


THE STRANGE ORIGIN OF HALLOWEEN SPAIN BRACES FOR MORE TROUBLE



GETTING OFF THE MATERIALISTIC MERRY-GO-ROUND

How many times have you heard non-Christians, judging one who professes Christ, say in disgust: "Well if *that's* Christianity, I don't want any of it!"

How many judge God by the way professing Christians live? How many assume that one must live a *perfect* life, before he can become a Christian?

How many say: "If I could give up smoking, I'd become a Christian."

How many think a Christian is supposed to be perfect, never doing anything wrong? Suppose you do see or hear about a Christian doing something wrong. Does that mean he is a hypocrite — that he is *not* really a Christian, after all?

Is it possible for one to actually SIN, while he is a Christian, and *still remain* a truly converted Christian?

I suppose nearly everyone would reply in the negative. But here is a vital point you need to UNDERSTAND!

It's hard to believe — but TRUE! Few know just what *is* a Christian. Few know how one is converted — whether suddenly, all at once, or gradually. Does conversion happen *immediately*, or is it a PROCESS? It's HIGH TIME WE UNDERSTAND!

The TRUTH is that there is a sense in which true conversion *does* take place at a definite time — all at once. But it is also true that in another sense conversion is worked out gradually — a process of development and growth.

Now NOTICE CAREFULLY!

WHEN does one really become a Christian? It is when he receives God's Holy Spirit. In Romans 8:9, we read that *unless* we have the Holy Spirit, we are not Christ's — not Christians.

There is a definite TIME when God's Spirit enters into one. At the *very moment* he receives the Holy Spirit, he is, in this first sense, *converted*. Yes, *all at once!* If he has Christ's Spirit, he is CHRIST'S — he is a Christian! He has been begotten as a child of God.

But does that mean his salvation is complete? Is he now fully and finally "saved"? Is that all there is to it? Is he now, suddenly, *perfect*? Is it now impossible for him to do WRONG?

NO! FAR FROM IT! But WHY? What's the answer? Why do so many misunderstand?

Here is the PLAIN TRUTH you need to know.

First, there are TWO conditions to becoming a Christian: REPENTANCE, and FAITH. These two we, ourselves, must perform. Yet no one can, of himself, say: "Oh now I see — I must repent. All right, I hereby repent." One does not just decide casually, as a matter of routine, to repent. WHY?

Jesus Christ said that none can come to Him, except the Spirit of the Father draw him. God *grants* repentance. God calls one, and convicts the mind and conscience by His Spirit, working on the mind externally. Usually a real struggle goes on within. The person has been shaken to *know* he has done wrong — he has sinned. He is not only sorry — he abhors himself! He is brought to real REPENTANCE not only for what he has done, but for what he now sees that he is.

Yet he, himself, must make the decision. If he does repent, surrender to God, and in FAITH accept Jesus Christ as personal Saviour, then, upon performance of these TWO conditions, God *promises* to put within him the GIFT of the Holy Spirit. This is the *very life* of GOD — SPIRIT life. It imparts to him the *very divine nature!*

Then what, at that stage, has happened?


This new convert has only been *begotten* of God — not yet BORN. He has not received the full measure of God's Spirit Christ had — he is only a *spiritual babe* in Christ — he must now GROW spiritually, just as a newly conceived fetus in its mother's womb must grow physically large enough to be BORN as a human.

This new convert has now REPENTED, in his mind, from the depths of his heart. HE MEANS IT, too! In all sincerity, in his mind and heart he has *turned around* to go the *other way* — to live a different life. He is now a CHRISTIAN — he has received God's Holy Spirit. He really *wants* to do what is right — to obey God — to live GOD'S WAY.

YET HE FINDS HE DOES NOT DO THIS PERFECTLY! Many, at this stage, become discouraged. Some give up even trying to live a Christian life. And WHY? Because of the false notion that a Christian is one who becomes PERFECT at one fell swoop — or, that one cannot become a Christian *until* he has broken all wrong habits, and *made himself* righteous.

It's vital to UNDERSTAND how true Christianity REALLY WORKS!

Personal from...



CHRISTIANITY IS A GROWTH PROCESS

The newly begotten Christian must grow up, spiritually. What would you think of a human baby, who became 6 feet tall *all at once*, without growing up? The growing up process requires TIME. There is an *instant* when a person receives the impregnating Holy Spirit of God — when he first becomes a Christian. But he is only a spiritual *infant*. He must grow up spiritually.

The newly converted person, in his mind and heart, sincerely has ABOUT-FACED! He has actually gained contact with GOD, and received God's Holy Spirit. God's own divine NATURE has now been conceived within him. BUT THAT'S ALL. It is *merely conceived* — not yet full grown! And his HUMAN NATURE is *still there*. It has not been killed or removed!

Understand this!

We were all born HUMAN. We all were born with HUMAN NATURE. Few seem to know what human nature is. It is a strong PULL — a tendency — and, like gravity, it is a *downward* pull. Like a strong magnet, it draws us in the WAY OF SATAN — that is, a pull toward pride and vanity, selfishness and greed, a lack of outgoing concern for others — the spirit of competition, opposition, strife, effort to acquire, and to exalt the self. It is a pull toward self-gratification, and jealousy, envy and resentment toward others.

It is the spirit of rebellion against authority, hostility toward God and the law of God. THAT is human nature. You were born with it. It is still within you.

Originally God created the beautiful

archangel Lucifer. He sealed up the sum of wisdom, knowledge and beauty. But one thing he lacked was the righteous CHARACTER to choose the right way, and resist the wrong — to discipline the *self* in the way it ought to go, instead of the way of self-desire.

God's PURPOSE in having created humanity — in having caused YOU to be born — is to reproduce Himself. And GOD, above all things, is PERFECT, RIGHTEOUS CHARACTER! God is able to create character within us — but it must be done as a result of our independent free choice. We, as individual separate entities, have our part in the process.

What is perfect character? It is the ability, in a separate entity, to come to the KNOWLEDGE of the right from the wrong — the true from the false — and to CHOOSE the right, and possess the WILL to enforce self-discipline to DO the right and resist the wrong.

Like muscle, character is developed, and grows by exercise. My name is Armstrong. I suppose I could make my arm stronger, and develop the muscle, by constantly bending it back and forth at the elbow. But if I pull, or push, against some heavy weight or resistance, the muscle will develop much faster. Therefore God purposely put within us this NATURE that exerts a heavy pull *against* that perfect righteous character — to give us something to *strive against*, for THE VERY PURPOSE OF STRENGTHENING AND DEVELOPING RIGHT CHARACTER!

God's CHARACTER travels in the direction of His law — the way of LOVE. It is
(Continued on page 7)

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG
Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Managing Editor: Arthur A. Ferdig
Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn
News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg
Features Editor: Gary Alexander
Art Director: Allen Merager
Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lipross
Publishing Administration: Dexter H. Faulkner
Copy Editor: Jim E. Lea

Senior Editors: C. Wayne Cole, David Jon Hill, Herman L. Hoeh, Charles F. Hunting, Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith
Bureaus: Brussels: Ray Kosanke; Jerusalem: Mark Armstrong, Chris Patton; London: Peter Butler.

David Price: Sydney; Don Abraham, Washington, D.C.; Henry Sturcke

Correspondents: Auckland: Graeme Marshall; Bonn: Wolfgang Thomsen; Johannesburg: Robert Falley; Manila: Colin Adair; Vancouver: Dean Wilson

Contributing Editors: Jeff Calkins, Robert Ginsky, Ron Horswell, Brian Knowles, Gerhard Marx, Adli Mubtadi, Carole Ritter, George Ritter, Don Schroeder, John R. Schroeder, Keith Stump

Graphics: Art: John Dunn, Monte Wolverton, Garry Haggerty, Ron Lepeska, Gary Richardson; Photography: David Conn, Alfred Hennig, Phil Stevens, Warren Watson; Photo Files: Al Leiter

Business Manager: Frank Brown
Circulation Manager: United States: Benjamin Chapman; International Editions: Leslie McCullough

Volume XL No. 18

Circulation: 3,735,494

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

Plain Truth is published twice monthly (except monthly in July and October) by Ambassador College, Pasadena, California, 91123. © 1975 Ambassador College. All rights reserved. Second Class Postage paid at Pasadena, Ca., and at additional mailing offices. PRINTED IN U.S.A.

3
SPAIN BRACES FOR MORE PROBLEMS

Western Europe's last remaining authoritarian regime may be heading fast toward its violent end.

4
AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL FOR ARABS

A new Middle East equilibrium is in the making as Arab leaders realize that to prosper they need peace.


6
THE STRANGE ORIGIN OF HALLOWEEN

This Friday night, little goblins will besiege your home. Where did this strange holiday come from? Should your children observe it?



8
ONE MAN'S SMOKE IS ANOTHER MAN'S POISON

Second-hand "sidestream" smoke may be more dangerous to your health than the main drag. So, for the innocent bystander, STOP SMOKING!



12
THE SUGAR CONSPIRACY

The high cost of sugar may be a blessing in disguise. Save your teeth and your money — buy honey.

12
YOUR STAKE IN THE BEEF CRISIS

Despite current adequate supplies of meat, changes on the ranges may once again empty our supermarkets.



14
EMPTY OPTIMISM

The United States is sick — and wishful thinking by government officials will not cure the sickness.

15
A SEARCH FOR SATAN

At the first World Congress of Witchcraft in Bogotá, the real Satan sent a counterfeit.



GETTING OFF THE MATERIALISTIC MERRY-GO-ROUND

by Jeff Calkins

It seemed that no one ever noticed, but throughout the social smoke and political haze generated by the turbulence of the 1960s, the material condition of most Americans improved immensely. The same decade that spawned campus turmoil, riots in the streets, and the Vietnam war also produced for the average American consumer an unprecedented increase in real income.

During this time the United States and the world as a whole were blessed with abnormally good weather, and food production made gains each year. Americans found the percentage of their income that went for food on the decline.

