned in Isaiah 42:6. His rulership will be the time of peace, great prosperity and deliverance (verses 8-12).

But why is he first rejected?

Isaiah quotes the servant as speaking again in chapter 50:

"The Lord God hath given me the tongue of them that are taught, that I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary.... The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away backward" (verses 4-5). This servant cannot be Israel, because God calls the people "rebellious" (Isa. 65:2; Ezek. 2:3-8).

"I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting" (Isa. 50:6).

Why would God's servant the Messiah allow this? For what reason is he beaten?

First, notice verse 10. "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant?" How can we hear the voice of God's servant? Is there a source that we can go to to find out his words?

Isaiah continues describing the servant with verse 13 of chapter 52: "Behold, My servant shall prosper, he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high. According as many were appalled
at thee—so marred was his visage unlike that of a man, and his form unlike that of the sons of men—so shall he startle many nations, kings shall shut their mouths because of him; for that which had not been told them shall they see, and that which they had not heard shall they perceive" (verses 13-15).

He would be tragically disfigured. But how can this be? And most of all—why?

The idea that the Messiah was to suffer before being glorified used to be recognized in Judaism. Several passages in the older Jewish writings including the Talmud speak of the Messiah suffering.

With this background, I came to study Isaiah 53 again. This chapter had been the brunt of much debate through the centuries.

Beliefs and interpretations on the personage in this chapter have been varied: the nation Israel, one of the prophets, Zerubbabel, Moses, Cyrus or even an unknown individual! The Christian world believes, in general, that this "unknown individual" is Jesus of Nazareth. The most common interpretation among the Jewish people is that this a reference to Israel. In my study I looked further into the Hebrew Scriptures to find which possible explanation is meant.

We have seen so far that Isaiah speaks of two servants. He describes the Messiah right up to chapter 53. Now suddenly, some would have readers believe that Isaiah is talking about someone else in this chapter.

Isaiah 53 is simply a continuation of Isaiah 52:13-15!

Read the entire chapter to get the full meaning. For now, we will examine these points:

Isaiah says: "Surely our diseases he did bear, and our pains he carried" (verse 4).

"For he was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due" (verse 8). "My people" in the Hebrew Scriptures refers to Israel. The "servant" therefore cannot refer to Israel.

This servant actually bears the pains and sins of others. He is killed even though he is righteous (verse 9). This cannot be Israel.

We will come back to this issue, but now we will see another revelation of Scripture.

The Angel of the Lord

The Scripture in several places speaks of the "angel of the Lord." The word angel in Hebrew simply means messenger. It does not always mean an angelic being. It can sometimes refer to a man.

In several passages of Scripture, however, we find that the "angel of the Lord" is called "the Lord!" This truth we find in Judges 6:11-24. Speaking to Gideon is the angel of the Lord (verse 11). After the angel of the Lord hears Gideon, we read: "And the Lord turned towards him, and said..." (verse 14). At the end of the meeting "Gideon saw that he was the angel of the Lord; and Gideon said: 'Alas, O Lord God! forasmuch as I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face'" (verse 22). Here the name of the angel or messenger of the Lord is also called the Lord (verse 14) and God (verse 22).

In Judges 13 we can find a similar account. The angel of the Lord appears (verse 20). The people recognize him to be God (Elohim in Hebrew—verse 22).

In Genesis 16, the angel of the Lord finds Hagar, Sarah's handmaid, in the wilderness. We find it is actually God speaking, for Hagar recognizes him as God (verse 13).

But now, if the angel (messenger) of the Lord is also called Lord and God, who is sending him? Is he sending himself?

In Genesis 18, three men appear to Abraham (verse 2). Two of them are angels (Gen. 19:1). The other one is the Lord (Gen. 18:1).

God appeared as a man elsewhere in the Scriptures. Jacob wrestled with a man all night. He recognized him to be God, because he said: "For I have seen God face to face" (Gen. 32:31). Hosea 12:3-5 reveals that this being called God is a messenger or angel of God. (Angel means messenger in Hebrew.) That is this person's function.

Is He the Messiah?

Now we can return to our questions. Who is the incredible individual that is to rule all earth? Why is he to die for others?

He cannot be a mere man. His titles are too great to describe one human being. Yet, he is born as a son in the lineage of David.

He is so great that his life pays for the sins of the nations. He is greater than David. He will take David's throne.

God most likely is King over Israel (I Sam. 8:7). It was only when Israel asked for a human king that God allowed a human king to sit on his throne. Yet, it was "the throne of the Lord" (I Chron. 29:23).

God said that David's throne—actually the Lord's throne—would last forever. Yet the Messiah will claim the throne that belongs to the Lord!

How can the Messiah claim that throne and all the wonderful titles unless he is God? Zechariah helps to explain it further. Look at Zechariah 2:8-9. In the days of the Messiah when Israel is to be restored, it is the Lord who will be in her midst! This means that one of the names of the Messiah is Lord.

How can this be?

There is only one explanation possible! The word for God in the Hebrew is Elohim. It is a plural word sometimes used with a singular or plural verb or pronoun. Hence the word can mean more than one person. In Genesis 1:26 God says: "Let us make man in our image!"

This can only mean that the great King, the Messiah—like the Creator of all—is also God!

No wonder, then, that he can pay for the sins of the nations! His life is worth more than all lives combined. He was a joint participant in the creation.

Is it surprising that he is called such wonderful titles as God "the Mighty"? Or that he is referred to as "The Lord is our righteousness" in Jeremiah 23:6?

I came to realize that the Hebrew Scriptures described a Messiah in eye-opening ways. I could not ignore these plain facts.

This search made me aware that I needed to prove everything. It is with that thought in mind that I read the New Testament. I knew what the Hebrew Scriptures said, and I knew that they could not be contradicted. I began to see the "arm of the Lord...revealed" (Isa. 53:1).
The shower head fell into the bathtub again this morning. It always does when I try to adjust it. Not that it really matters—the hotel doesn’t have any running water today anyway. Or electricity. The cleaner (if that is what you call the man who comes in twice a day to rearrange the dust) says both might be back on tomorrow, or the day after... or sometime.

The restaurant has run out of tea and coffee, and they can’t remember when they last had sugar. The brewery hasn’t got any bottles, so there is no beer either. This is, incidentally, the best hotel in town.

And so this little place became a sovereign state. There were celebrations and dancing in the streets. At last, the people were told, they could breathe free. (Most weren’t aware they hadn’t been.) Centuries of humiliation and exploitation were behind them, it was explained. They had a smart new flag, a stirring new anthem and a seat in the United Nations.

Enthroned in the old governor’s palace was their president—the national hero who had led them in their “fight for freedom.” Unfortunately the national hero turned out to be a megalomaniac, an incompetent and a crook. His several years of misrule led the new nation to the brink of bankruptcy.

Eventually, his people tired of his empty promises and grandiose schemes, and they applauded when a coup d’etat sent him into exile. But a succession of military dictators drove things further and further down the road to ruin, until today, in the exaggerated words of a weary expatriate, “The place is becoming uninhabitable.”

It is in the capital city of one of the poorer nations that we optimistically call “developing.” Once, this country was a colony of a European power. It was considered to be fairly prosperous, although that prosperity did not significantly filter down to the native people. But on the whole they were content, and at least they lived without fear of famine or revolution.

Self-rule and independence were not a burning issue back then. There was a sort of understanding between the colonial authorities and the local leadership that eventually—in a hundred years—two hundred maybe—the country would be ready to govern itself.

Then came the Second World War, and in its aftermath colonialism became unfashionable. The European powers began to divest themselves of their overseas possessions.

There are other nations like this. One can only look at them with compassion. They don’t know what to do anymore. The exaltation over nationhood has long since given way to a grim struggle for survival. Successive leaders become more desperate, and consequently more repressive, causing the people to become ever more sullen and rebellious. The economy is a shambles, and the inflation rate has
made the once proud new currency a joke. (The money to buy a refrigerator probably would weigh more than the appliance itself.)

In a desperate attempt to stave off disaster, the government is making yet another attempt to "reorganize society." The long-suffering people accept the new order—knowing that it probably won't work either. It may seem right for a while—but then, glib politicians always make it seem right. In the end, it always means more misery.

It may seem right for a while—but then, glib politicians always make it seem right. In the end, it always means more misery.

The pace of life in the Third World is often measured by the calendar rather than by the clock.

After a few years of living like this, a people's spirit breaks, and they begin not to care anymore. They watch listlessly as their homeland crumbles around them. The roads disintegrate, the only bridge over the river collapses, the post office roof caves in—but nobody does anything. Even the proud independence monument molders in its decrepit park, and the capital city slowly returns to being a village.

Some years ago, in a nation not unlike this one, I met a young student caught up in a revolutionary movement. He was angry, frank and candid. "Look at this mess," he said, driving through the ruins of the capital's main thoroughfare. "My nation has gone the wrong way," he went on passionately. "When we became independent, our leaders wanted no more of European ways. We were full of confidence. We were sure we knew the way to go. But we were stupid to try to be so independent—now we are worse off than ever. We need help—education, technology. We will never make it by ourselves."

"So why does your government refuse all offers of aid from outside?" I asked. His country had doggedly pursued a path of nonalignment, and totally rejected any aid that would carry the risk of being drawn into the orbit of a major power.

"Oh yes, all sorts of people want to help us," he said. "The communist countries offer their help. We know what that means. We'll end up indebted and obligated to them, and that will be the end of our way of life. There are too many strings attached to their aid... let them keep their tractors and military advisers."

"But it's the same with the Western powers," he continued. "Once we let them in, it's the end of independence. Look at..." He reeled off several of the more prosperous Third World nations. "They are colonies again!" He was right—they are, in effect, cultural colonies of the West. "We want what you have, but we don't want the way of life that goes with it. If we let you help us, we'll just be another market to be developed."

"That's why I am really a very harmless revolutionary," he added confidentially. "What's the point of trying to overthrow the government when you know you couldn't do any better? Why isn't there anyone who can help us without hurting us?" he almost cried with frustration.

This young man was honest enough to recognize his country's dismal lack of success, yet he was also realistic enough to admit that he didn't know what to do about it. He helped me to understand how educated people in the Third World think. It is something that many of us in the affluent First World overlook.

In the "developed" world, we tend to evaluate the success or failure of a way of life by measuring material prosperity. We grade the nations of the world in terms of their per capita income, or their gross national product. We classify societies as being "have" or "have not," after we have carefully calculated the ratio of automobiles or television sets to the population.

Now, if these are indeed true values—or to put it another way—if man does indeed live by bread alone, then the Western, industrial, consumer-oriented way of life is by far the most successful and other people would do well to follow it.

After all, the First World—and to a large extent this goes for the European communist countries as well—has all but abolished famine and plague and the grinding, abject, hopeless poverty that one sees throughout much of Africa, and in certain areas of Asia and South America. The First World has nearly 100 percent literacy, low infant mortality, and the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen. Our societies aren't perfect. But compared to the squalor of much of the Third World, surely all can see that this must be the way to go—can't they?

Not necessarily.

It would be good for the so-called advanced nations to take a look at themselves—through the quiet, thoughtful eyes of educated people who live in less prosperous, but less selfishly oriented societies. People like this do not measure success solely in terms of material gain. They place a higher value on very real but intangible things, such as tradition, religion and family life. They value personal...
integrity, respect from their sons, chastity in their daughters, and modesty and fidelity in their wives.