The same condition characterized housing and transportation. There was still open suburban land to be had for low prices, and construction costs — especially for raw materials — were lower than today. As a consequence, the average family found itself able to afford a larger house or a better apartment than before.

And while urbanologists murmured about "suburban sprawl," what they really were lamenting were the most comfortable mass living conditions in history.

Inflation had yet to jack up the price of a new car. The average price increase of one of Detroit's behemoths stayed close to two percent per year. Cheap food, housing, and transportation more than offset the increasing costs of medical care, personal services, and recreation.

Those were indeed halcyon days when inflation, at its worst, reached the towering peaks of five and six percent — and usually crept along at about half that figure. By contrast, nowadays we have to have the worst recession since the 1930s in order to coax inflation down to eight percent.

"Real discretionary income" — economist jargon for what people have at the end of the month with which to do as they please — was on the rise. The relative costs of life's necessities were going down, so the average person found he had money left over to pursue his fancies and whims — something which history had previously reserved only for the rich.

For many, it all congealed into a semi-hedonistic life-style. Predictably, expectations were raised still further — until they soon surpassed the ability of the economy to fill them, a fact which helped spawn domestic turmoil, dissatisfaction, and unrest.

From Xanadu to Nostalgia

On into the seventies, America grew to resemble a modern Xanadu, the ancient land where Kubla Khan decreed his pleasure domes be built. But instead of pleasure domes it was Astrodomes and Superdomes. Kubla Khan found his modern counterpart in the wealthy professional sports owners.

But the vision has faded. Now America revels in a nostalgia kick, yearning to go back beyond the prosperous sixties to the pre-boom fifties, when life was less hectic and complex.

Blame the Russians, Earl Butz, Big Bad

Agribusiness, or the Meddlesome Middle Man, or whomever you will, the point is that the price of food has shot up 40 percent since 1971. "The era of declining food prices is over," intones one government economist. More of our budget will simply have to go for food.

The discomfiting fact is that the same thing is echoed by the industry spokesmen in both transportation and housing.

Austerity's Benefits

But the foregoing needn't cast a spell of gloom and despair; any number of positive results can emerge from our declining incomes. At the time of the original energy crisis, many commentators said we should use the shortage of fuel to make some healthy readjustments in our life-styles. Americans, they said, had the opportunity to rise above mere materialist pursuits. Unfortunately once the crisis was "over" — of course, it really isn't — Americans all too soon returned to many of their energy-wasting practices, as anyone who patiently drives at the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit quickly discovers.

A dose of austerity, it can be argued, could be good for the nation as a whole. After all, even with rising prices and declining real income, America's standard of living still far surpasses that of most of the world. Even the prosperous nations of Western Europe cannot match, for example, what the average American pays for either food or fuel. And even the new "no frills" houses the homebuilders are now constructing are mini-palaces compared to the cramped apartments inhabited by so many people in the rest of the free world.

Perhaps the lesson of the sixties is that Americans became too accustomed to a good life based exclusively on material acquisitions. There is a grave danger in this outlook on life.

In a reflective moment on *Meet the Press*, California's Governor Brown pointed out that "every civilization that has gone to a sensate, sensual culture has fallen."

America doesn't have to go the way of sensate Rome. It has Christ's counsel that "a man's life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions" (Luke 12:15, RSV).

A declining standard of living can be used creatively: One can learn to derive enjoyment from areas in life which aren't "money intensive" — such as spending time with one's family, talking with friends, visiting neighbors, or *doing* things oneself again.

Redefining the "good life" in 1976 makes far more sense than hopelessly scrambling for the last vestiges of the "good life" of 1966. And who knows? People might even be tempted to break loose long enough from the stranglehold of our secular culture to ask themselves infinitely more important philosophical questions as to the real meaning and purpose of life. Materialistic merry-go-rounds do not lend themselves to such introspection. It is time we all got off. □

Spain Braces for More Trouble



Behrendt — Het Parool, Amsterdam — Rothco

For over 36 years — from the overthrow of the Spanish Republic by Generalissimo Francisco Franco in 1939 — opponents of *El Caudillo*, as Franco is called, have been predicting the imminent downfall of his authoritarian regime.

Now, at long last, the prediction appears to be rapidly heading toward fulfillment. Plagued by a growing tide of internal violence and increasing international isolation, Western Europe's last remaining authoritarian regime may be fast drawing to a violent close.

Storm of Protest

In late September, the Spanish government, ignoring pleas for clemency from all quarters of Western Europe, executed five terrorists convicted of slaying Spanish policemen. Two of the five were members of the Basque separatist movement *Basque Nation and Liberty (ETA)* and the others belonged to the smaller, Maoist-oriented *Patriotic Anti-Fascist Revolutionary Front (FRAP)*.

Inside Spain, the executions touched off a series of terrorist-reprisal killings of policemen and a two-day general strike in the four northern Basque provinces. But to the Spanish government's surprise and chagrin, the ramifications of the executions extended far beyond the nation's borders.

Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, in the strongest denunciation, labelled the Franco regime a group of "bloody

murderers." Italian Christian Democrat Paolo Cabras branded the Madrid government "a continuing curse against all free men." And Pope Paul VI assailed the executions as "murderous repression" — especially severe language for the Vatican.

In all, 16 European governments recalled their ambassadors from Madrid in protest. Spanish embassies and offices were looted and burned in several European capitals. Mexico's President Luis Echeverria called upon the United Nations to expel Spain and "speed up Franco's fall."

The European Economic Community (EEC) dealt Spain what was perhaps the hardest blow of all by cutting off negotiations on a new free-trade agreement. Spanish foreign policy had recently been working for closer links, both economic and otherwise, between Spain and the West European democracies.

Washington Mum

The United States remained notably silent amid the storm of anti-Franco protest. Negotiating with Spain for the renewal of the agreement giving the U.S. rights to four military bases in Spain, Washington chose only to express regret at "the cycle of violence that led to this tragic outcome." With NATO's southern flank already weakened by difficulties in Portugal, Greece, and Turkey, Spanish bases are regarded as

essential to the U.S.-NATO presence in the Mediterranean.

The unusually intense outburst of condemnation from the governments of Western Europe was not a reaction to the executions *per se*. The use of the death penalty against clearly guilty political murderers is not generally objectionable to most Europeans. The protests were directed in most cases against the *method of trial* — the hasty, closed-door, military tribunal which has become increasingly common in Spain, beyond which there is no appeal.

Nevertheless, political analysts feel the trials and executions acted merely as a *trigger*, releasing long pent-up resentment and animosity for the Franco government. Britain's Foreign Secretary James Callaghan observed that the whole problem was "brought about not just by a single act of brutality, but by injustices over a generation or more." Many West Europeans have not forgotten that Franco's forces in the Spanish Civil War — the testing ground for World War II — were supported by the Nazis and fascists which later brutalized the entire Continent.

Replying on national television, Spain's Prime Minister Carlos Arias Navarro angrily rejected the foreign criticism, calling it hypocritical, false, unjust, and an unwarranted interference in Spain's internal affairs. Spain, he asserted, does not desire international isolation, but neither does it frighten her.

The aggressive government line was echoed by General Franco in a three-minute, emotional speech.

(Continued on page 4, col. 1)

"SHIPPING CHAOS" PROSPECT FANNED BY INFLATION

LONDON: Double-digit inflation is now causing concern among free world shipping operators. It's not so much the runaway inflation they are suffering as it is the low rate of inflation in communist nations.

Since most shipping lines belong to rate-agreement cartels that fix prices at uniform rates for given routes, inflation has hitherto had little real effect on the competition of one ship against another because a new gentlemen's agreement increased *everyone's* prices periodically. Shippers operating in countries not experiencing double-digit inflation went along with price rises because this increased their profits.

Now these cozy arrangements are in danger because of the lesser rate of inflation in the communist world.

Iron Curtain shipping authorities consistently refused to join free world price-controlling associations, and, hence, because they weren't beset with runaway domestic inflation and the same commercial profit-making pressures as free-world shipping, their rates have remained relatively stable. Effectively this means they are now seriously undercutting other shipping line rates and, consequently, are capturing a growing share of world cargo movements.

The communist success has come at the worst possible moment for its free-world competition. Ship owners are reeling under three financial hammer blows — the collapse of the supertanker market, a spectacular increase in bunkerage charges, and the downturn in

cargo rates in view of slackened world trade.

Mr. F. B. Bolton, president of the General Council of British Shipping, recently stated that on certain routes Soviet cargo rates run an average of 20% to 30% lower than the tariffs fixed by British liners. In some cases the rates are as much as 50% below the competition.

"Rate dumping" is undoubtedly going on to some degree as well. But it's a traditional method used by shipping owners to break into otherwise closed trading areas and is not solely the answer to the Soviet success.

Whatever the reasons, Mr. Bolton feels pessimistic as to the long-term effects.

The collapse of rate-fixing conferences due to shipping lines pulling out to be free to undercut each other's prices and compete with the Soviets could result, he thinks, in a chaotic price free-for-all.

On a short-term basis this might seem good — the effect being to lower cargo rates and passenger fares — but history teaches that the likely next step is for nations to take protective reprisals, insisting that domestic cargos be carried in nationally owned ships or country-of-origin ships and ultimately, to a greater or lesser extent, this could lead to trade restrictions and a form of trade war.

The fact that all but two or three major shipping lines have recently pulled out of the Trans-Pacific Freight Conference and are operating in a "free-for-all" manner indicates that Mr. Bolton knows what he's talking about.

— John D. Stettaford

Arab Arms Industry Beginning to Take Shape

LONDON: The Arab world is littered with the remains of well-intentioned cooperative efforts which have been condemned to paper dreams after the usual fanfare accompanying their inception. One inter-governmental effort that is giving signs of actually functioning, however, is the Arab Organization for the Manufacture of Armaments (AOMA), set up in May as a joint venture by Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar.