How can they rate as successful a society that produces a 40 percent divorce rate, punk rock or a situation where one out of every four young children risks being sexually assaulted? What is the use of a modern city if it isn’t safe to go out in? Ironically, it is the poorest countries in the world that have the lowest crime rate.

And what is so wonderful about living to a ripe old age, if nobody wants you?

My wife and I once visited a native village in the rain forests of Sarawak, where people lived a life hardly touched by civilization. When we arrived, the men were out on the steep mountain slopes cultivating their crops. The women were down at the river washing clothes. We could hear them chattering and singing as they pounded the laundry on the stones. The only people at home were some old men who were spending their time making roofing thatch for the long house, and old ladies who were baby-sitting.

The older children were attending a school that had recently been opened to serve the district. The Malaysian government has been trying hard to help these people into the 20th century. But these unsophisticated natives were not so sure they wanted that. They were quite happy in their jungle hideaway—working hard, demanding little, and—some might reason—“getting nowhere.”

A few days later, we flew to Australia. At the airport I bought a newspaper. In it there was a story about an old lady who had been set up in a modern apartment by her family who no longer had room for her in their home. She had tripped over her vacuum cleaner, hit her head on the corner of her new color television set and lain on the floor unconscious for three days before anyone came looking for her.

At least the old people in the native village were living out their old age feeling useful and wanted. Who should be showing whom how to live? Is material prosperity the standard by which success should be judged, if that prosperity has to be achieved at such a terrible cost of other values?

“You call us savages because we cut the hand off a thief,” a Saudi Arabian once told me, accusingly. “But in your society, you cut off the life of your old people when you don’t want them around anymore.”

Who then are the savages?

The industrialized, consumer-oriented way of life has come to be known as Westernization. Its fruits are causing many non-Western nations to consider carefully if it is, after all, the way they want to go. Some, like Burma, decided at the time of their independence that it would be better to be poor than to drown their traditional values in a flood of foreign aid.

Others, like Iran, slammed the doors in panic on Westernization—their leaders opting for the relative security of a “great leap backward.” But even sophisticated technocracies like Japan are taking a hard look at the fruits of their commitment to materialism. Has the erosion of traditional values been worth it, they ask? Is there, perhaps, something inherently wrong with a way of living that, while producing great prosperity, quickly reduces the youths of a nation to those lowest common denominators of degeneracy—drugs, obscene music, gangs, dropouts and suicide?

It is a dilemma. On the one hand, the developed nations have made human existence more comfortable. But they have also made it more precarious and, some would say, less satisfying. Should we then be so sure that this is the best way for poor nations to improve themselves? Should we be so critical of those nations that resist Western ways? It is so easy to become exasperated at their couldn’t-care-less approach to life. I do whenever the shower head falls in the bathtub. Many Westerners who try to help give up in despair. They berate the natives for their lack of “Protestant work ethic,” fume because they prefer to live by the calendar rather than the clock, and are outraged by their customs and religions.

No thinking person could dispute that clean water, regular food, adequate shelter, sewers, electricity and education would improve the quality of their lives. But if it comes at the cost of broken family ties, lack of respect for parents, destruction of a community spirit and an increase in greed, competition, envy and crime, is it really progress?

The book of Proverbs twice records a saying of wise King Solomon of ancient Israel: “There is a way which seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death” (Prov. 14:12, 16:25, Revised Authorized Version).

The way that seems right to this poor Third World country is surely killing it. It needs help, but from whom? From other people whose ways of life are also killing them? The young revolutionary was right—there is no nation in the world that knows a way that will bring peace and happiness. We have tried everything. Some ways seem more right than others for a time—but in the end, they all lead to death. Indeed, the way that seems right to the advanced nations has led to the very real possibility of total annihilation of all life.

There is a way that works, however. It combines not only the best of both worlds—material progress, while retaining those values that sustain true human happiness. It also adds a dimension totally missing in every culture. It is the way of life that Jesus Christ came to teach to those who would listen. Most didn’t—his way of giving, of outgoing concern for others, of wholehearted obedience to God seemed wrong, and they rejected it and him.

The world—all of its components, First, Second, Third and Fourth—has continued to reject that way. It prefers to experiment with its own ways that seem right, and lead to death.

We can be thankful Jesus Christ will soon return to force all men to live his way. He will show them the way to life—as God intended it to be.

—John Halford
Increasing Volcanic Activity

WHY?

by Dan C. Taylor

Are eruptions like Mount St. Helens, Galunggung and El Chichón previews of worse to come? Bible prophecy reveals the answer.

"Vancouver, Vancouver. This is it!" The excited voice on the radio stopped abruptly, with an air of anticipation and resignation. It was the morning of May 18, 1980 and 30-year-old David Johnston of the U.S. Geological Survey was making observations of the bulge on the north slope of Mount St. Helens, located in...
Overleaf, clockwise from lower left: Another residence on Heimaey Island, south of Iceland, is threatened during 1973 eruption of Eldfell. Eerie glow of lava attracts scientists and tourists alike to Hawaii's Kilauea. Mauna Ulu (Glowing Mountain), one of several vents on Kilauea. Beauty of an eruption along its east rift belies destructive potential. Awesome fury of Mount Eldfell pours forth during 1973 eruption. Above and right: Mount St. Helens was considered to be one of the most beautiful peaks in the U.S. northwest. After the 1980 eruption, a moonscape.

southwestern Washington state, when he radioed his base with the frantic message.

Seconds later, he became engulfed and perished in one of the most awesome events in the realm of natural disasters.

At 8:39 a.m. that morning, the once stately Mount St. Helens erupted with the awesome fury of a 50-megaton hydrogen bomb. This massive upheaval sent thunderous plumes of more than 1.5 cubic miles of hot ash, rocks and earth some 12 miles (19 kilometers) high in the air.

Millions of trees in a 150-square-mile (390 square kilometers) area were snapped like twigs only seconds after the initial blast. Superheated gases released from the awakening giant almost instantly melted the ice and snow on the mountain. The result was a huge avalanche as earth and water descended together to form a massive wall of boiling mud that destroyed the once crystal clear waters of Spirit Lake and altered the course of the Toutle River.

A blizzard of fine gray ash covered parts of several Western states, turning day into night. Moscow, Idaho, 300 miles east of the erupting volcano, was covered with about eight tons of ash an acre.

In all, 65 people lost their lives while 370,000 were put out of work because of the eruption. Millions more suffered as officials estimated the cost of the damage to be in excess of US$2,700,000,000!

Anniversaries to Remember

The devastation caused by the eruption of Mount St. Helens just four short years ago is still very much evident in the area around the volcano. Though new life has sprung up out of the devastation, the inhabitants can still see the scars on a land that in 1980 was more akin to a moonscape than its once breathtaking vistas. An uneasiness remains.

Mount St. Helens had been quiet for 123 years before it erupted. Many residents simply were unaware that they were living in the shadow of an ominous time bomb. Millions more around the world are even now in the same dangerous predicament.

We do not realize that picturesque mountains like Mount Rainier, also in Washington, or Mount Fuji in Japan could one day come back to life with all of the sound and fury of a Mount St. Helens—disastrous results.

Sleeping Giants

The world experiences an average of 30 eruptions each year from the more than 600 active volcanoes that dot our planet.

More than 75 percent of these volcanoes lie within the so-called Ring of Fire. This region encompasses the coastal areas of the circumPacific from Chile north to Alaska across to Siberia and down to New Zealand.

The other great volcanic region is the Mediterranean Belt that stretches from Southern Europe to Central Asia. Within these two great regions also occur more than 95 percent of all earthquakes.

These areas are full of sleeping giants just like Mount St. Helens. Despite centuries of dormancy, many are waiting to thunder back to life.

A Window on the Earth's Interior

Volcanoes, like earthquakes, are manifestations of the enormous forces that lie beneath the earth's surface. You might call a volcano a window on the heart of the earth.

Many volcanologists have learned more about these forces through firsthand experiences at places like the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory near the frequently erupting Kilauea volcano. Others, like David Johnston, have chosen to examine more dangerous volcanoes like Mount St. Helens.

Through the use of sophisticated equipment, volcanologists are able to measure the many changes that take place in volcanoes. This has improved their understanding of the complex processes involved before, during and after an eruption.

Yet even with this improved understanding, scientists are quick to point out that the art of forecasting volcanic eruptions is no more perfected than the much-maligned weather forecast. One reason meteorologists have such a hard task may be because of volcanic eruptions.

Volcanic Activity and Its Effects

Volcanoes long have been a major factor in shaping our environment. Significant amounts of our atmosphere have come from gases released by volcanoes. Much of our landscape has been shaped by
ancient and modern volcanic activity.

Scientists have long wondered how volcanic eruptions affect climate and weather. In 1815, the most powerful volcanic eruption in recorded human history took place. Tambora volcano in what is now Indonesia exploded. More than 36 cubic miles (1.7 million tons) of debris were scattered over one million square miles.

So much debris filled the stratosphere that it created a huge filter that reduced temperatures by as much as 2 degrees Fahrenheit for more than a year. It is believed that this caused the record low temperatures that produced what was called "the year without summer." Until now, however, evidence was more circumstantial than conclusive.

But studies conducted at El Chichón volcano in Mexico after its 1982 eruption have given scientists evidence to suggest that volcanic eruptions can and do affect weather conditions.

In the case of El Chichón, it was found that after its eruption, temperatures of the equatorial stratosphere rose by 4 degrees Celsius, causing the warmest temperature reading since stratospheric temperatures were first recorded in 1958.

Many scientists conclude that by altering these temperatures so much, the El Chichón eruption contributed to the intense El Niño phenomenon of 1982-83. (See the January 1984 Scientific American.) Nevertheless, in spite of these new discoveries, a comprehensive picture of volcanoes and their effects remains elusive.

What is known is that many volcanoes are now about due for eruptions. According to a 1983 report by the U.S. Geological Survey, Mount St. Helens may only be a preview of things to come for the Western United States.

What would have happened had a Mount St. Helens erupted near a large city? It is a frightening thought, but, as the report suggests, not one that is beyond the realm of possibility. What is puzzling to many scientists is that though the earth theoretically is cooling off, volcanic activity is increasing, not decreasing.

A preliminary list in this report noted 35 volcanoes in the Western United States that are now considered likely to erupt sometime in the future. The Mono-Inyo Craters, near San Francisco, California, are considered the next most likely to erupt. Then come Lassen Peak and Mount Shasta, also in California. Others on the list include Mount Rainier, Mount Baker in Washington state and Mount Hood in Oregon—all much nearer to large population centers than Mount St. Helens.

Heeding the Warnings

In the last five centuries, more than 200,000 people have lost their lives because of volcanic eruptions.

"Such catastrophes [loss of life] needn't recur. A volcanic eruption is preceded by ample warnings of tremors or escaping steam," noted one scientist with the U.S. Geological Survey. This is most assuredly true, but history—modern and ancient—has proven that people do fail to heed warnings.

Whether out of curiosity or indifference to the repeated warnings of civil authorities, humans do become fatalities—witness Mount St. Helens (65 dead), Mexico's El Chichón (187 dead—unofficially thought to be five times that high) and Indonesia's Galunggung on populous Java (30 dead). History records many such tragedies.

In 1883, approximately 36,000 lost their lives in a 100-foot tidal wave caused by the spectacular eruption of Krakatoa in Indonesia. So powerful was the explosion that it was heard 3,000 miles away! The effects of the tidal wave that ensued were seen as far away as the English Channel.

In 1783, one fifth of the population of Iceland starved to death from the loss of almost half of that island nation's livestock to the poisonous gases from Mount Laki's massive eruption and lava flow.

Examples for Us Today

For weeks the stench of sulfur corrupted the air in the city of Saint-Pierre, Martinique—sometimes called the Paris of the Caribbean. It was indeed a charming city, with brightly colored homes with wrought iron trim. The landscape, however, was dominated by an active volcano, Mount Pelée. But besides the volcano there was another undesirable side to this city. Saint-Pierre, it seems, was also known as the lustiest port in the Caribbean!

On May 8, 1902, the 34,000 inhabitants of Saint-Pierre were slaughtered in only three minutes when Mount Pelée erupted. The lateral blast of this volcano sent a raging tide of superheated gases (about 1,800 degrees Fahrenheit—1,000 Celsius) toward the doomed city at a speed of 300 miles an hour!

Probably the most famous volcanic catastrophe in history was the A.D. 79 eruption of Mount Vesuvius that destroyed Pompeii, Her­culaneum and several other Cam­panian cities.

These were wealthy cities on the Gulf of Naples just southeast of the modern-day city of Naples. Pom­
peii, with many famous Roman residents, was the chief city in the area. It was known for its good climate, fertile soil, fine baths, the Emperor Nero's favor and its entertainment.

The passion of the Pompeians was the gladiator games, where men cruelly battled each other or animals—often to the death—for the pleasure of a ravenous citizenry.

Archaeologists have also discovered many other pursuits that were fashionable in Pompeian society. Prostitution was openly accepted; signs conveniently noted locations and prices. Much evidence from contemporary literature suggests that divorce and infidelity were commonplace. Life seemed to be good to most Pompeians. Then, one day their world came literally crashing down on their heads.

Violent earthquakes had shaken the area before the eruption, but no one seemed to be all that concerned. The Romans felt that Vesuvius was extinct. Therefore, the huge "pine tree-shaped" cloud of ash that rose from the volcano on August 24 took the Pompeians, assembled in numbers in the amphitheater, by surprise.

The poisonous gases from the volcano killed hundreds. Others were buried alive by 10 feet of volcanic ash in Pompeii or 60 feet of boiling mud in Herculaneum.

We can view many of these tragic victims today through replicas from preserved molds of corpses found in the hardened volcanic ash and mud. Many reflect the agony of the inhabitants' wretched deaths as they struggled for their last breath. The loss of more than 10 percent of the populations of these cities shocked the Roman world and sent many searching for the reason for the anger of their gods.

The destruction of Pompeii and Saint-Pierre means little to most people today. Yet there is a striking similarity between the life-styles of the inhabitants of these two cities and those of our world today. Many live out their lives tragically unconcerned with the ramifications of their actions. But the Creator God is concerned. He has given us living laws by which we can live happy and fulfilled lives. We break these rules at our peril.

Of course, time and chance happen to all. Possibly—just possibly—this is what happened in Saint-Pierre and Pompeii. But don't count on it! The Bible mentions instances when God intervened in the affairs of men to halt activities that were a grievous insult to God and men. The cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for their wickedness. The world of Noah's day was destroyed in a flood because of its licentiousness and previously unparalleled violence.

Are the ruins of Saint-Pierre and Pompeii merely the end product of time and chance, or is there a lesson here? In Proverbs 11:11, God says, "Through the blessing of the upright a city is exalted, but by the mouth of the wicked it is destroyed" (New International Version throughout).

It is food for thought, especially when we can look around and see the many crimes and sins rampant in our cities today.

Perhaps a pre-eruption message scrawled on a wall in Pompeii provides a fitting epitaph for that city; it simply reads, "Sodom, Gomorrah." Maybe someone then saw the analogy and recorded it on the wall for a warning to Pompeian society. It went unheeded.

How about our own societies? Could we soon witness similar catastrophic disasters—or worse? Scientists believe we are headed for a reawakening of volcanic activity, but they cannot tell us when or why. For these answers, we must turn to a source that lies outside the realm of science: the Bible.

Propheased to Happen

Bible prophecy does indeed foretell a tumultuous period of natural disasters. World conditions plainly indicate that we are in the perilous last days that Jesus described in Matthew 24. Jesus warned that before he returned to rule this earth, there would be "earthquakes in various places" (verse 7). Other scriptures plainly show that these earthquakes will be accompanied by historically unparalleled volcanic activity heralding the coming of Jesus Christ to rule the earth (Matt. 24:29-30).

"Suddenly, in an instant, the Lord Almighty will come with thunder and earthquake and great noise, with windstorm and tempest and flames of a devouring fire" (Isa. 29:5-6).

Why will these events happen? Jesus elaborated on this coming punishment in Matthew 24. Here he quoted from Isaiah 13:10-11: "The stars of heaven and their constellations will not show their light. The rising sun will be darkened and the moon will not give its light. I will punish the world for its evil, the wicked for their sins...." See also Deuteronomy 32:21-22.

For nearly 6,000 years, man has rejected the peace and security our Creator has offered us through obedience to his laws. The result has been sin—untold grief and pain caused by living a selfish way of life. And unless God stops our present course, there will be nothing left of this physical creation to salvage (Matt. 24:22).

In the past, mankind largely was blinded to the truth of God's creation by superstition. Now he is blinded by a vain assessment of his abilities.

Those who have scoffed at their Creator, and yet seen the wonderful design in his creation, will soon be astounded as the elements of the creation become aroused by God's fierce wrath at this world's conduct (Rom. 1:20).

The whole earth is going to be affected by these soon-coming events. God is merciful, however. He has plainly told those who are willing to listen, "Be always on the watch, and pray that you may be able to escape all that is about to happen, and that you may be able to stand before the Son of Man" (Luke 21:36).

But a disbelieving world is going to be ensnared.

How about you?

Take this warning to heart. Find out where your life is leading—ask God to open your eyes—BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!

For more information, why not write for our free booklets Are We Living in the Last Days? and Why Were You Born?
A New Look at a DIVIDED CITY

by John Ross Schroeder

BERLIN IS an enigma, a paradox. Berlin is a conundrum of ironies. Berlin is the Jerusalem of central Europe in terms of controversy. Berlin is all this and more.

For Berlin is a city that used to be one city and now has been divided into two separate cities belonging to two different countries.

The enigmas and ironies of Berlin go on and on. Surrounded on all sides by the German Democratic Republic (the G.D.R.), West Berlin is an island of capitalism in the midst of a country of socialism.

West Berlin is, in some ways, a part of West Germany. But it is effectively separated from the Federal Republic by 100 miles of East German territory.

Bound for Berlin

I boarded an intercity train in the bustling West German city of Hanover bound for West Berlin. The train was full of Berliners returning to that city from a visit to the Federal Republic.

In the restaurant car I sat across from an elderly gentleman who lives in East Berlin. He spoke a little English. He remarked at how much cheaper the very same meat dish we were partaking of would be in East Berlin.

Upon our arrival at the East German border town of Helmstedt, G.D.R. police and customs officials boarded the train. They checked passenger passports and visas as the train rolled through the East German countryside. The stark difference between the two countries became immediately obvious. West Germany is an exceedingly prosperous country from a materialistic point of view. East Germany is not.

One should not, however, jump to the conclusion that life in the West is always superior. Crime is not a big problem in either East Berlin or East Germany as a whole. The same cannot be said of West Germany.

But the stark and Spartan housing estates of East Germany bear no comparison to the colorful, prosperous homes one sees nearly everywhere in the Federal Republic. Numerous G.D.R. houses, at least along the railway route, were little more than huts.

Being a longtime admirer of steam locomotives, I was in for an unexpected treat on this 100-mile ride across East German territory. I had not seen steam locomotives in regular service since 1953. Most Western countries have long since modernized their locomotive fleet with diesel electrics. To my delight there were a number of handsome steamers working the route—another telltale clue that economically, the East was behind the West.

The four-hour train ride to West Berlin was one of the most pleasurable trips of my life, conversationally and otherwise. I was sorry to have to detrain.

The railway station in West Berlin was a shabby eyesore compared to most of the modern metropolitan passenger depots in the Federal Republic—another one of those abundant ironies so peculiar to Berlin. The reason: East Germans own and operate the overground railway systems in West Berlin—a peculiarity brought about by the unusual status of the whole city of Berlin following World War II. In
1945, Berlin was divided by the Quadripartite Agreement into four sectors. Soviet Russia, the United States, Britain and France ruled one sector each. But in short order the last three merged into the city of West Berlin.

Quite understandably, G.D.R. authorities were reluctant to modernize railway facilities in West Berlin even if they had the ready cash. Fortunately, the two Berlins are well on their way to solving this long-term railway paradox. Extensive modernization is in the works.

**Beauty of West Berlin**

The railway station is untypical of West Berlin. A brisk walk in the city center soon confronts one with the German genius. The architecture is magnificently modern—a delight to the eye by day or night. Most impressive is the Kurfuerstendamm—the largest and main street in West Berlin. It is a sheer delight to see the Kurfuerstendamm ablaze at night with neon lights. It is, as American writer Thomas Wolfe wrote, "the largest coffeehouse in Europe." There are some 100 coffeehouses and restaurants on the "Ku'damm"—including the historic Cafe Kranzler. A stroll along the Ku'damm, with its colorful advertisements and decorative shops, is a must for any Berlin visitor.

The merchandise equals in elegance most anything one can find on Regent Street in London or Fifth Avenue in New York.

All is not well with West Berlin, however. The Ku'damm is also punctuated with sex shops and porn movie houses—a moral softness permeating much of Western culture.

This softness of character seeps into other aspects of West Berlin life. Some ride the U-bahn (the underground railway or subway) and do not pay—there is relatively little risk of getting caught. No one ensures that riders buy tickets to begin the journey nor demands the tickets at the destination. Spot checks are ineffective and fines are so small that a regular but illegal rider soon makes up the difference in frequent journeys.

**Depressing Demographic Evidence**

There are other serious and disturbing trends afflicting West Berlin. It sports the most extreme age profile in Germany. About 25 percent of West Berlin's inhabitants are more than 65 years of age.

Of course, every West Berliner has a different view of what it's like to live in that city. I met a French immigrant on my outward train journey who would live in no other city in this world. Apparently many do not share his feelings. More and more young West Berliners are opting for other cities in the Federal Republic as a permanent place of residence.

West Berlin reached its peak population of 2,229,000 inhabitants in 1957. Population has declined to about 1,700,000.

Historian Gordon A. Craig touches on some probable reasons for these disturbing demographic difficulties. He wrote in his book *The Germans*: "It was estimated in 1971 that every third person who was drawn to the city by these advantages [tax and travel inducements] changed his mind sooner or later and left it, either because he was dissatisfied with his working or living conditions or because he was affected by the Berlin form of claustrophobia, the fear of being caught without hope of escape if the city fell to the forces of the East" (page 281, New American Library edition, 1982).