AOMA was born at a meet-

ing on May 10 in Cairo with a capital investment of \$1.04 billion to develop arms and other industries. Although it is not known where the factories are to be established, it is assumed that they will eventually be found for the most part in Egypt. At the head of AOMA is a ministerial committee attended by the Egyptian war minister, the Saudi defense minister, and the armed forces commanders of Qatar and the UAE (United Arab Emirates).

AOMA policy seems to indicate that its function will be to

import perfected weapons technology from the West, rather than trying to build a home-grown Arab arms industry from scratch.

President Sadat visited Britain in June very largely in order to discuss the possibilities of setting up assembly lines for British weapons. After Sadat's visit, it was announced that Britain's three largest aerospace contractors — British Aircraft Corporation, Hawker Siddeley, and Westland — had submitted studies for the manufacture in Egypt of missiles, jets, and helicopters respectively. The other items believed to be on the list for assembly include the Hawker Siddeley Hawk fighter-trainer, ground-to-air missiles

(Continued on page 4, col. 3)

Agonizing Reappraisal for Arabs

by Norman Cousins

Most of the attention given to the Israeli-Egyptian accord has been directed to the terms of the agreement engineered by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Of equal importance has been the effect of the pact on the politics of the Arab world.

The biggest change of all is the psychological one. Before the Israeli-Egyptian agreement was concluded, there was virtually a united front inside the Arab world against any recognition of Israel as a state. In the very act of signing an accord with Israel, however, Egypt has accepted Israel's right to make commitments as a nation. This does not constitute formal recognition, to be sure, but recognition is implied and the long-term implications have produced shock waves throughout the Arab world. The fact that the leading Arab nation would seek to be at peace with Israel — even though the agreement is

an interim one — has confronted the Arab peoples with the need for an agonizing reappraisal.

No doubt, a large number of Arabs would like to see the Egyptian peace with Israel collapse. But the Egyptian people themselves harbor no such preference. Egypt needs peace. Food shortages are acute. The public transportation system is breaking down. The country faces a massive problem in housing. Inflation and unemployment are producing social and political unrest. The last thing in the world President Sadat needs is war or even the need to deal with foreign tensions.

Another psychological change that has come about as a result of the Egyptian-Israeli signing has to do with Arab attitudes toward the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). When Palestinian terrorists were carrying out their acts of violence against Israel, the perpetrators were not widely condemned inside the Arab world. But now that the Palestinian terrorists have turned their violence against Egypt, the united front of public opinion favorable to the PLO has been broken.

While this shift is not likely to

affect Arab support for a separate Palestinian state, the dissension inside the ranks of the PLO itself is bound to increase under outside pressure.

A new equilibrium is in the making in the Middle East. If Henry Kissinger can follow up his success between Egypt and Israel with an agreement on military disengagement in the Golan Heights, he may have the momentum he needs to go all the way.

What part would the Geneva conference play in such a comprehensive settlement? From the start, it has been clear that not until all the parties got around the same table would it be possible to fit all the pieces into place. But it also seems likely that the function of a Geneva conference would be to ratify an agreement rather than to negotiate one. So the argument over a step-by-step approach vs. the conference approach has been a false issue. The best chance of success for a Geneva conference is to have an agenda with some agreements that can serve as a scaffolding for a structure of peace.

This is the Kissinger strategy. It was a long shot to begin with, but the odds are changing very fast.

©1975, Norman Cousins. Dist. by Los Angeles Times Syndicate.

Spain Braces

(Continued from page 3)

tion-filled speech before a cheering mass rally assembled in front of the Royal Palace on October 1 — the 39th anniversary of his assumption of power. Franco blamed Spain's troubles on a "left-wing Masonic conspiracy" abroad and "communist-terrorist subversion" at home. He also assailed "certain corrupt countries" for criticizing his government.

Uncertain Future

The recent international condemnation of Spain, most analysts agree, has served to unite the country to some degree behind the Franco government — with the exception, of course, of the nation's 750,000 Basques.

But unrest is still brewing in broad segments of Spanish society, including the business and professional communities, the church, and elements of the military who want to see meaningful reform in the country.

In the short run international tongue lashing and growing guerrilla violence will undoubtedly prompt 82-year-old Franco to tighten his grip on the country. This could spark further terrorist defiance and even greater professional and institutional dissatisfaction, in the assessment of most observers.

Many Spaniards are looking to Franco's designated heir, 37-year-old Juan Carlos de Borbon — the grandson of Spain's last king — to lift the repression when he assumes power in a restored monarchy following Franco's death or, less likely, resignation. Juan Carlos is said to favor gradual liberalization and the opening of political participation to all but the communist party. Spain is presently a one-party state.

Some fear, however, that the young king will be unable to control the coalition of powerful right-wing groups which have run Spain for nearly four decades.

Will Spain follow in the footsteps of Portugal, which was thrown into political chaos when her authoritarian regime was overthrown? Will extremist factions on the left and the right meet in a head-on clash? Will the armed forces assume a major role as they have in Portugal?

It had once been hoped that when Franco departed the scene, a peaceful transition to a democratic system and accompanying international acceptance would be seen. But the longer a change in the "reign in Spain" is delayed, the more unlikely it is that it will come without suffering for Spaniards and problems for all of Europe. □

Arab Arms

(Continued from page 3)

and the Anglo-French Adour engine powering the Hawk.

A report in a daily paper in Beirut announced that arms-production priorities had been decided upon. Top priority would be given to the manufacture of fighter and fighter-bomber aircraft. Second came the assembly of electronic equipment, thirdly anti-aircraft and anti-tank guided missiles, and finally tanks and armored vehicles.

In addition to the studies submitted by British aircraft manufacturers, the Beirut paper stated that cooperation offers had also been received from Dassault, the makers of the Mirage, and Thomson-CSF and Plessey, respectively French and British electronics manufacturers.

The Arabs, and the Egyptians particularly, appear to be taking AOMA very seriously — perhaps prodded by the example of Israel's burgeoning homemade arms industry which recently unveiled its first fighter plane, a hybrid derived from the Mirage equipped with a Phantom engine. But even if the implementation of the plan does proceed as expected, it will require French and British blessing before it gets anywhere. □

— Adli Muhtadi



Worldwatch

by Gene H. Hogberg

NATO: Who Needs It?

LENINGRAD, U.S.S.R.: The sleek, three-masted vessel anchored here in the harbor of the "Annapolis" of the Soviet Union carries a message by its very presence. It's the training ship of the Portuguese navy — a navy which, on paper at least, is still a part of NATO.

Spokesmen for Portugal's leftist Armed Forces Movement — instigators and protectors of Portugal's 1974 "flower revolution" — claim that their nation is still committed to the Western alliance. But the Soviet and Portuguese flags flying cozily side-by-side in Leningrad harbor, along with the casual ambience between the bearded, scraggly-haired Portuguese midshipmen and their crew-cut Soviet counterparts suggest that Portugal's AFM leaders are also looking elsewhere for "sailing instructions."

Portugal is only one example of NATO's slumping state of affairs. The current economic slowdown in the West — referred to in Moscow as the "crisis in capitalism" — is partly responsible for the situation. Some say an excuse.

Holland, for example, is planning serious defense cuts which NATO Secretary-General Joseph Luns, a former Dutch Foreign Minister, warns could set a dangerous precedent for other NATO countries and jeopardize Western security, in view of the continually growing strength of the Warsaw Pact forces.

Holland's Socialist-led government, ignoring pleas from its military advisers, is planning to cut from 15 to 2 the number of Neptune maritime reconnaissance planes in its sea patrol fleet and to scrap its naval flagship, a guided-missile cruiser.

Netherlands' Defense Minister Henk Vredeling defends the cuts, stating that they are unavoidable because of the state of the Dutch economy and the need to inject funds into other sectors to combat unemployment. Mr. Luns — noting that the cuts will save only 90 million dollars — describes the reductions as completely unjustified and only "the tip of an iceberg" of similar planned economies expected to be proposed not only in the Netherlands but in other NATO states.

The debate over defense commitments also occupies Parliament's time in Britain, the most important European NATO member after West Germany. Once again, a socialist government, with heavy radical-left influence, is exerting pressure to trim back Britain's defense posture still further. Spending on the military is down to 10% of government expenditure, as opposed to 17% in 1960.

Now the British Ministry of Defense is cutting previously planned spending by \$1.4 billion by the end of the next fiscal year, by over \$4 billion by March 1980 and by about \$10 billion by the end of 1984. (Meanwhile, outlays for social services — health, education, social security — will continue to rise.)

As a result, the Royal Navy will lose half of its amphibious force and 14% of its warships; funds for the Army will drop 30%; and the RAF will lose one-fourth of its long-range maritime reconnaissance aircraft, one-fourth of its support helicopters and fully 50% of its fixed wing transport force.

Making matters worse is that, with inflation, the shrinking allocations for defense buy less and less. A destroyer, for example, today costs three times as much as in 1950, a light anti-aircraft weapons system eight times as much.

It would be nice if defense cuts were being made on the "other side" too. It would be wonderful if détente truly meant a lessening of tensions. But repeated statements in the Soviet press make it clear that the ideological struggle against "pluralist democracies" is as viable as ever.

Britain's Field Marshall Sir Michael Carver admits the difficulty of taking defense seriously in the climate of détente. But it's most important, he says, that people understand that "you can only afford a policy of détente with people whose ideologies are totally opposed to one's own, from a position of strength."

Not everyone in NATO, apparently, is getting the message. □

COMMON MARKET'S POLITICAL ROLE GROWING

BRUSSELS: In all the emotional charges and countercharges over Spain's execution of five terrorists in late September, for which 8 of the 9 EEC countries withdrew their ambassadors from Spain (Ireland was the only exception), one fact of importance comes to the surface: the increasing political leverage exerted by the European Economic Community.

In the past as its title indicates, the EEC has played a purely economic role. However, at the meeting of the EEC foreign ministers in Luxembourg in early October, the EEC Commission, in a purely political act, urged the Community's Council of Ministers to halt trade negotiations with Spain. After a heated debate during which French Foreign Minister

Sauvagnargues criticized the Commission for the political initiative it had taken, the council decided "not to resume" negotiations at this time with Spain.