The citizens of West Berlin are a courageous lot. They have coped with crisis after crisis. The city was blockaded in 1948 and 1949. The wall was built to encircle the city in the early sixties. And there have been serious threats and minicrises from time to time.

But there is such a thing as *a*
cumulative effect from all these negative forces from without. A city's resistance can be gradually worn down over a period of many years. Comments Gordon Craig: "Whether [West] Berlin can survive indefinitely in its present riven state is a question that no one can answer with any assurance" (op. cit., page 262).

The only really satisfactory solution is, of course, reunion with East Berlin. But in this present age this can only occur if East and West Germany are reunited.

The Sharp Contrasts of East Berlin

Much progress has been made in the Eastern sector of Berlin since World War II. There are now few grim reminders of a war-wrecked and devastated city. Many modern buildings, especially of the large apartment variety, have been constructed throughout East Berlin.

The similarity between East and West seems to end there. By comparison, the edifices of East Berlin are stark, Spartan and spare. An enforced monetary economy is all too obvious. There is a drabness of color with few of the frills that make enlightened architecture so very attractive.

But give East Berliners their due. One finds a dedication to duty, a spirit of discipline and a measure of moral values that are somewhat missing in the Western sector. If East and West Berlin (and indeed East and West Germany) are ever reunited, one should not assume that the lion's share of the leadership will come from the West. We may be surprised.

Visitors who take the separate coach tours of both East and West Berlin cannot help but notice the remarkable difference in approach between the tour leaders. The Eastern tour leader was not only determined to give us a colorful and comprehensive description of significant sites, but an informative lecture on ideology as well.

Berlin is a city divided by more than a physical wall.

The Berlin Wall

No article about Berlin should omit mention of the wall. I was stunned by gross and tasteless graffiti on the wall's Western side. This was no advertisement of proper Western values.

The Berlin Wall is built of large concrete slabs "graced" with the usual barbed wire. The wall separating East from West Berlin is 28 miles in length; the wall separating East Germany from West Berlin is 72 miles long, making a 100-mile demarcation line around the Western sector of the city. G.D.R. troops diligently guard the wall from observation turrets and one can traverse the two cities only at official crossing points like Checkpoint Charlie. The Brandenburg Gate has been closed for a long time.

Fortunately, travel between East and West Berlin is easier these days. And considerable efforts are being made to ease tensions between the two cities. One thing is certain. Humans should not be divided either by a symbolic curtain of iron or an actual curtain of concrete.

Believe it or not, the Berlin Wall, like the ancient walls of Jericho, has a limited life. The eventual outcome is sure. The Berlin Wall—like all such walls, symbolic of a divided humanity—will come down. But whereas that may be achieved through human effort, it will take divine intervention in this world's affairs before all peoples everywhere learn to solve their differences peacefully.

Bible prophecy is clear. Nations will learn to get on together. For example, notice Isaiah's prophecy about the transformation of human nature among the descendants of the sons of the ancient Jacob or Israel: "The jealousy of Ephraim [half brother of Judah, the father of the Jews] shall depart ... Ephraim shall not be jealous of Judah, and Judah shall not harass Ephraim" (Isa. 11:13, Revised Standard Version).
later prophecy about the same future time, Isaiah had this to say about the Mideast:

“In that day there will be a highway from Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian [restored to their land in Iraq] will come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians will worship with the Assyrians” (Isa. 19:23, RSV).

No jealousy between nations; uninhibited travel across national borders between former enemies; even worship of the true God together. Sounds like a greater miracle than the crossing of the Red Sea dry-shod. And it will be!

The late U.S. President John F. Kennedy fired the imagination of nearly every West Berliner with his “Ich bin ein Berliner” speech in June of 1963. In concluding that speech, perhaps without realizing it, he was effectively speaking of the day of God coming in the near future.

President Kennedy said: “So let me ask you . . . to lift your eyes beyond the dangers of today to the hopes of tomorrow, beyond the freedom merely of this city of Berlin, in your country of Germany, to the advance of freedom everywhere, beyond yourselves and ourselves to all mankind. Freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved all are not free. When all are free, then we can look forward to that day when this city will be joined as one, and this country and this great continent of Europe, in a peaceful and hopeful globe.”

That day is coming.

Suffering:

War, famine, family breakups—human suffering continues to spiral! Why is there seemingly no solution?

The solution, happily, is known. Our free booklet The Ten Commandments reveals the solid foundation for world peace and successful living. You can apply and benefit from it! For your copy mail the request card in this issue or, if there is none, write to our office nearest you.

Solution:

TAX MAN

(Continued from page 9)

people of Judah had to learn from the captivity that when they obeyed and pleased God, God blessed them. They prospered. They had good health, a sound economy. God protected them against their enemies. When they disobeyed they had problems. So obedience is not a burden—it brings God’s pleasure and his blessings.

The Jews returning from Babylonian captivity began to forsake God—falling back into disobedience as the people had before the captivity. So Malachi wrote, speaking for God: “Will a man rob God? Yet you rob me. But you ask, “How do we rob you?” In tithes and offerings. You are under a curse—the whole nation of you—because you are robbing me. Bring the whole tithe into the storehouse, that there may be food in my house. Test me in this,” says the Lord Almighty, “and see if I will not throw open the floodgates of heaven and pour out so much blessing that you will not have room enough for it” (Mal. 3:8-10).

Tithing was never meant to be a burden.

Frankly, taxation can be. But the government where you live will insist you pay taxes. And while you may not always cheerfully do so, it is an obligation you have for living in your country.

And tithing?

It is the key to successful financial management.

The world economy is not going to get better. But if you want to ensure yourself of the best possible conditions in very uncertain times, you need to learn to manage your finances based on God’s principles.

We have two free booklets to assist you in this important aspect of life. One is entitled Ending Your Financial Worries. The other is Managing Your Personal Finances. Why not write for them right away?

You will find how sound financial management based on God’s laws will help you for many years to come.
NEVER BEFORE has the threat of terrorism been so great.

We bring our readers a fascinating interview, by Plain Truth senior writer John Ross Schroeder, with Christopher Dobson, British author and journalist, and one of the world’s most knowledgeable authorities on the frightening spectre of terrorism. Mr. Dobson has authored or coauthored six books on terrorist groups, their weapons and philosophy.

How would you define terrorism?

A very good definition of terrorism is in the United Kingdom’s Prevention of Terrorism Act: Terrorism means the use of violence for political ends and includes any use of violence for the purpose of putting the public or any section of the community in fear.

That’s an excellent definition because if you use it then you know when you are dealing with a terrorist and when you’re not dealing with a terrorist.

Terrorism has become an instrumentality not only of small groups taking revenge against society, but it has also become an instrumentality of states. Could you comment on this phenomenon?

Yes, terrorism has become a surrogate form of waging war. The Soviet Union uses this form. I’m not for one moment suggesting that the Russians are behind every single act of terrorism. I wouldn’t suggest that they manipulate every terrorist gang. But where a terrorist gang or terrorist situation suits their purpose, they will then support it, they will take advantage of it, they will finance it and they will give it arms, and it will be used. In some ways one may say that the Third World War is already being fought, and it is being fought by means of terrorism.

What role is terrorism presently playing, and what role will it continue to play in the struggle for power and influence between states and superstates? One act of terrorism actually began World War I.

Yes, one remembers very well the assassination at Sarajevo, but of course that single act could not have sparked the Great War unless the conditions for that Great War were already present. The great danger is that where the conditions are right for war, a single act of terrorism can actually provide the detonator.

All types of states use terrorism now. Look at Col. [Muammar] Kadafi, for example. Col. Kadafi sends out his hit teams, trained by the Venezuelan assassin, Carlos, to kill off his opponents in other countries. I interviewed Kadafi about two years ago, immediately after one of his hit teams had murdered one of his opponents here in Britain, and I said to him, “Colonel, when are your people going to stop killing your enemies in my country, in Britain?” He said, “I don’t see why you are worried about this. We don’t harm British people, it’s nothing to do with the British government,"
and we are going to continue doing that."

It is that sort of arrogant attitude by terrorists and the promoters of terrorists which can cause enormous problems, certainly for countries which themselves do not use terrorism as an instrument of state. One sees it, particularly in Beirut now, where terrorism is being used by just about every different faction in Lebanon. The Shias are using it, the Druzes are using it, the Phalangists are using it—they are all using terrorism as a weapon of war.

There seems to be a real fear of the possibility of nuclear war. How does this phenomenon affect the attitudes of terrorists who are desperate and become more desperate every day?

I don't think that the threat of nuclear war actually affects the major terrorist groups, because if there is no nuclear war, they will no longer be in business anyway. Their purpose in life and in death is to achieve their objectives in small-scale wars.

There are two places where there is a linkage between nuclear warfare and terrorism: one is the danger of terrorist groups acquiring nuclear weapons, or at least nuclear material which they can use to blackmail cities. A little while ago this was a fairly high concern among the antiterrorist organizations, but that seems to have slipped away now and people aren't nearly so worried.

I know that in the United States there are very effective military units which make sure that nobody acquires nuclear materials illegitimately.

What are Western governments doing at the highest policy level to combat terrorism?

The Western governments were very, very slow in doing anything united against terrorism. There is now an agreement under the EEC [European Economic Community] which enables all the countries of Europe to work together. Even before that agreement was made, there were various specialized units in European countries and in Israel and in the United States which cooperated on what we call in England, The Old Boy Network. The colonels knew each other and the captains knew each other. They exchanged visits and they compared notes. They tended to work together, but it was on an unofficial level.

What we've got now officially is legal, military and police cooperation among those countries that are specifically fighting terrorism.

One of the greatest assets in this fight is the German police computer at Wiesbaden, in which every known fact about every known terrorist is stored, and all the police forces of the Free World can draw on that computer's data banks. If people are picked up in London engaged in a form of terrorism, Wiesbaden is consulted and then the results come back in half an hour.

Some observers think that international terrorism may pose a greater threat to democratic societies than either external military aggression or internal subversion. Do you think that is a fair evaluation of that situation?

I don't think that's true at the moment. Terrorism is rather like the sea. There are great tides of terrorism and then the tide recedes. Some days the waves come crashing on the foreshore and frighten us all, and other days they are way out.

A point to keep in mind about this question is that terrorism can never succeed in overthrowing a country unless the government itself is rotten and falls.

And not so long ago, it was thought that the Red Brigades would overthrow the Italian government, but they haven't. They failed miserably. The Red Brigades are now in disorder, their leaders are in prison and they are no longer effective. This happened because the government was strong.

The same thing happened in Germany where the Bader Meinhoff gang and the Red Army faction thought that they could overthrow the German government. But it wasn't possible, because the solid layer of government, not only the central government, but also local government, was far, far stronger than the terrorists.

Terrorism can never be completely stamped out—new countries will use it as they get into situations where they see terrorism as their way of waging warfare. This is state terrorism and not acts by gangs of antistate terrorists.

There are a number of countries in the world who will use terrorism. The Libyans will use it, the Palestinians have always used it. The Palestinians have used it because the Arab states have no other way of striking at Israel.

There are various bands in Africa supported by black African countries which will use terrorism against South Africa. It is essentially the weapon of the weak against the strong. But at the same time, it's a weapon which is being fostered by one or two major states.

The Soviet Union will support acts of terrorism where it suits its purpose. The Cubans, of course, act as surrogate for the KGB and will carry out acts on behalf of the Soviet Union.

I don't want to be complacent about this because one should never ever be complacent about terrorism, and, of course, we are seeing terrorism being used in a number of places. But in most places it's not terrorism which is going to vitally affect the course of the world unless people panic and allow terrorism to do exactly that. Strong governments are needed, strong will is needed, and in this way, terrorism can be contained.

But it can never be entirely defeated because it only needs one man with a couple of sticks of explosives, which he can make from materials bought in the nearest hardware store, to hold a city to ransom. However, although this is very easy to do, it doesn't really affect the course of the world's history.

Specifically, why are nations of the world and individual groups within those nations turning to terrorism as an act to influence political events?

There are two answers to this question. The first answer is that some nations are too powerful to wage war, and the second answer is that some nations are too weak to wage war. The Soviet Union can't
wage war with the United States because it could result in a nuclear holocaust. So they don’t do so but instead they use terrorist groups in other countries to wage their wars for them.

It’s like sending out a small boy to pick on the boy of another family when the father doesn’t dare hit the father. With the smaller countries, those that don’t have the power to wage war against big countries can use acts of terror—small hit squads, small bomb squads—to strike at those major countries which they would otherwise be frightened to attack.

The Third World press seems to focus on Israel as being the number one terrorist power in the world today. What is your opinion on this seeming phenomenon?

Of course, the Third World would concentrate on it because of their support for the Arab cause. This is a perfectly natural political development.

It is true that the Israelis themselves used terrorism against the British mandate forces to force the British army to leave Palestine. Their excuse, then, was that their people had suffered nearly six million dead from the holocaust and they needed the homeland of Israel.

In fact, they committed various acts which are still regarded in Britain as acts of the most appalling terrorism.

However, during the “War of Independence” in 1948, acts of terrorism were committed by both sides. The Arabs committed acts of terrorism against the Israelis and the Israelis committed acts of terrorism against the Palestinians.

After they achieved independence, the Israelis forswore terrorism, until the Palestinians used it against them. And then, because Israelis couldn’t strike back in any other way, they started to use their counterterrorist forces against the Palestinians operating in Europe.

After the 1972 Munich massacre, when it seemed impossible that the people who planned it would ever be caught, the Israelis said, “We will deal with this ourselves.” They believe in an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. They sent out their hit teams, their assassination squads, to try to wipe out the people who were committing acts of terrorism against them. There was a war of kill and counterkill throughout Europe.

Would terrorist groups dare to undertake such a fanatical mission as kidnapping the British Queen? Could they really get past the security forces?

Given the present level of security it would be a difficult task to kidnap the Queen. The security forces are well aware of the danger and have worked out contingency plans to cope with all foreseeable sets of circumstances. They have even made dummy kidnap runs on the Royal Family. This does not, of course, mean that it would be impossible to kidnap the Queen—anything is possible in the world of terrorism.

It is the threat of assassination rather than kidnapping which is the constant nightmare for the Queen’s security men.

She is aware of the danger but persists in her walkabouts both at home and abroad during which she walks through crowded streets greeting people.

It would seem that the terrorist groups have decided that the international outrage caused by such an attempt would be counterproductive to their cause. There is no doubt that if the IRA decided that such an attempt would benefit their cause then they would attempt it. But as we have seen recently, they prefer softer targets like the people doing their shopping at Harrods in London.

How many terrorist organizations are there in the world today?

It is impossible to say precisely how many terrorist groups exist today, as they are like amoebae, constantly splitting, dying and regenerating. However, a nation by nation count of the groups now operating on a serious level gives us a figure of 45 to 50.

To what extent do these groups cooperate?

There is no ‘Terrorist International’ as such but there is a great deal of free-lance cooperation. Most of this stems from a meeting of international terrorists held in Lebanon in 1972 under the auspices of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. There have been similar meetings, especially in Ireland, of so-called freedom movements which have been covers for terrorist cooperative planning. They seem to work on a basis of doing favors for one another.

German members of the Red Army faction—the successors to the Bader Meinhoff gang—helped the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) in the Entebbe, Uganda, hijack for example.

There is also extensive exchange of arms and expertise. It is known, for example, that the Irish bomb makers have passed on their techniques to the Arabs and the Basques in exchange for arms.

More recently, the most desperate acts of terrorism have been carried out in the name of religion among the warring factions in Lebanon. But in most cases the religious cause is used only to disguise the real purpose of the terrorism: the acquisition of political and therefore commercial power.

One exception to this rule are the Shias who carry out bombings and killings on behalf of Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran. They are convinced that they are acting on behalf of their version of Allah through the commands of the Ayatollah, and they are convinced that if they are killed they will become martyrs and go directly to heaven.

The only theme uniting all these elements is that they are prepared to kill to further their cause.

Which countries in the world provide safe havens for terrorists and give substantial financial support to terrorist groups and military training and equipment?

Libya, Cuba and South Yemen are the three main havens for the terrorists. The various Arab nations also give shelter, training facilities, arms and money to the various groups which attach themselves to the government of the day. Russia’s satellites also give succor to the terrorists, but quietly.

(Continued on page 38)
ANOREXIA NERVOSA

The New Famine

by Agnes Youngblood

A new shocking social problem has arisen in Western society. Here's what you need to know about eating disorders that plague thousands.

Joanie has always been an above-average high school student. Her grades are at the top of her class. She is a star athlete and the homecoming queen. Everybody's goal is to be like Joanie.

But Joanie has a secret. She is starving herself to death. They Call It Anorexia Nervosa

Like a growing number of young women—and young men in 5 to 10 percent of reported cases—Joanie suffers from an illness called anorexia nervosa. She is one of a growing number worldwide, between the ages of 12 to 25 years, who voluntarily starve themselves. Typically, the anorectic comes from a middle- to upper-class family and is a high achiever.

Anorexia literally means "without a longing." This term is misleading. Anorectics do have a longing—they are acutely aware of their hunger. Even though the victim almost totally refuses to eat, he or she suffers a great deal from hunger pangs. But victims rarely, if ever, complain of hunger, or of the difficulty of keeping to a diet. They pride in their effectiveness to do what others find difficult.

It is a new and tragic form of vanity.

Food becomes a reverse obsession to the anorectic. It is an all-consuming thought and everything in life focuses around it, even though the barest minimum of calories is consumed. An anorectic may become a gourmet cook, insisting that others eat what she has prepared, but dutifully abstaining from a morsel herself.

The Causes

What causes promising young women who seem to have everything going for them to subject themselves to such torture—this new kind of famine?

Sigmund Freud once suggested that anorexia stemmed from a symbolic rejection of sex. The illness, he claimed, caused the loss of curves and menstruation, both feminine characteristics. This theory is generally rejected today.

While certain causes of anorexia are still being debated, most recent studies indicate that the core problem stems from the family relationship. Usually a high achiever, the anorectic will go to any length to please people, especially her parents.

This extreme diligence, cooperation and compliance often leads the person to feel that she has no real control over her own life—that she is living her life for everyone around her. But in one area she has total and complete control: the area of her own body.

Often the family of anorectics places great value in physical appearance, achievement and reputation in the community. One or both parents tend to be overprotective of and overconcerned about their children.

Disorders are especially likely to develop when parents set excessively high standards of achievement for their children or try to exert too much control over their lives.
It is this environment that many anorectics rebel against. They feel that they can no longer comply with and accommodate others' demands upon their lives.

Society is another key factor in determining the cause of anorexia. The "in thing" in today's Western world is to be thin. A brief glance through any fashion magazine will tell that story. Protruding cheek and hip bones are presented as essential to what goes toward having the ideal female shape.

One study of anorexia showed that magazine centerfolds as well as beauty pageant contestants have decreased in size over the past 20 years. Miss America winners, for example, have been an average 10 percent thinner than other contestants in the last several years.

Peer pressure also takes its toll. Females, especially those in the younger age bracket, feel compelled to look like the fashion models without regard to the state of their health or difference in structure.

Bulimia, Too

But anorexia is not the only eating disorder that is becoming more common. Colleges are now plagued with its counterpart, bulimia (binge-purge syndrome). It is estimated that nearly half of the victims of anorexia also develop bulimia. Some studies estimate that one out of five college women engages in bulimic activity—a practice of consuming huge quantities of food and then getting rid of it by vomiting or excessive use of laxatives or diuretics.

The origin of bulimia certainly extends back to ancient Rome. Accepted as common practice, the participants would gorge themselves, force themselves to vomit and then return to the tables to continue overeating.

Causes of bulimia are also closely linked with societal influences. General Mills' Contemporary Nutrition bulletin put the problem in these words: "As society has placed greater emphasis on the desirability of thinness in women, it is likely that this emphasis has caused more and more individuals to vomit in order to control their weight."

This practice obviously wreaks havoc on a healthy body. Some of the complications include: heart abnormalities; irritation of the esophagus; tooth decay; kidney problems; dangerously low levels of potassium; extreme weakness; stomach rupture; and hormonal imbalance.

Exercise

Not only does the anorectic starve herself, she also exercises with obsession. She feels that any calories she consumes must be used immediately. Running is often the form of exercise the anorectic uses.

Whole magazines are published that focus entirely on the body. Our society has become transfixed with the idea of the perfect body. Athletes often experience trouble with eating disorders through trying to keep themselves in shape for their events. Ballet dancers and gymnasts are especially susceptible. Anorectic or bulimic activity is the one way they feel they can maintain their weight at an acceptable level.

Men who suffer from anorexia or bulimia are often obsessed with exercise. Studies compared the characteristics of these compulsive male joggers with those of female anorectics. According to the New England Journal of Medicine, "The typical anorexic woman ... has many comparable characteristics, although her goal is physical attractiveness rather than physical effectiveness."

Male anorectics differ from women in other ways. Men "are more often underachievers, working hard but often in a chaotic and haphazard way, unlike the obsessively ordered work rituals that female anorexics typically develop," reports Psychology Today.

Symptoms

Excessive, compulsive exercise is not the only symptom, however. (Continued on page 44)
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COLORADO
KLDH, Grand Junction — 25, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
KDVR, Denver — 2, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WWJ, Washington — 9, 11:00 a.m., Sun.
WICS, Springfield — 20, 9:30 a.m., Sun.

CONnecticut
WFSB, Hartford — 2, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WMVT, Hartford — 24, 12:00 p.m., Sun.

FLORIDA
WBBH, Ft. Myers — 21, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
WTVJ, Jacksonville — 12, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WEAR, Pensacola — 3, 7:30 a.m., Sun.
WCTV, Tallahassee — 6, 12:00 noon, Sun.
WXSP, Tampa — 8, 9:00 a.m., Sun.
WPEC, Palm Beach — 12, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WBBG, Bradenton — 26, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
WRL, Columbus — 3, 8:30 a.m., Sun.
WMAZ, Macon — 13, 8:00 a.m., Sun.