EEC Commission President François Ortoli (also French) strongly supported the Commission's initiative stating that it was indeed a political body and therefore has the right to adopt a position and make decisions. If this right were denied, Ortoli stated, he would prefer to resign.

EEC Aid to Portugal

Events on the troubled Iberian Peninsula dominated the EEC meeting in Luxembourg. In a related issue, a \$175,500,000 line of credit was extended to Portugal from the

European Investment Bank (EIB). A three percent interest allowance will be taken care of by the EEC. The nine are also coordinating bilateral aid for Angolan refugees and are prepared to grant food aid as well as credit for purchase of medicines and other essential commodities.

For Portugal, with close to 10 percent of its active population unemployed, such aid is of considerable relief, especially since it is having to absorb thousands of refugees from Angola.

The importance of all this is that the EEC has concretely shown its desire to rebuild Portugal. With the economic strength it has and the aid it can offer, the EEC is rapidly becoming a focal point of economic and political stability in Europe. In such a climate — especially in view of events south of the Pyrenees — the EEC stands out in its new role as protector of the material prosperity Europeans have gained in the past two decades.

— Ray Kosanke

ARAB SPOKESMAN DEFENDS OIL PRICE POSITIONS

WASHINGTON: Kuwait's minister of finance, Abdul-Rahman S. Al-Ateeqi, spoke here recently on a subject dear to everyone's heart — and pocket-book: oil prices.

"The traditional order of oil prices," he declared in a speech to the National Press Club, "was an order imposed on us." "Our largest national resource," he continued, "was in the hands of foreign concessions who had little interest in interaction with the local society, little regard for the welfare of peoples of that country."

He told of the fixed price throughout the 1950's of \$2.20 per barrel of oil, which was then lowered in 1960 by the oil companies, without consulting the producing nations, to \$1.59 per barrel. (The price was recently raised 10% by the OPEC cartel, from \$10.50 a barrel to \$11.51.)

"Because of this," he observed, "we now feel we can set the price without consulting the companies."

Mr. Al-Ateeqi mentioned that because the price was kept artificially low for so long, it was unfair to compare the pre-1973 price with that of today (four times as high), since the price is

only now what it should be. He claimed that the economic dislocation which followed OPEC's decision would not have occurred if the price had been allowed to rise with other prices from 1950 on. It "made the rise seem more radical when it came," he stated.

He also claimed that the effect of the crude-oil price is only one factor in the industrial situation and that its role is exaggerated.

The finance minister then pointed out that it was unfair to compare the price of oil with the cost of production (15¢ to 20¢ per barrel). According to him, even Western economists have agreed that the price of oil should also include the factor of world demand for a scarce supply and the fact that the oil remaining in the ground is a finite amount, constantly diminishing.

Al-Ateeqi, one of OPEC's founders, brought up development aid and investment in industrial countries to further justify the OPEC position. "The 'unmanageable recycling problem' is another fantasy," he declared, reporting that OPEC invests \$11 billion in the United States and a further \$6 billion in Britain.

This gives rise, of course, to the opposite fear: that the oil exporting countries will seek to control major Western corporations. Al-Ateeqi denied this, claiming that his people lack the experience to run these companies successfully, so it would be folly to do so. Although he refused to divulge

any details of Kuwait's holdings, he repeatedly emphasized that the main aim of its wide variety of investments is security.

Al-Ateeqi pointed out that 8% to 10% of Kuwait's GNP goes "to help other nations." The first priority on this impressive proportion, though, goes to other Arab nations, especially to nations bordering Israel. Kuwait has been a chief financier of replacement arms after each round of war.

I asked him to what degree Kuwait's aid to developing nations offset the difficulties these nations experience due to the oil price hike. He ducked the question by saying: "I don't expect Kuwait to solve the world's problems. What we have is very little, insignificant."

He did point out some of the things that Kuwait is doing, though, through the World Bank and through other means, summing it up by saying, "We try, within our ability; we have suffered poverty; we know what misery is."

As other spokesmen for the OPEC position who have spoken in the West, Al-Ateeqi expressed his views in a calm tone, with ample, reasoned evidence to show the justice — from OPEC's point of view — in the new price of oil.

Embargo Threat Still Real

That calm tone was broken, however, each time the subject of Israel came up. He warned that if peace does not come to Palestine (by which he means

ART BUCHWALD

How Can I Separate Cronkite from Kojak?

WASHINGTON: I have a problem and perhaps many other Americans are having it as well. I can't tell the TV news shows any more from the crime dramas that follow shortly afterwards.

I'm not sure whether or not I saw Patty Hearst on Walter Cronkite or on The Streets of San Francisco. Was Sara Jane Moore a character in Cannon or did she really try to shoot the President of the United States?

Reality and unreality blend into one. There doesn't seem to be much difference between the Lynette Fromme we see on Eyewitness News and the sick hippy we watch on Hawaii Five-O.

What do the crazy people do when they're not out in the streets aiming guns at people? Do they sit home and watch television? Do they fantasize that S.W.A.T. has their house surrounded or that the FBI's Efram Zimbalist is hunting them in a helicopter?

Do they identify with the people who are trying to kill McCloud or the ones who are trying to rape Angie Dickinson in Police Woman?

When did John Chancellor go off the air and Mod Squad go on? There must have been a commercial break somewhere.

Israeli withdrawal from all territory occupied in 1967, called for by U.N. Resolution 242), war will come again and again. "And when you are in a war," he added, "you use everything in your hand, even if it is oil."

No matter how reasonable the oil price is from the Arab point of view, the clear intention is to again use the oil itself as a hostage. The aim: to bend other nations — including the United States, which Al-Ateeqi labelled the only nation which stands against Resolution 242 — to the Arab viewpoint in a totally unrelated area: the question of whether Israel exists and in what form it exists.

This emotional fixation (and Kuwait's high proportion of Palestinian population does not lessen the emotional pressure any) shows how difficult it will be to find a solution to the problem. The Middle East remains a grave threat to world peace.

— Henry Sturcke

Did I see a bank robbery on the six o'clock news or was it on Barbary Coast? Was it the lady in The Rookies who had a .45 in her hand or did I watch her on Harry Reasoner?

Who writes the news shows; who writes the crime dramas? Are they the same people?

Has President Ford seen too many John Wayne movies on TV?

I know I heard that a woman had her .44 taken away from her and in 12 hours she was able to purchase a .38. But what show did I see it on? Was it the Today program or could it have been on Baretta?

Where are all the future Oswalds and the Arthur Bremmers now? Do they have color TV or are they watching in black and white?

Was it Petrocelli, Ironside, Perry Mason or Patty Hearst's lawyer I saw last night saying his client had been brainwashed?

They showed a gun on television that could shoot poison darts and kill someone in 15 seconds. I think Dan Schorr talked about it — but then again it could have been on Mission: Impossible.

Did someone really try to kill Jack Anderson or was it a man on Conrack? I wish I could recall.

There was a kidnapping on TV. I think it was a boy named Bronfman. They caught the kidnapers. Who did? The real FBI or was it Harry O? What shows do kidnapers watch after they're caught? The news programs or the crime dramas?

Are would-be killers jealous of Charles Manson? Do they envy Miss Fromme's TV exposure? Do they dream they will be the next ones grinning in the kleig lights that press against their police escorts?

Or do they pretend they're shooting it out with Charles Bronson on the ABC Friday Night Movie.

If I can't tell the real events from the fictional ones, how can they? Maybe there is no such thing as a real event any more. Maybe there's no fiction. Then what is it we're watching and what is it doing to us?

And if it's doing it to us, what is it doing to them — those lonely frustrated people sitting in their dingy rooms fondling the .22s, .38s and .45s and whatever else they bought in the store last week?

The National Rifle Assn. spokesman said on Mike Wallace's show that guns don't kill people — people kill people. Or did I see that on Kojak?

For the life of me, I can't remember.

©1975, Los Angeles Times

The Strange Origin of Halloween

Where did Halloween come from? Should it be observed? How did enlightened twentieth century man come to observe such a superstitious custom?

by John R. Schroeder

Halloween is the strangest holiday of the entire year. On the eve of November 1, children in many lands dress as goblins or witches, knock on doors, announce "trick or treat," and soap windows of schools and stores. Some tear down mailboxes and give the police a great many headaches with their juvenile vandalism. It is a time when young people "let off steam."

The Strange Origin of a Strange Holiday

Is this the way in which children should be brought up? WHY is this holiday celebrated anyway? Where did the custom of "trick or treat" originate?

Here is the intriguing answer from history: "The American celebration rests upon Scottish and Irish folk customs which can be traced in direct line from pre-Christian times" — from paganism! "Although Halloween has become a night of rollicking fun, superstitious spells, and eerie games which people take only half seriously, its beginnings were quite otherwise. The earliest Halloween celebrations were held" — not by the early church, but — "by the Druids in honor of Samhain, Lord of the Dead, whose festival fell on November 1." (*Halloween Through Twenty Centuries* by Ralph Linton, p. 4.)

Further, "It was a Druidic belief that on the eve of this festival, Saman, lord of death, called together the wicked souls [spirits] that within the past 12 months had been condemned to inhabit the bodies of animals" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 12, pp. 857-8).

It was a pagan belief that on one night of the year the souls of the dead returned to their original homes, there to be entertained with food. If food and shelter were not provided, these spirits, it was believed, would cast spells and cause havoc toward those failing to fulfill their requests. It was *spiritual* trick or treat. And the "trick" was not especially cute.

"It was the night for the universal

walking about of all sorts of spirits, fairies, and ghosts, all of whom had liberty on that night" (*Highland Superstitions*, Alexander Macgregor, p. 44). Literal sacrifices were offered on this night to the spirits of the dead, when, so the belief went, they visited their earthly haunts and their friends.