ILLINOIS
WICD, Champaign — 15, 6:30 a.m., Sun.
WCUI, Chicago — 26, 10:30 p.m., Sat.
WGN, Chicago — 9, 7:30 a.m., Sat.
WSIL, Harrisburg — 3, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WQAD, Moline — 8, 8:00 a.m., Sun.
WEEK, Peoria — 25, 6:30 a.m., Sun.
KJQA, Quincy — 7, 8:30 a.m., Sun.
WTOC, Savannah — 11, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
WVGZ, Valdosta — 14, 10:30 a.m., Sun.

IOWA
WOL, Des Moines — 5, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
KMT, Mason City — 8, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
WKKL, Waterloo — 7, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

KANSAS
KUPK, Garden City — 13, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
KCTV, Kansas City — 10, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
KAKE, Wichita — 10, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

KENTUCKY
WBKO, Bowling Green — 13, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WLX, Lexington — 18, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WAVE, Louisville — 3, 9:30 a.m., Sun.

LOUISIANA
WABF, Baton Rouge — 9, 11:30 p.m., Sat.
KATC, Lafayette — 3, 8:30 a.m., Sun.
WWL, New Orleans — 4, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
KTLA, Shreveport — 6, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

MAINE
WJY, Bangor — 7, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
WMTW, Poland Spring — 8, 9:00 a.m., Sun.

MARYLAND
WBFF, Baltimore — 45, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
WHAG, Hagerstown — 25, 7:30 a.m., Sat.

Massachusetts
WBKB, Boston — 38, 9:00 a.m., Sun.
WGBB, Springfield — 40, 9:00 a.m., Sun.

MICHIGAN
WUHQ, Battle Creek — 41, 11:30 a.m., Sun.
WTOM, Cheboygan — 4, 11:30 a.m., Sun.
WJMN, Escanaba — 8, 6:30 a.m., Sun.
WJRT, Flint — 12, 8:00 a.m., Sun.
WZZM, Grand Rapids — 13, 12:00 noon, Sun.
WIL, Lansing — 10, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
WJBK, Southfield — 2, 6:30 a.m., Sun.
WBN, Traverse City — 7, 11:30 a.m., Sun.

MINNESOTA
KDLH, Duluth — 3, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
KMPR, Minneapolis — 9, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
KSTP, St. Paul — 5, 7:00 a.m., Sun.

MISSISSIPPI
WLOX, Biloxi — 13, 8:30 a.m., Sun.
WLBT, Jackson — 3, 9:30 a.m., Sun.

MISSOURI
KRCG, Jefferson City — 13, 10:30 a.m., Sun.
KODE, Joplin — 12, 7:30 a.m., Sun.
KPOU, Poplar Bluff — 15, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
KOLR, Springfield — 10, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

NEBRASKA
KCA, Lincoln — 9, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
KSCI, Scottsbluff — 10, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

NEW JERSEY
WABC, New York — 7, 11:30 a.m., Sun.

NEW MEXICO
KGSW, Albuquerque — 13, 11:00 a.m., Sun.

NEW YORK
WNYT, Albany — 13, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WBNG, Binghamton — 12, 11:00 a.m., Sun.
WGRZ, Buffalo — 2, 8:30 a.m., Sun.
WENY, Elmira — 36, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WNEW, New York — 5, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WOR, New York — 9, 11:00 p.m., Sun.
WOKR, Rochester — 13, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WIXT, Syracuse — 9, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WWNY, Watertown — 7, 11:30 a.m., Sun.

NORTH CAROLINA
WPCQ, Charlotte — 36, 8:00 a.m., Sun.
WRAL, Raleigh — 5, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WITN, Washington — 7, 11:30 a.m., Sun.
WWAY, Wilmington — 3, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
WXII, Winston-Salem — 12, 8:00 a.m., Sun.

NORTH DAKOTA
WDAD, Devils Lake — 8, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
WDAY, Fargo — 6, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

OHIO
WAKR, Akron — 23, 11:00 p.m., Sun.
WLWT, Cincinnati — 5, 11:00 a.m., Sun.
WUAU, Cleveland — 43, 9:00 a.m., Sun.
WBNS, Columbus — 10, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WDTN, Dayton — 2, 7:00 a.m., Sun.
WDHO, Toledo — 38, 9:00 a.m., Sun.
WVTY, Youngstown — 8, 10:00 a.m., Sun.

OKLAHOMA
KTEX, Ada — 10, 10:00 a.m., Sun.
KOklahoma City — 25, 8:00 a.m., Sun.
OKL, Tulsa — 23, 11:00 a.m., Sun.
KTUL, Tulsa — 8, 9:30 a.m., Sun.
The Irish community in the United States also acts as a rear base for the Irish terrorists, providing money through NORAID, which buys arms in sporting goods shops and smuggles them across the Atlantic, as well as providing protection for terrorists on the run and a center for propaganda.

Does the Soviet Union play a major role in supporting terrorist groups?

The Soviet Union has tried most successfully to present a pure image to the world over its support of terrorism. A pamphlet published by the Jonathan Institute in Jerusalem has exposed this facade. The Russians pick likely recruits from among third world students and train them at Lumumba University as terrorist leaders. There are terrorist training camps maintained in East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

A number of Arab terrorists who have been captured by the Israelis and have told their stories reveal the extent of Soviet involvement. Most terrorist weapons are Soviet designed but made in and supplied from Czechoslovakia. Terrorists are also allowed to use the satellite countries as havens after carrying out operations in Europe. It is significant that not a single act of terrorism has been carried out against the Soviet Union by these terrorist groups.

Their [Soviet] sensitivity about being blamed for sponsoring terrorism is illustrated by their intense reaction to accusations that the Bulgarian secret service was behind the attempted assassination of the Pope by the Turkish gunman Ali Agca.

Would the financial support the IRA receives from Irish-Americans compare with the backing such nations as Cuba and Libya give the PLO?

No. These are two different phenomena. The Irish-Americans give money and political support out of love for an ancient cause. Many of them feel guilty that they are leading a soft life in America while their cousins are fighting and dying in the old country. This type of emotionalism obscures the truths of the situation in Ireland and hides the fact that the men they are supporting tend to be ruthless thugs.

The support given by Cuba and especially Libya is of a different quality. These countries provide training camps, weapons, finances, logistic support through the "diplomatic bag" and, in fact, behave like countries at war.

How sophisticated is the weaponry of these groups, and just how well organized and capable of pulling off major coups are they?

Weaponry is growing increasingly sophisticated. The Irish in particular have become expert in bomb making, using mercury trembler fuses and remote controlled bombs triggered by radio devices similar to those used in controlling the flight of model aircraft.

There are about 10 groups who are organized enough to pull off major coups. But such coups have become more difficult with the formation and success of specialized antiterrorist groups such as the British SAS and the German GSG9. Hijacking seems to have gone out of fashion because of the Mogadishu and Entebbe incidents, when hijackers were dealt with ruthlessly by German and Israeli commando raiders and it was made clear to the terrorists that the world was prepared to fight against aerial hijacking, even at the price of some innocent lives. Once that fact was established the terrorists realized that their blackmail would no longer pay off.

Do the Arab terrorist groups have as an ultimate ideal a resurgent Islamic empire uniting all Arab states?

Most terrorist groups which have been operating throughout the world in the Palestinian cause are not religious. In fact, the most ruthless of the groups was founded and controlled by two Christian Arabs.

It is the aim of most of these groups first to reoccupy Palestine and then to spread a leftist movement of various degrees throughout Arabia. The overthrow of the Shah by the Shia Moslems has, however, introduced a new factor, because this movement and the general resurgence of Islam must sooner or later clash with the secular aims of the terrorists. Islam can never live with communism.

Would you say that urban terrorists are initially dedicated to anarchy to bring about their aims?

Most of the urban groups in Europe see anarchy as a prerequisite to the overthrow of the present system of government and the emergence of their new utopia. The formula is well known. Cause chaos. The government will be forced to introduce repressive measures. The populace will rise. Anarchy will ensue. The system will collapse. Paradise will be created out of the ruins.

This has so far not worked because the ordinary people have come to hate terrorism so much they are prepared to put up with repressive measures in order to get rid of the terrorists.

The danger lies in the fact that unless these repressive measures are removed from the statute books, once the terrorists have been destroyed, they could provide a framework for a dictatorship—so the terrorists will have succeeded only in creating what they hate the most.

Are most terrorists perfectly willing to sacrifice their lives for the cause?

A great number of terrorists are perfectly willing to die for the cause, principally because once having become a terrorist there can be no going back. They must either triumph or die. Death becomes commonplace. This is what makes them so dangerous. They will kill because they are prepared to die.

Which terrorist group has the most military clout today?

I doubt if a European urban group has any real political power now. The only ones that have are the various Arab groups. And their threat lies in their position as a fuse to the powder keg of the Middle East and the oil fields on which the Western world relies for its survival.
And this worldly civilization worships its God. The appalling fact unrealized by the world is that Satan, not the Eternal, is its God! The Creator God “is not the author of confusion,” we read in I Corinthians 14:33. Its real author is Satan, the world’s God! And so he has his many denominations and sects, all striving in a babylon of confusion!

There is just one thing, it seems, that all Satan’s ministers can agree upon. “God’s Law,” they chorus in unison, “is done away!” Yes, they have to tell that in order to draw their salaries! Today the people of organized religion refuse to hear the law of the Lord (Isa. 30:8-11). They demand that their ministers preach the soft and smooth things—the deceits! They have turned away from the truth, and are accepting and believing fables (II Tim. 4:2-4). They are bitter against God’s law, and against the few who have courage today to proclaim the plain truth of God’s Word!

Yes, Satan has organized religion. He himself appears, not as a devil with horns and a tail bearing a pitchfork, but “is transformed into an angel of light” (II Cor. 11:14). His ministers are transformed as the ministers of righteousness, appearing as the apostles of Christ (verses 13, 15). But they are preaching “another Jesus” (verse 4), in the power of “another spirit,” and deceiving men with “another gospel” than the true gospel of the kingdom that Christ brought and Paul and all the apostles preached (Gal. 1:6-7).

Satan’s congregations go in for much form. “Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away,” plainly warns God’s Word (II Tim. 3:5). The present worldly order—its competitive principles, its customs and traditions, its political systems—is upheld by Satan’s religious systems within every land! Truly, all nations are deceived (Rev. 12:9, 17:2, 18:3).

Jesus Christ appeared 1,900 years ago as a messenger bearing a message from God. He brought to an unhappy world steeped in false ways the “good news of the kingdom of God.” A kingdom now, soon, to replace these crumbling governments of earth!

That kingdom today is near at hand—even at the doors (Luke 21:31).

Thank God, we are near the end of the six working days allotted to Satan’s dominion. God’s thousand-year sabbath day is just about to dawn!

There is a saying that it is darkest just before the dawn. Now we see on every hand the final fruitage of men’s ways. Written in ineradicable blood, in human misery, anguish and despair, is the 6,000-year record of experience!

Even now men will not heed this horrible lesson—not until they are forced to see it!

But, as Satan’s sixth “working day” closes, God is about to step in and supernaturally to interfere!

The coming seventh millennium shall see Satan restrained. Christ will return to rule the earth with all the power of God. God’s new order for the next thousand years will restore peace, happiness and joy.

Then men may look back over this present world and compare! Never will God force a single human being, against his own will, into salvation and eternal life.

But, with the 7,000-year record of experience set plainly before seeing eyes, do you think anyone will want to return to these ways we seem now to love? Not many, you may be sure of that! Yet some, even then, will rebel.