There was a reason why November was chosen for that particular event. The Celts and other northern people considered the beginning of November as their New Year. This was the time when the leaves were falling and a general seasonal decay was taking place everywhere. Thus it was a fitting time, so they reasoned, for the commemoration of the dead.

Since the northern nations at that time began their day in the evening, the eve leading up to November 1 was the beginning of the festival. According to the Roman calendar, in which days began at midnight, it was the evening of October 31 — hence, Halloween, or *All Souls' Eve*, was kept throughout the ancient pagan world. The observance was widespread.

"There was a prevailing belief among all nations that at death the souls of good men were taken possession of by good spirits and carried to paradise, but the souls of wicked men were left to wander in the space between the earth and moon, or consigned to the unseen world. These wandering spirits were in the habit of haunting the living... But there were means by which these ghosts might be exorcised" (*Folklore*, James Napier, p. 11).

To exorcise these ghosts, that is, to free yourself from their supposed evil sway, you would have to set out food — give the demons a treat — and provide shelter for them during the night. If they were satisfied with your offerings, it was believed they would leave you in peace. If not, they would "trick" you by casting an evil spell on you.

This sort of Halloween festival was strenuously observed throughout the ancient world. Pagans would pray to their

false gods to prevent "demons" and "witches" from molesting them.

In Cambodia people used to chant: "O all you our ancestors, who are departed, deign to come and eat what we have prepared for you, and to bless your posterity and to make it happy" (*Notice sur le Cambodge*, E. Aymonier, p. 59).

In the New World, too, the custom is found: "The Miztecs of Mexico believed that the souls of the dead came back in the twelfth month of the year, which corresponded to our November. On this day of All Souls the houses were decked out to welcome the spirits. Jars of food and drink were set on a table in the principal room, and the family went out with the torches to meet the ghosts and invite them to enter. Then, returning to the house they knelt around the table, and with their eyes bent on the ground, prayed the souls to accept the offerings" (*Adonis*, Frazer, p. 244).

This, then, is the way the heathen world celebrated their Halloween, their *All Souls' Day*. Although some aspects of the Halloween festival varied with each country, the overall pattern and purpose remained the same.

Halloween "Christianized"

But how did the professing Christian world come to accept and keep such a day?

For numerous years prior to the 6th century, Rome was invaded and ruled by barbaric tribes from the north. But in A.D. 607 the Roman Emperor Phocas defeated the barbarians. The Roman Pantheon, a pagan edifice which had been wrested from the barbarians, was given to Pope Boniface IV.

With this splendid edifice now falling into the hands of the professing Christians, the question was, what should be done with it? After several ideas were put forward, this is what was finally decided.

Whereas the pagan dedication had been to Cybele and all the gods, the Roman bishop now consecrated it to the Virgin Mary and all the saints of both sexes. (See *The Mysteries of All Nations*, Grant, p. 120.) Thus, this pagan building became a "holy" structure. No more did the pagans use this edifice to pray for their dead. It was now the Christ-professing Romans who employed the Pantheon in praying for their dead.

This rededication of the pagan temple to Mary and others occurred in A.D. 610. Now converted into a Christian shrine, an annual festival was instituted to commemorate the event. The day chosen was May 13.

The Christian-professing populace now paid homage to the consecrated Pantheon and to those for whom it was dedicated. The masses were encouraged to pray to Mary and the other saints. This day became known as "All Saints' Day" — a day on which prayers were offered for the souls of saints who had died. The more prayers were offered, the less they would suffer the interim time in "purgatory." Later, even money was solicited for expiation purposes, thus curtailing the saints' sufferings.

This commemoration of the dead saints, going by the name of "All Saints' Day," continued to be held in May within the empire until A.D. 834. At this

time, the name and date were changed. "The time of celebration was altered to the first of November, and it was then called *all hallow*" — from where we get the name Halloween (*all hallow* merely meaning *all holy* and the "een" from a contraction of "evening") (*Folklore*, p. 177).

Thus in A.D. 834 the church at large kept Halloween on the first of November, for the first time. And yet, this was the very same day the Druids in Britain, the Norsemen in Scandinavia, and the pagan Germans among others were keeping their festival of All Souls' Eve, in commemoration of Saman, lord of death and his demons.

Reason for Change

It was a general practice of the Christianized Roman Empire and the church at Rome to convert the pagans within the empire as quickly and on as large a scale as possible.

Ever since the time of Constantine — who made Catholicism the state religion — the Roman emperors realized how essential it was to have a unified empire, where as many as possible would be of one mind. The civil and religious leaders saw how important it was for the sake of unity to allow only one religion within the Roman domain.

It became, therefore, a stringent state policy to force all non-Christians to accept the orthodox faith. The condition for "conversion," of course, made it very easy for the pagan population of Rome and elsewhere to accept Christianity. If "acceptance" of Christianity was made simple, refusal was made difficult. This plan of action led vast numbers of the heathen population within the empire to flock into the fold of the church.

When the German Frankish king Charlemagne invaded and conquered parts of Eastern Germany, he compelled the conquered German Saxon king, Wittekind, to be baptized and to accept Christianity.

Wittekind's Germans, now professing Christians, and other conquered peoples, had a profound influence on the ecclesiastical affairs of the church in the early 800's. These uncultured people brought with them many outright pagan practices and celebrations, Halloween merely being one of them.

What was the church to do? Excommunicate them and thus reduce her membership? This she would not do. Was she to force them into discarding their heathen practices and adopting Italian or Roman ones? This, as she had learned in past times, was not possible.

There remained only one other way.

Let the recently converted pagans keep certain of their heathen festivals, such as Halloween or All Souls' Day — but label it "Christian." Of course the Germans were asked not to pray to their ancient pagan gods on this day. They must now use this day to commemorate the death of "saints."

If a pagan practice or festival could not be forbidden, it was reasoned, "let it be tamed." Thus many were persuaded to transfer devotion from their former gods to the Christian God. So it was with the festival of All Souls' Eve. Notice: "Thus, at the first promulgation of Christianity to the Gentile nations

... they could not be persuaded to relinquish many of their superstitions, which, rather than forego altogether, they chose to blend and incorporate with the new faith" (*Popular Antiquities of Great Britain*, John Brand, p. xi).

And in Our Day

Now come down to the twentieth century. What about you and your children? What comes to your mind when thinking about Halloween? You probably picture weird and frightening masks or persons portrayed as witches and demons. Maybe you think of pumpkins and turnips hollowed out in the shape of eerie-looking faces with lighted candles placed inside to help bring out the more frightful side of these carvings. Generally you envision children, dressed up in revolting costumes going from door to door yelling "trick or treat."

The *Good Housekeeping Book of Entertainment*, on page 168, has a section on what to do on Halloween. Notice the astonishing advice given.

"Orange, black and red, the devil's colors, are the colors associated with Halloween and this scheme should be carried out as far as possible... Have paper streamers and lanterns hanging from the ceiling, or, if you would like to have something less usual, you could make a giant spider's web with black and orange strings, or in narrow strips of crepe paper coming from the four corners of the room, complete with a large spider — one of the devil's favorite followers."

No Biblical Basis

Nowhere does the Bible — which should be the foundation of our beliefs — command us to pray to anyone except God the Father and his Son or to make intercession for the dead. Praying for the dead is not biblical (Psalm 49:7). None of God's people in the Old or New Testaments has ever prayed for so-called departed souls. There is a reason for this. Man just does *not* have an immortal soul.

Nowhere does the Bible speak of a person having an "immortal soul." In other words, there is no such thing mentioned in God's divine Word as souls leaving the body at death. This erroneous idea also stems from paganism.


The Bible does speak, however, of a "soul." But by the word "soul," it merely means a person, a human being, or a living being. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die!" (Ezek. 18:20). If man had an immortal soul, he could not possibly die. All this is explained fully in our free booklet entitled *Do You Have an Immortal Soul?* Write for your free copy.

Halloween and several other annual festivals people observe in the Christian-professing world have no biblical basis, but rather originate in paganism.

Of course, right here many people might say, "Well, what difference does it make even if it is pagan? We don't worship demons. It's all harmless fun for the kiddies."

Yet, it is a "religious" holiday. And religion is the obedience, service, and adoration rendered to the object of one's worship. It presupposes profession, practice or observance of whatever belief and practice — in this case Halloween —

Personal from...



(Continued from page 1)

an outgoing CONCERN for others. GOD has that character! He has an outgoing concern for you and for me. He GAVE His only begotten Son to reconcile us to Him, and make the joys of His character and everlasting life possible for us. He showers on us every good and precious gift. He even puts within us HIS DIVINE NATURE — when we repent and turn from the WRONG way of THIS WORLD, begin to resist it, and turn to Him through faith in Jesus Christ as personal Saviour!

God's divine nature is the nature of love — of giving, serving, helping — of outgoing concern. It is the nature of humility.

Now when one is converted — has repented, and turned from Satan's and this world's false way and has at once received God's Holy Spirit — his HUMAN nature, as I said before, does not flee. It, too, remains. It still exerts a pull. We still live in THIS PRESENT EVIL WORLD, and it exerts a pull. God still allows Satan to be around — and HE exerts a pull.

So we now have THREE PULLS TO RESIST — TO OVERCOME! We must now overcome these three — Satan, this world, and our own SELVES. We have to battle against these three, in order to develop and strengthen RIGHT CHARACTER within us. God says plainly it is THE OVERCOMERS who shall be saved — who shall REIGN with Christ!

No human being is strong enough to do this BY HIMSELF! He must seek, and IN FAITH receive, the help and power of GOD. Even with God's power he will not overcome such forces easily, or all at once. IT IS NOT EASY! Christ plainly said the way to ultimate salvation is hard, difficult. It's a constant BATTLE — a struggle against self, the world, and the devil. The creation of CHARACTER comes through EXPERIENCE — it takes TIME!

THIS development is a PROCESS. It is a matter of GROWTH — DEVELOPMENT. It requires, to become PERFECT, full and right KNOWLEDGE of the very Word of God — because Jesus taught that we must live by EVERY WORD of God.

The natural, unconverted mind cannot fully and rightly UNDERSTAND the Scriptures of God. The acquisition of this KNOWLEDGE, in itself, is a procedure requiring TIME. It is the DOERS of this Word, not hearers only, who shall be saved.

as required by some superior authority. Since this holiday is called "Christian" one assumes that the authority cited would be the superior authority of the Christian faith — Jesus Christ. The shocking point, however, is that NOWHERE can you find he commands, sanctions, or alludes to this holiday in the Bible.

It is time we discover the source of our religious beliefs and find out whether we ought to observe them. □

But can any man do, immediately and all at once, this new way he now learns about? Can any man, all at once, break all HABITS he now sees are wrong? No, he finds he has a FIGHT against acquired former habits.

He still has this PULL of human nature to overcome. This nature is a LAW working within him. The apostle Paul calls it the law of sin and death.

Paul was converted. Paul was a real Christian. He had repented, accepted Christ, and received the Holy Spirit. With his MIND, he wanted with all his heart, and in real intense sincerity, to DO GOD'S WAY! But did Paul do it perfectly?

Let him tell. LISTEN!
"For we know that the law is spiritual," he wrote, "but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I... Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." He is speaking of human nature within him. He continues, "... for to WILL is present with me: but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do... O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Then he thanks God, that GOD WILL — through Jesus Christ, and by the power of HIS HOLY SPIRIT. BUT IT TAKES TIME!

The truly converted Christian will find that he often stumbles, under temptation, and falls down — even as a physical child, learning to walk, often falls down. But the year-old child does not get discouraged and give up. He gets up and starts out again.

THE TRULY CONVERTED CHRISTIAN IS NOT YET PERFECT!

GOD LOOKS ON THE HEART — the inner MOTIVE — the real intent! If he is trying — if he gets up whenever he falls down, and in repentance asks God's forgiveness, and sets out to do his very best NOT TO MAKE THAT MISTAKE AGAIN — and to persevere with renewed effort to OVERCOME, God is rich in mercy toward that man in his striving to overcome.

Speaking to CONVERTED CHRISTIANS, John writes: "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin..." (even though he ought not) "... we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins..." Yes, for the SINS of converted CHRISTIANS. Such people often are under heavier temptation than before conversion. They are STRIVING against sin — STRIVING to overcome. But they are not yet perfect. Sometimes they are caught off guard. They may actually sin. Then they WAKE UP, as it were, and realize what they have done. They REPENT. They are filled with remorse — truly sorry — disgusted with themselves. They go to God, and CRY OUT for HELP — for more power and strength from God to OVERCOME!

THIS is the WAY of the Christian! It is the way of a constant BATTLE — a striving against SIN — a seeking God in earnest prayer for help and spiritual POWER to overcome. They are constantly GAINING GROUND. They are constantly

GROWING in God's KNOWLEDGE, from the BIBLE. They are constantly rooting out wrong habits, driving themselves into RIGHT habits. They are constantly growing closer to God through Bible study and prayer. They are constantly growing in CHARACTER, toward perfection, even though not yet perfect.

With Paul, they say: "... Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect: but I FOLLOW AFTER... Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, FORGETTING those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I PRESS TOWARD THE MARK FOR THE PRIZE OF THE HIGH CALLING OF GOD IN CHRIST JESUS!"

But, someone may ask, what if one's life is cut off, and he dies before he has attained this perfection? Is he saved, or lost? The answer is that we shall never obtain absolute perfection in this life.

I said, earlier, that a person who is converted does receive the Holy Spirit at a definite time — all at once! Not the full measure Christ had — he is not at once full grown spiritually — only a spiritual babe in Christ. Yet he is then a changed, converted man — changed in mind, in attitude, in the direction he has set himself to strive to travel. Even though he has not yet reached perfection — even though he may have stumbled under temptation, and taken a spiritual fall — as long as, in his mind and heart, he is earnestly striving to travel GOD'S WAY, to overcome and grow spiritually — as long as God's Spirit is in him — as long as he is being LED by the Spirit of God, he is a begotten SON of God.

If, anywhere along this life's journey, that life is cut short, such a man will be resurrected.

It is only the one who deliberately QUILTS and GIVES UP — who REJECTS God, and God's WAY, and rejects CHRIST as his Saviour — who turns FROM this direction of God's WAY, in his mind and heart — in his inner INTENT — who deliberately and intentionally in his mind TURNS FROM CHRIST, who is lost. If, once having been converted, having received God's Spirit, and TASTED of the joys of God's WAY, one deliberately rejects that way, makes the DECISION, not under stress of temptation, but deliberately and finally, NOT to go God's way, then God says it is IMPOSSIBLE to renew such a one to repentance. He would have to REPENT of that decision. But if he WILLFULLY made it, not in a time of temptation, but calmly, deliberately, willfully, then he just WILL NOT ever repent of it.


But anyone who FEARS he may have committed the "unpardonable sin" — is perhaps worried about it, and HOPES he has not committed it, and still WANTS to have God's salvation — no such has committed it. Such a person MAY repent and go right on to salvation IF HE WANTS TO!

If you have stumbled and fallen down, DON'T BE DISCOURAGED! Get up and press on ahead!

If you see a Christian do something wrong, DON'T SIT IN JUDGMENT AND CONDEMN — that's God's business to judge, not yours! Let's have compassion and mercy — we don't know the inner heart of others — only God does! □

one man's smoke is another man's poison

by Ron Beideck



Watson — Plain Truth

"Tobacco drieth the brain, dimmeth the sight, vitiateth the smell, hurteth the stomach, destroyeth the concoction, disturbeth the humors and spirits, corrupteth the breath, induceth a trembling of the limbs, exsiccateth the windpipe, lungs, and liver, annoyeth the milt, scorcheth the heart, and causeth the blood to be adjusted."

— Tobias Venner, 1620

Written more than 300 years before the U.S. Surgeon General warned us about the dangers of smoking, the words of Tobias Venner seem aptly prophetic. But if the gentleman who penned this quotation were alive today, he would undoubtedly add to the list: "Polluteth thy neighbor's air and annoyeth him greatly."

The wicked weed is still very much with us, and it has become one of the "burning" issues of our day. There has been in recent years, as I myself discovered, an increasing groundswell of opposition among nonsmokers, who, in fact, outnumber smokers. This increasingly vocal nonsmoking majority is saying, in effect, "We won't put up with smokers' pollutants a silly millimeter longer!" (No, they don't want to meet the Turk; and, yes, please, though it's tough, put your Muriels down.) After examining the facts, one has to admit that nonsmokers have, if not an air-tight case, at least an air-polluted one.

"Smokers and nonsmokers cannot be equally free in the same railway carriage."

— George Bernard Shaw

Some months ago, I wrote a short article entitled "Confessions of a Nonsmoker." In it, I said: "I don't enjoy going to a restaurant or riding public transportation and having to breathe billowing clouds of smoke. But if it means so much to smokers, if it gives them so much pleasure, I'll gladly suffer for their sake."

I received a number of letters justly critical of this statement. A woman from St. Louis wrote: "Why should innocent people suffer for the ignorance of others? People who do not smoke are constantly being made to suffer, physically, from the harmful effects of secondhand smoke." Enclosing a pamphlet from the American Lung Association, she concluded: "I wish you would do an article on the innocent people who do 'suffer for their sake' (the smokers)."

Another letter came from the Kenosha (Wisconsin) chapter of G.A.S.P. — that is, Group Against Smokers' Pollution. They wrote: "A bunch of onions to nonsmokers who say as you did that you will 'gladly suffer for smokers' sake.' The G.A.S.P. chapters around the world are in the process of educating the public to the serious implications of secondhand smoke." Then followed a description of some of the 49 known poisons in tobacco smoke, sounding like a scenario for chemical or biological germ warfare.

All I can say to the G.A.S.P. chapters of the world (and others who wrote me) is, I repent in sackcloth and ashes. When I said I would gladly suffer for their (smokers') sake, I meant it somewhat facetiously, for the truth is, I really don't enjoy suffering. And I guess the statement was made out of a somewhat ingenuous, misdirected sympathy for smokers. I mean, if anyone deserves sympathy, isn't it smokers? Here are people who *know* smoking is bad for them; they have heard the statistics (someone once said that smoking has proven to be, without a doubt, a leading cause of statistics); they *know* smoking is killing them. They lose their wind, can't taste their food, and hack and cough all the time. Reeking with tobacco, their mouth resembles a birdcage; eventually they stand a good chance of having most of their lung tissue deposited on the operating table. But they smoke anyway because of the pleasure and enjoyment it gives them (so I'm told), regardless of the consequences, regardless of the facts. Now *that* deserves sympathy.

Why *anyone* with the intelligence to add two and two would want to smoke has to be a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. Can the pleasure possibly be worth all the suffering and ill-effects on one's health? Meanwhile, the tobacco companies are laughing all the way to the bank.

It is bad enough what smokers do to themselves, but more alarming is what they do to innocent bystanders. If you are a nonsmoker, exposed to secondhand smoke, the next section explains what is in it for you.

"Smoking is a shocking thing — blowing smoke out of our mouths into other people's mouths, eyes and noses, and having the same thing done to us."

— Samuel Johnson, 1773

From "Secondhand Smoke — Take a Look at the Facts," a pamphlet published by the American Lung Association, we read: "Tobacco smoke is a very complex mixture of gases, liquids, and particles. There are hundreds of chemical compounds in tobacco and hundreds more created when tobacco burns.

"Some of the most hazardous compounds are tar, nicotine, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ammonia, benzene, formaldehyde, and hydrogen sulphide. And dozens of others. Any one alone can assault the body and cause trouble. Together, they make smoking the menace it is.

"Even when a smoker inhales, researchers have calculated that two-thirds of the smoke from the burning cigarette goes into the environment. . . .