Finally the world shall acknowledge, of its own free volition, that God’s ways are right. Christ, says the scripture, “learned obedience by the things which he suffered” (Heb. 5:8). Even he who never did wrong! “And being made perfect”—through experience—“he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him” (verse 9).

Some day we shall look upon God’s plan with breathtaking admiration and awe! The suffering of this present time shall have faded completely from mind. The lessons of experience we shall have with us for eternity! Finally humanity shall accept God’s ways of life, knowing that they are right ways. The happiness and joy we shall then experience cannot be conceived by our minds today! None will look back and say, “God isn’t fair.”
U.S. trade with the Pacific rim nations exceeded that with the Atlantic nations. Moreover, 40 percent of America's immigrants each year now come from Asia (with the same percentage from Latin America), as opposed to only 16 percent from Europe and Canada. From 1930 to 1960, 80 percent of U.S. immigrants came from Europe and Canada.

Given enough time, the United States would become an Asian- and Third World-origin nation—and this is a profound shift that few, even in the United States, fully comprehend.

And even without this new shift to the Pacific, it must be realized America's close security ties to Europe since the end of World War II are out of character with the American historical experience. The Economist, referred to earlier, editorialized:

"The Americans are not, as too many Europeans think they are, a collection of intermarried Europeans who happen to have moved sideways across the Atlantic, plus some blacks and Hispanics. They are the descendants, in overwhelming majority, of people who left Europe because they wanted to be free or rich and the old world kept them squashed and poor.

"So they shook Europe's dust off their feet.... The act of going to America was a deliberate decision... to turn their backs on the unsatisfactory politics of the world they were leaving behind."

Deep within the American psyche, furthermore, is a longing to drop out of world power politics. "Despite decades of costly international experience," writes Eugene V. Rostow, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in the February 20, 1984 issue of The New Republic, "the American mind still dreams about the golden century of isolationism between 1815 and 1917.... We have not yet learned to think like a great power. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union plays hard and well, on the basis of meticulous preparation, in the ancient tradition of chess."

"It is clear what the Soviet leaders are up to. While the Russians distract us by secondary though important moves in the Caribbean and the Middle East, they are lunging to neutralize Western Europe by detaching it from the United States."

"Emancipation of Europe"

What is to be the outcome of the strained U.S.-West European ties? One far-reaching and sobering speculation was presented in an article in the Spring 1983 issue of Foreign Policy. Entitled "Freedom for Europe, East and West," the article was written by Klaus Bloemer, an official in the Press and Information Office of the West German government. Mr. Bloemer states that the views expressed are his own, not necessarily those of his government.

"It is a harsh truth," writes Mr. Bloemer, "that the political emancipation of Europe-East and West-will proceed with difficulty as long as Western Europe remains utterly dependent upon the United States." What is now required, this official adds, "is a vision—a far-sighted plan to end the confrontation in Central Europe that, for 35 years, has passed for normality."

Instead of perpetuating close ties to the United States, Mr. Bloemer maintains that "countless historical, geographic, cultural and strategic interests require that West European countries enter into some kind of security relationship with the Soviet Union."

As far as the nations of Eastern Europe are concerned, continues this West German official, they no longer adequately fulfill their function as a buffer zone for the Soviet Union.

The 110 million East Europeans, he maintains, "represent a potentially disruptive political and social force" within the Soviet orbit. And economically, their bleak economies constitute an acute drain on Soviet resources.

This presents West Europeans with the opportunity to offer the Soviets and their East European partners what Mr. Bloemer calls "a New Deal-Marshall Plan-type proposal" to modernize their economies.

"An essential precondition for such an evolution," he adds, "would be ending both Soviet and American military presence in East and West European countries," with "a West European defense organization" arising to replace the departing Americans in the West.

Western Europe would continue to recognize the Soviet Union's "legitimate security requirements," but in return for this recognition and the offering of massive economic assistance, the Soviets hopefully would allow much greater freedom for their East European satellites, similar to that enjoyed by Finland.

The end result, Mr. Bloemer hopes, will be the "Finlandization of Moscow's European allies" and—note this—the emergence of "two self-governing halves of Europe" (emphasis ours throughout).

Understanding "Finlandization"

The term "Finlandization" is normally used in the mass media to convey willing West European subservience to Moscow. As such, it is incorrect. Moreover, it is highly offensive to the Finnish people who, faced with the geographical fact of life of an 800-mile border with the Soviet Union, have nevertheless managed to preserve their Western-style independence.

Looking at it from the perspective of the East Europeans, said Mark E. Austad, former U.S. ambassador to Finland, "the East Europeans would love to be Finlandized."

Soviet expert Nora Beloff adds that "the whole concept of Finlandization needs to be reversed." Writing in the July 30, 1982, Daily Telegraph of London, Ms. Beloff stressed how important Finland is to the Soviet Union, especially in trade.

Finland, moreover, is not strapped with the chronic economic problems of the East bloc, increasingly an economic burden for Moscow. "That is why," said Ms. Beloff, "sooner or later, Moscow must be persuaded to see that it is in its own economic as well as security interests to Finlandize the satellites and set the people free."

The prognostication of Mr.
Bloemer, Ms. Beloff and others might be very close to the way political relations in Europe ultimately will materialize, as indicated in the Bible, in the second chapter of the book of Daniel.

Like it or not, just over the horizon in world events is the final end-time revival of the Roman Empire, just before the restitution of the Kingdom of God on the earth to bring world peace at last. This final restoration is pictured as the toes of a great image in the form of a man. The feet of this image are "partly of iron and partly of clay" (verse 33, Revised Authorized Version), meaning it "shall be partly strong and partly fragile" (verse 42).

The ancient Roman Empire was divided. The Europe to come could well be composed of two confederated halves: "five toes" representing Western and a part of Central Europe, the other five comprising the nations of Central or Eastern Europe, perhaps existing in a Finlandized form, giving consideration to the security interests of the Soviet Union.

"Five Fingers" on the Trigger

The eastern half of a new Europe may well remain neutralized and "nuclear free." This meshes with ideas that have been in circulation for the past few years.

For example, Sweden’s independent Palme Commission has advocated the idea of a corridor in Central Europe, the other five comprising the nations of Central or Eastern Europe, perhaps existing in a Finlandized form, giving consideration to the security interests of the Soviet Union.

Kissinger, in Brussels, also said he would make proposals.

It would be better, Mr. Krauss said, for the new Pershing II and cruise missiles now going into Europe to be controlled by the Europeans themselves. He feels there would be less public reaction in Western Europe against them. "Such a ‘de-Americanization’ of European defense would be better for western security,” said Mr. Krauss.

But would it be good for American security in the future?

That is a question no one seems to be asking.

Continued Mr. Krauss: "Far more credible to Moscow . . . would be for Europe to have its own nuclear deterrent. The obvious problem raised by a nuclear West Germany could be circumvented by the establishment of a European defense force so that instead of a single finger there would be a single hand with five fingers on the crucial red button."

The Soviets would never permit Western missiles in a future Finlandized Eastern Europe, but could conceivably permit a united defense force consisting of the five-fingered Western "hand" of a 10-nation federated European third force to have nuclear weapons.

Moscow would likely demand a military nonaggression pact, in addition to infusions of economic aid, from Western Europe. Such an arrangement might prove very tempting to the sluggish industries of Western Europe that have been falling steadily behind the U.S. and Japan in the high-technology race.

Call for European "Superpower"

The late 78-year-old French philosopher-author Manès Sperber, in an address in Munich, West Germany, last year, called for Europe to become its own superpower: "Instead of being the bone of contention between two superpowers, Europe itself must become a superpower, neither expansionist nor revengeful, but utterly determined through its own sufficiently strong defense forces to deter anyone who might feel emboldened to want to take possession of it because of its weakness."

Blunt exchanges dominated last winter’s European security conference in Stockholm. No quick thaw in strained superpower relations is seen.
TERRORISM
the
Worst Is Yet to Come!

by Dan C. Taylor

Suicide bombers threaten mayhem in the Middle East. And experts now warn about “state-supported terrorism.” Where is it all headed?

A NEW WAVE of violence is sweeping over the world. In its wake are death and destruction on an unprecedented scale.

Just look at what has happened.

Suicide bombings of U.S. and French peacekeeping forces in late 1983 left nearly 300 dead in Beirut, Lebanon. Not long afterward, six explosives rocked tiny Kuwait within minutes, in an ominous spread of disorder to the vital oil-rich Gulf region.

In Asia a bomb in Rangoon, Burma, took the lives of 17 South Korean officials, including four cabinet members—and narrowly missed South Korean President Chun Doo Hwan.

In Britain the Irish Republican Army (IRA) continued its holiday-season policy of increased public terrorism with its Christmas car-bombing outside the world-famous Harrod’s department store. Ten people died and 74 were wounded. The IRA also launched an unprecedented attack on a church service in Northern Ireland. All of these links in a rapid chain of terrorist attacks have stunned governments around the world.

A Losing Battle?

In recent years there had been some bright spots in the battle against terrorism. Through the use of conditional pardons, better intelligence networks, tougher policies in hostage situations and greater international cooperation, governments have been able to make considerable progress against the more traditional terrorist organizations such as Italy’s notorious Red Brigades.

Despite these government successes, however, international terrorism is alive and now more deadly than ever.

In the first nine months of 1983, nearly 7,300 died in terrorist attacks—more than twice those killed in the eight years between 1972 and 1980. The ensuing climate of fear and notoriety has forced many nations to introduce a wide range of security measures for public officials and buildings.

Barricades now block access to public buildings in Washington, D.C., for fear of what some have called the terrorist weapon of the 1980s: the Beirut-style suicide truck bomb.

And with the XXIII Olympic Games only a few months away, officials in Los Angeles, recalling the 1972 tragedy in Munich—at which 11 Israeli athletes were killed by Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) commandos—are hoping for the best but preparing for the worst.

The U.S. Olympic Organizing Committee has arranged for more than 17,000 security personnel, backed by a 42-man FBI antiterrorist team, to ensure the safety of both the athletes and the public at large.

These precautions may save many lives. Yet they’ve contributed to an atmosphere of governments under siege—precisely the climate terrorists hope to create.

State-supported Terrorism

Terrorist groups survive despite governmental pressures in much the same way as a troubled business survives in spite of economic difficulties.

To “stay in business,” terrorist groups have, in the past, robbed banks, kidnapped, extorted, even dealt in drugs or other contraband materials. But “local fund-raising”
has proven unreliable for some groups. As a result, they have opted for another, more ominous way of augmenting their budgets: seeking out powerful sponsors to provide safe havens, training, weapons and money. In some cases these sponsors have proven to be national governments—leading to what is now called “state-supported terrorism.”

Terrorists have become the means by which some powerful nations, desiring to avoid unwanted escalation or public outcry, can punish their enemies at a relatively small cost.

These modern-day guns-for-hire also provide the same service for smaller nations that may fear a direct confrontation with a major power.

Many nations make no bones about their connections to terrorist groups. Syria, Libya, Iraq and South Yemen all see no objection in directly aiding terrorism. Israel, in turn, mounts numerous counter-attacks on specific targets. Others like Cuba, North Korea, Algeria and several Eastern bloc nations prefer the role of clandestine training centers.