"The fascinating fact is that sidestream smoke — the smoke from the burning end — has higher concentrations of noxious compounds than the mainstream smoke inhaled by the smoker. Some studies show there is *twice* as much tar and nicotine in sidestream smoke compared to mainstream. And *three* times as much of a compound called 3-4 benzpyrene, which is suspected as a cancer-causing agent. *Five* times as much carbon monoxide, which robs the blood of oxygen. And *50* times as much ammonia."

The current allowable concentration of carbon monoxide in industry is 50 p.p.m. (parts per million). The Federal Air Quality Standards for the *outside air* is an average of 9 p.p.m. Yet one study showed that "smoking seven cigarettes

in one hour — even in a ventilated room — created carbon monoxide levels of 20 p.p.m. In the seat next to the smoker, the level shot up to 90 p.p.m., almost twice the maximum set for industry. Smoking ten cigarettes in an enclosed car also produced carbon monoxide levels up to 90 p.p.m. The carbon monoxide level in the blood of nonsmokers as well as smokers in the car doubles.

"When nonsmokers were exposed to these levels, the carbon monoxide level in their blood not only doubled within the first hour, but doubled again during the second hour.

"When nonsmokers leave a smoky environment, it takes hours for the carbon monoxide to leave the body. Unlike oxygen which is breathed in and then out again in minutes, carbon monoxide in the blood lasts for hours. After three or four hours, half of the excess carbon monoxide is still in the bloodstream."

Summarizing a few other facts from the pamphlet: the concentration in cigarette smoke of hydrogen cyanide, a poison that attacks respiratory enzymes, is 1600 p.p.m. Levels above 10 p.p.m. are considered dangerous. Cigarette smoke contains 250 p.p.m. of nitrogen dioxide, an acutely irritating gas that can damage lungs. Five p.p.m. is dangerous.

Research shows a significant increase of bronchitis, emphysema, and lung tumors in animals exposed to secondhand smoke.

And finally, as if mercury in your tuna, sulphates in your water and pesticides in your lettuce were not enough, here's one more thing to worry about: cadmium. According to Health Column No. 226 (April 14, 1974): "Only minute amounts of cadmium, a metal poisonous in high concentrations, are inhaled with one cigarette. But the metal builds up in the body in almost direct proportion to the number of cigarettes smoked. Not only does it accumulate in the lungs but some of it also passes on to the liver and kidneys, where it mounts up more. Autopsies on emphysema patients show excess levels of cadmium in all three organs . . ."

"In addition, there are disturbing implications for nonsmokers. Some research has shown there is even more cadmium in the smoke that drifts off the burning end of the cigarette than in the drag the smoker inhales."

According to the G.A.S.P. people, cadmium stays in your lungs forever, no matter how little you inhale. (Let's hope that the tobacco companies don't get wind of this, or the next thing you know we'll be seeing advertisements for Puffo brand recessed, micronite, charcoal, cadmium-trap filter cigarettes. Come to think of it, it might be interesting. Since there is more cadmium in the sidestream smoke — smoke from the burning end — than in the mainstream smoke inhaled by the smoker, the filter would have to be on the burning end!)

The case against tobacco smoke — the facts, the statistics, the proof — could go on endlessly. But for fear that your head may be beginning to nod right about here, I'd best end this section by saying the only good thing that can be said about tobacco: It keeps doctors employed.

"What smells so? Has somebody been burning a rag, or is there a dead mule in the backyard? No, the man is smoking a five-cent cigar."

— Eugene Field
"The Tribune Primer," 1882.

Someone once said: "What this country needs is a good five-cent cigar." What this country really needs, of course, is a good five-cent nickel. Speaking for nonsmokers everywhere, if all cigars were dumped into the ocean, it would be so much better for humans and so much worse for the fish.

Of all smokers' trespasses, probably nothing is as annoying to nonsmokers as cigar smoke. The next time you are in the presence of a person smoking a dead mule, I mean a cigar, what can you do? If you can get close enough to the person without fainting, you might politely and kindly quote a few facts from the American Lung Association: Cigar smoke is even more irritating to the eyes, nose, throat and breathing passages than cigarette smoke; it has higher levels of damaging chemical compounds like phenol and benzo (a) pyrene, etc.

If this doesn't get results — remember it's tough for him to put a Muriel down — walk up to him (or her) and calmly but firmly say: "You, sir (madam), are polluting my air." I've been told this works best when standing on the smoker's foot, but I personally wouldn't want to recommend this. Some have even suggested grabbing a fire extinguisher if one is handy.

Such harsh action shouldn't be necessary, of course. Most smokers are not blatant miscreants (it only seems so); if you tell them the smoke bothers you, they almost always will refrain.


"A custom loathsome to the eye, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs . . . Herein is not only a great vanity, but a great contempt of God's good gifts, that the sweetness of man's breath, being a good gift of God, should be wilfully corrupted by this stinking smoke."

— James I of England
"Counterblast to Tobacco," 1604


If you are a nonsmoker, here is one stratagem you might want to try. (King James would have approved of it.) The next time a human smokestack — puff, puff, puff — sits down beside you with a lit cigarette, whip out a three-by-five card from your pocket, take a deep breath (no, I guess you can't take a deep breath if he's smoking), and begin reading: "Pardon me, would you mind blowing your hydroquinone, methacrolein, methyl alcohol, methylamine, nickel compounds, pyridine, carbon dioxide, crotonitrile, dimethylamine, endrin, ethylamine, furfural, cadmium, carbon monoxide, methyl nitrite, ammonia, formaldehyde, hydrogen sulfide, benzo(a)pyrene, nicotine, DDT, ethane, acetylene, methanol, nitrogen dioxide, acetone, methyl chloride, phenol, cresol, methane, isoprene, propane, acrolein, acetaldehyde, ethylene, methyl ethyl ketone, "tar," hydrogen cyanide, metals, hydrocyanic acid, nitric oxide, acetonitrile, acrylonitrile, benzene 2,3, butadiene, and butylamine in the other direction?" (Better yet, ask him to extinguish it completely.)

This is even more effective when it is memorized. Either way, the smoker will be momentarily stunned. You will have a chance to explain that, believe it or not, these are just some of the noxious ingredients coming from the burning end of his cigarette, all of which are harmful to your health, well-being and present mental equanimity.

If you use this technique, be forewarned you will undoubtedly get a reputation for being some kind of nut. But
(Continued on next page)



"You'd never get me to move back to the city. That smog was killing me!"



"Forget about the weight! Just remember that you're using the best filter money can buy!"

don't let it bother you. Dangling a fire inches from your nose and bringing smoke into your mouth and nose (strangling and choking innocent bystanders in the process), as smokers do, is a lot more silly. Just ask King James.

"There are liars, chronic liars, and then there are the tobacco companies."
— Ron Beideck, 1975

When it comes to unequivocal avarice, I must tip my hat in unbelieving amazement to the tobacco companies. For a long time, you'll remember, they *denied* there was any connection between smoking and cancer (heart disease, or anything else). But as the evidence became more and more overwhelming, in the 50s and 60s, no one — I mean *nobody* — could deny the facts. Not even the tobacco companies! But did this stop them? Of course not. They gave us miracle filters; in the interests of filthy lucre, they gave us ads picturing young couples puffing cigarettes at a clear, sparkling mountain stream with blue skies up above, everyone in love. To this day, they try to foist off smoking as a sociable thing, something to do among friends.

Is smoking really a sociable thing? Is polluting your own air and the air of others sociable? It seems just the opposite.

But the tobacco companies, experts in fabricating fabrications, have succeeded. Many people *do* believe there is a connection between smoking and a sparkling mountain stream with fresh, clear, blue skies. These same people would also, probably, believe black is white and white is black if they were told so.

Thankfully, some have given up smoking, and nonsmokers are winning some rights to clean air in public places. But don't think that the tobacco industry is lying down to the recent challenges from nonsmokers. They *are* alarmed (at least a little). They have spent all of this money for ads palming off smoking as a socially acceptable thing. Now, more and more, a young smoker on a plane, in a public building, or almost anywhere he goes, is told he can't smoke there. Because of pressure from nonsmokers, smoking no longer seems quite so attractive.

Tobacco industry representatives, dollar signs in their eyes, are livid. One was recently quoted in the *Los Angeles Times*, as saying: "Nonsmokers may see smoking as offensive, but look at the other things that occur that some people see as offensive — loud talk, eating garlic or smelling of perfume. We don't pass laws forbidding the eating of garlic in public places."

Such a statement is so ludicrous and inane it hardly seems worthy of comment, but let me just give here a brief threefold reply: (1) I myself, personally, cannot recall once in my lifetime meeting a person who was so reeking with garlic that he offended me; (2) if I did meet such a person, I doubt that garlic breath has 49 known poisons as does cigarette smoke; (3) just because there are people who reek with garlic doesn't justify a smoker polluting nonsmokers' air. Two wrongs don't make a right, do they?

To the tobacco people, it is money, not morality or truth in advertising, that is the chief concern. Besides, isn't tobacco vital to the economy? If everyone gave up smoking, the tobacco industry would go broke and many people would be unem-

ployed — a problem, someone might cynically say, second only to unemployed napalm manufacturers.

*May never lady press his lips,
his proffer'd love returning,
Who makes a furnace of his mouth,
and keeps his chimney burning,
May each true woman shun his sight,
for fear his fumes should choke her,
And none but those who smoke themselves
have kisses for a smoker.*
— Anonymous

Now that I know the facts, I can no longer be so charitable to smokers. I suppose if a smoker wants to go out behind the barn to keep his chimney burning, that's his prerogative. But no smoker has the *right* to subject nonsmokers to his effluvia. Certainly there is no good reason why the innocent should have to suffer for smokers' sakes. If a smoker wants to keep one foot in the grave, it's his problem. But common sense says he has no right subjecting others to the risks he himself is willing to take.

Unfortunately, none of us live in a vacuum. No one lives or dies to himself. What we do invariably affects others. So it is with smokers.