Perhaps as many as 5,000 guerrillas and terrorists have been trained in Cuba alone.

Two decades ago, only a relatively few terrorist groups had connections with government sponsors. Now, according to one consultant on terrorism, only a few don't have the support of some state. In a bold statement made in 1979, Dr. Hans Josef Horchem of West Germany's antiterrorist Office for the Defense of the Constitution flatly stated: “The KGB [the Soviet intelligence agency] is engineering international terrorism. The facts can be documented and are well known to the international community.”

As Claire Sterling adds in her book The Terror Network: “In effect, the Soviet Union had simply laid a loaded gun on the table, leaving others to get on with it.”

Nor is the CIA (the U.S. intelligence agency) free from similar charges under one or more previous administrations.

State sponsorship has presented a dangerous new face of terrorism. For one thing, the level of weaponry employed has advanced greatly.

Crude pipe bombs have been replaced by sophisticated remotely-fired car bombs. Molotov cocktails are out; rocket-propelled grenades are in. But greater levels of finances and weaponry are not the only changes that have come on the scene. Targets have changed also.

In the 1970s, attacks against property accounted for 80 percent of all terrorist activities. Only 20 percent were directed against people. Today, those figures are about 50-50. Diplomats and diplomatic facilities are now particularly singled out. They have become the targets of nearly 40 percent of all international terrorist attacks.

Terrorism Will Be Stopped

The immediate future does not look bright for those battling against terrorism. And as the world’s level of frustration rises, an America that has seemed nearly impervious to terrorism may begin to suffer along with the rest of the world. As President Ronald Reagan said a few months ago: “We have never before faced a situation in which others routinely sponsor and facilitate acts of violence against us.”

For state-sponsored terrorists like the Libyan hit teams in Europe or the Shiite terrorists in Lebanon, the latter believed to be inspired by the revolutionary government of Iran, no act is too violent.

The world has reached—and threatens to go way beyond—a period similar to the violent terrorism that plagued post-World War I Germany, where small armies sponsored by various political factions waged war in the streets. This recent historic period was not unlike the situation in Beirut today—and not unlike a time described by the apostle Paul 1,900 years ago: “But mark this: There will be terrible times in the last days. People will be lovers of themselves... boastful, proud, abusive... unholy, without love, unforgiving, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not lovers of the good, treacherous, rash...” (II Tim. 3:1-4, New International Version).

Jesus Christ himself prophesied (see the account in Matthew 24:7-8) that at the time of the end, “nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom... All these are the beginning of sorrows.”

This is what we have today. One nation sponsoring bloody terrorist attacks on another. The governments under assault today are often powerless to stop this deadly scourge. The world must, instead, look elsewhere for a way out of this madness.

Harrod’s of London blanketed in smoke after a Christmas-season IRA car bombing.

More killings, more bombings, more sorrows are on the horizon. But there is a government on its way that will deal with terrorism in a firm manner. The kingdom of God will save mankind from men willing to go to any length—whether by war or terrorism—to achieve their means.

The coming Messiah “will judge between the nations and will settle disputes for many peoples. They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore” (Isa. 2:4, NIV).

For a glimpse of this coming age of peace, send for our free booklets The Wonderful World Tomorrow—What It Will Be Like and World Peace—How It Will Come.
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Herbert W. Armstrong, the President and Founder of Ambassador College and the Ambassador Cultural Foundation, has played an important role in the work of the ICCY. I first met him when he visited Israel in 1969. I was called upon to welcome him and his associates to the Knesset, in my capacity at that time as cabinet minister in the Israeli parliament. At the luncheon held in the Knesset we laid the foundation for an “iron bridge” between Ambassador College, the Israel Archaeological Society, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the International Cultural Center for Youth in Jerusalem. This cooperative effort has produced very positive results.

Since then groups of students from Ambassador College have come to Israel to participate in the archaeological diggings in the Old City and are invited to the ICCY to attend many different types of cultural programs. This spirit of cooperation soon led to participation in other projects in the city of Jerusalem, e.g., a children’s playground in the Liberty Bell Park was built and bears the name of Herbert W. Armstrong.

In honor of his continued dedication to the programs and goals of the ICCY and for his success in building bridges between leaders of nations to promote peace in the world, the Board of Directors of the ICCY has named the square at the entrance to the ICCY building in Jerusalem the Herbert W. Armstrong Square.

The leaders of the excavation projects in the Old City, Professors Benjamin Mazar and Nachman Avigad, have expressed their gratitude for the roles Ambassador College and Herbert Armstrong have played in this outstanding archaeological achievement.

Joseph Aviram and Professor Yigal Yadin of the Israel Archaeological Society have paid tribute to Ambassador College’s involvement in these archaeological activities. The Mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek, has praised Mr. Armstrong as an outstanding personality of our time. As honorary treasurer of the Israel Archaeological Society, I, too, applaud the contributions made by Ambassador College and Foundation to this important work.

Let us continue to work together toward our common goal—peace in our time.

New Famine  
(Continued from page 35)

Of course, drastic weight loss is the primary sign. Lack of menstrual periods, excessive constipation, depression, unnecessary loss of head hair, growth of down-like hair over the body, intolerance of cold temperatures and a dangerously low pulse rate are all symptoms.

The most puzzling symptom to psychologists is the distorted body image. No matter how emaciated an anorectic may get, she feels like she is “still a little hippy.” She feels that she still needs to lose just one more pound.” Those suffering with bulimia differ from the anorectic on this point. Bulimics have a clear perception of what their bodies look like and feel that they must continue their binge-purge cycle to maintain their weight. Anorectics, by contrast, deeply believe that they are still fat.

The Treatment

Help is available for those who suffer from eating disorders.

Treatment of eating disorders such as anorexia and bulimia vary, often depending on the stage of illness. If the case is serious, obviously malnutrition must be dealt with initially. If malnutrition is mild, other treatment may be employed first.

Involvement of the family in treatment is important. Since a major cause of the illness stems from family relationships, getting to this root of the problem is absolutely essential.

Self-help techniques are also important, including relaxation, seeing nutrition counselors or joining a group especially for people with similar problems. Part of this treatment is the patient’s acceptance of her natural size, which means no more self-deception or lying to oneself! A former anorectic told one magazine: “Everyone is not meant to be thin. Some women have heavy calves... As long as they feel healthy, women should forget about trying to look like the models in the magazine ads.”

The dietary principles involved in treatment of anorexia or bulimia are always impressed upon the patient by therapists. The first step is to determine the basal caloric requirement and add a small increment for activity calculated to maintain weight initially.

An important factor in treatment is early detection. The longer these patterns continue, the more difficult they are to break.

Even though anorexia and other eating disorders are still being studied, many young people have already overcome them with help from others. If you or someone you know has an eating disorder, seek help. It’s a serious problem—much more serious than many realize. It can be a matter of life and death.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

50th Anniversary

I just received your 50th anniversary issue of The Plain Truth. I agree with you that the world has taken God out of the picture. God has sadly become just a word to so many people. We have changed his rules to fit our own way of life. It makes me shout with joy when I realize that Jesus will soon be coming to make this world into the kind of world he wanted it to be. Keep publishing your magazine, because it is a light in this darkened world.

Lynda Wrieden
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Your February 50th anniversary issue is interesting, bringing back some of the old and updating with the new.

I have been reading your publication on and off for some 30 years. I especially love the frequent use of italics as though the reader would not otherwise be able to get the proper meaning. Why can't the material be presented more interestingly? This tribute to Mr. Armstrong is no doubt well deserved, but I know that no reader will alter the founder's style.

I am sure that many letters about this issue will be glowing compliments, and they will be deservedly so, but I have written one which will perhaps raise a question or two which could be useful as you work toward your next 50 years of publication.

W. M. Morris
Lake Zurich, Illinois

I just received your beautiful publication, The Plain Truth, for the 50th anniversary, and would like to compliment those responsible for designing the cover. It is very elegant. I also enjoyed the color photos of Ambassador College and am very impressed with the size and beautiful grounds. All the students should be proud of being a part of it.

Wini Venable
Morehead City, North Carolina

Orwellian Nightmare

As I sit down to write this letter, my mind whirls with thoughts generated by Michael Snyder's article describing the Orwellian nightmare. It gave the reasons why this book has such a powerful impact on the reader. I often wondered why I remembered this book while forgetting others. Now I know! The startling fact that we are right now living in an Orwellian age sober my thoughts.

DuWayne E. Ready
Prairie Village, Kansas

If the eminent British novelist and social critic George Orwell ("Is a New Dark Age Coming?", January 1984) were alive today, he would point to the alarming number of abortions as a tragic sign that "1984" already has arrived.

George Comstock, the hero of Orwell's novel, Keep the Aspidistra Flying, impregnates his lover, and after learning that she is carrying his baby, engages her in a conversation regarding what they should do. After his lover begins talking about money for an abortion, Comstock suddenly begins to understand that what they have been discussing is the killing of their unborn child: "For the first time he grasped, with the only kind of knowledge that matters, what they were really talking about. The words 'a baby' took on a new significance. They did not mean any longer a mere abject disaster, they meant a bud of flesh... It was the squalid detail of the (money) that brought it home."

Haven Bradford Gow
Arlington Heights, Illinois

I have, for a number of years, subscribed to your magazine, and when I find a story with facts that are so blatantly untrue, the whole magazine becomes suspect, which I am sure is not your intention.

In your January issue, you feature a story on page 39 titled "Is a New Dark Age Coming?" by Michael A. Snyder.

I strongly suggest that Mr. Snyder did not research his article, for he states, and I quote: "Orwell was born in the 'Third World. He was reared in poverty." This is utterly ridiculous. George Orwell, born Eric Arthur Blair, was born in India in 1903, of English parents, and moved to Henley-on-Thames outside London a year later. He attended Eton, where only the sons of wealthy and the aristocracy go.

Derek C. Freer
Fort Walton Beach, Florida

• Orwell (née Blair) was born in 1903 at Mothahari, Bengal. His father was a minor official in the Indian civil service, his mother the daughter of an unsuccessful teak merchant in Burma.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (15th edition) characterizes Orwell's parents' attitudes as "those of the 'landless generations,' as Orwell later called people whose pretensions to social status had little relation with their income. Orwell was thus brought up in an atmosphere of impoverished snobbery."

Continuing with the Britannica account, Orwell attended a preparatory boarding school in Sussex, England, "where he was distinguished among the other boys by his poverty and his brilliance." It was this same brilliance that won Orwell a scholarship to both Eton and Winchester, both leading schools in England. Orwell chose the scholarship to the former.

Some erroneously thought the article asserts Orwell was reared in India.

Correction
The photo credit that appeared on page 35 of the April issue should have read: UNDENA PUBL.
Once, marriage was for life. But today marriage and the home and the family lack permanence. In some Western countries, nearly one in two marriages ends in divorce!

Little wonder, with so many broken homes, marriage has been questioned—even attacked. But marriage is not obsolete!

Society as a whole overlooks an important truth about marriage! How and when did marriage originate? What purpose does it really serve?

Our free booklet Why Marriage! Soon Obsolete? offers positive, practical information that can guide you through the confusion and provide hope and help for your own marriage. You may have a copy by mailing the card inside or by writing to our office nearest you.