As a result of the overwhelming evidence against it, I would like to think everyone in the whole world would give up smoking. Forget it. If the pen truly were mightier than the sword, people would have given it up long ago. For the record, tobacco-industry profits this year are higher than ever before. The tobacco people would say that's *Kool*. There is still gold in them thar weeds, and they are still laughing all the way to the bank.

If you are a smoker, maybe in gratitude they will give you some of those coupons for your next lung operation in "Mariboro country," your local cancer ward. There you can see all of those masculine, rugged, sunburned, tattooed-all-over cowboys who rode the range with their red-and-white crush-proof boxes in hand, now emaciated and wasted in their middle age, crying out in pain and agony in their death throes. Is that using hyper-scare tactics? That, my friend, is *reality* more often than you realize. One man's smoke is his own poison, too.

Thought for the day: Nicotine, found only in tobacco, is used commercially as a weed killer. Maybe there is a place for smokers, after all. Invite some to your next garden party.

Quote for the day: "The cigarette companies have spent billions of dollars and half a century trying to link smoking to the beautiful things in life. . . . What smoking is really linked to is disability and death" (American Lung Association).

You've come a long way, baby! In the last ten years, lung cancer among women has doubled, and, according to the American Lung Association, "a pregnant woman who smokes two packs a day blocks the equivalent of 40 percent of the oxygen supply to the fetus. . . . Pregnant women who smoke have more still births, spontaneous abortions and low-weight babies than nonsmoking mothers." (These babies *don't* come a long way, do they?)

A final wish for all nonsmokers: that the next camel you see is the animal, not the weed, that you don't ever meet the Turk, and that your last GASP is not your breath, but rather your local chapter of Group Against Smokers' Pollution. □

the facts for nonsmokers

from the American Lung Association

- Cigarette smoke affects the nonsmoker in much the same way as the smoker.
- Inhaling second-hand smoke makes the heart beat faster, the blood pressure go up, and the level of carbon monoxide in the blood increase.
- There is more cadmium in the smoke that drifts off the burning end of the cigarette than in the drag the smoker takes. Large doses of cadmium have been related to hypertension, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema.
- Smoke from an idling cigarette contains even more tar and nicotine than an inhaled one.
- The amount of carbon monoxide in the blood of nonsmokers doubles in a poorly ventilated room filled with cigarette smoke. Even outside the room, the inhaled carbon monoxide stays in the body for three to four hours.
- The nonsmoker is forced to breathe in smoke from the burning end of the cigarette as well as the smoke exhaled by the smoker.
- Researchers have found that lung illness is twice as common in young children whose parents smoke at home compared to those with nonsmoking parents.
- An estimated 2 million Americans are sensitive to tobacco smoke and suffer smoke-caused asthma attacks.
- The U.S. Surgeon General has said, "Nonsmokers have as much right to clean air and wholesome air as smokers have to their so-called right to smoke, which I would redefine as a so-called right to pollute. It is high time to ban smoking from all confined public places such as restaurants, theaters, airplanes, trains, and buses. It is time that we interpret the Bill of Rights for the nonsmoker as well as the smoker."



"I advise you to switch to Folly Cigarettes. For only 100,000 coupons you get a new set of lungs."

orchids & onions

letters

The Incredible Human Potential

Yesterday during my lunch hour, I read Mr. Armstrong's latest article on "The Incredible Human Potential" and I wish you would let him know how much I enjoyed reading it. I am aware of man's potential, but the way God has inspired him to write that article... wow!!! I had trouble disengaging my brain and getting back to work.

Keep up the good work — everyone of you.

Donald J. Lohr,
Johnstown, PA

After just finishing Part V of "The Incredible Human Potential," my mind is whirling and my heart bursting with gratitude....

Just to know and understand the great plan and purpose God has in store for mankind fills me with unspeakable, incomprehensible joy! Just to know that ALL people, little and big are wanted by God to build and to restore his universe is staggering to the human mind. I don't understand it — but I believe it. I know it to be true.

Since reading again how Lucifer, who had everything going for him, and how he let his chance slip and dragged one-third of God's angels down with him, I am more determined than ever to hold fast to my faith and knowledge and also to seek more and more of God's way as he gives me ability.

I want to shout to the world: "God is alive and in command, just stop and listen to his LOVE exploding over the airwaves!"

Thank God for you, Garner Ted, and ALL who are carrying out God's orders. Praise God, his commandments are right.

teous. And just to know that I have a part to play! Thanks to you.

Emily P. Beaver,
McCordsville, IN

If I Were God...

I am not one who writes very often. But after reading Aug. 2, "Personal from Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong" on "If You Were God, How Would You Look at This World Today?" in *Plain Truth*, I have to say something or explode. It is wonderful, more wonderful, and most wonderful. I plan to keep it to read over and over again.

Also, "The Incredible Human Potential." I would like to shout that to the people of the world. Those that are miserable and unsatisfied. So here is my shouting money.

Mrs. Paul McQueen,
Waynesburg, KY

If I were God I would come down to this earth that I created and talk with my children. Reassuring them mentally and physically that I AM here *always*, and give them the courage and understanding that every child needs from his or her father.

I would teach my children (all of them) the real meaning of love, "the giving of oneself." They would have no need to search for me in a book (that few read) nor in schools or gatherings where prayers lose value through repetition. I would want very badly to walk and talk among my children everyday (as we do with our earthly children).

Children WITHOUT direct family love are apt to be delinquents. If our earthly children were expected to obey us by the teaching from a book they would all be delinquents. Children need correction and guidance and authority.

Perhaps the next article you write should be "Does God Have Time for His Chil-

dren?" You might try writing it without quoting from the Bible. Then you will see that without that book you have only physical surroundings that you imagine may speak to you.

For the record, I am a Christian. I do not question God, but you asked, "If you were God...?" and this is my answer. I also happen to think that the world is not bad. The world is beautiful and so are God's children. We have problems but we'll work them out. Try and remember that we no longer feed people to the lions — it helps at times.

Judy Konos,
Metairie, LA

Smoking

It is thanks to you that I have stopped smoking. I who needed at least two packs of cigarettes a day. I made this decision after having read your article on the frightening truth of the noxious effect of nicotine, since I was beginning to suffer from emphysema.

I. S.,
Beirut, Lebanon

I would like to tell you about your documentary "Smoke Until You Die." I read that article three times and I immediately stopped smoking. It has now been five months since I stopped smoking and I am happier. I told myself that I was ruining my health, since I had been smoking for four years. It was hard for the first fifteen days, but with a little bit of will power one can master it. I am 19 years old, my height is 6'5", and I weigh 198 lbs. I have acquired a taste for life. While I was smoking, I didn't participate much in sports activities, because I was always out of breath; now, I am active in racquetball, skiing, skating, swimming, tennis, weightlifting and hiking. I made four of my friends read your article too, and they stopped smoking, saying, "If you can do it, so can we." There are now four of us who no longer smoke, and we participate in sports together.

R. G.,
Joliet, PQ, Canada

• For further information on smoking — how second-hand "sidestream" smoke injures a nonsmoking bystander — see the center-spread feature article on pp. 8-9.

Orchids and Onions

Regarding "Orchids and Onions" — I like this section of your paper very much, but I am questioning your appellation "Orchids" — implying letters in favor of your policies or "nice" letters, and "Onions" — implying letters of the opposite ilk.

To my way of thinking, an orchid is a worthless flower — it doesn't even have a fragrance.

There is nothing more fragrant than onions bubbling in a stew on a cold, winter afternoon, when hunger pangs are gnawing.

How about the delightful green onion, which brightens up a salad with both color and flavor?

The onion is a noble vegetable. The orchid is a flower of little real value except as a status symbol indicating the presence of "money" or wealth.

Mrs. Molly Rasmussen,
Springfield, MO

I want to comment on the "Orchids and Onions" column in *Plain Truth*. It makes me chuckle to read of someone who reads your material and perhaps listens to the broadcast and continually hears about the wonderful Kingdom of God and what it will be like, etc. Then they send you an onion and say, "You people are so pessimistic." Is that pessimism? I eagerly await the day.

I shower you with orchids.

Cathie Morgan,
DuQuoin, IL

The Spirit of Hollywood

After reading your article on the "Spirit of Hollywood," I would like to say I agree with you... and disagree. The particular point I disagree on is the films of Francis Ford Coppola. You severely put down his new film on Vietnam. I am forced to disagree with this. His intention is to show how sickening and evil war is. He is not glorifying it, but this is to shock the viewer into realization.

The point of the "Godfather" films were to show that power corrupts. "Tommy" illustrated how people would abuse and exploit people.

Ed Rimshaw,
Dublin, CA

PRIME-TIME CRIME STARTS AT NINE

by J. G. Calander

This fall the major television networks are implementing a new programming policy. They have agreed to postpone all programs that are judged "inappropriate for viewing by a general audience" until after 9 p.m. The hours of 7 to 9 will be reserved for "family programs."

This new policy has met with a great acrimonious backlash of criticism, especially from producer Norman Lear, who is planning to seek a court injunction against the network rule. When Lear discovered that only one of the 24 "All in the Family" programs of last season would have been permitted to be run uncensored, he moved his number-one show to 9 p.m. Monday and sought to

rescind the controversial "family" rule.

All the criticism of this new policy is entirely unjustified, in my opinion, because the new rule (if properly implemented) promises to be the greatest victory for morality since Ozzie and Harriet slept in separate beds, kisses were limited to three seconds, and Lassie was the leading lady of video-land.

The success of the new rule will depend on the realization by parents everywhere that violence literally gushes from prime-time television from 9 p.m. to 11 p.m. (if it doesn't "gush" from your set, try adjusting your color control toward red), and that sex reeks from what has been appropriately called the "boob tube." If the "family hour" had not been instituted, we would have had only two alternatives: watching our children go communist or throwing a brick through the quasar controls.

The first step the network made was to remove all offensive language that had crept onto the airwaves. The words that have already found their way to the cutting room floors are such locker-room

smut as "virgin," "affair" and "vasectomy." Thankfully, such obscenities as "virgin" are being replaced by the appropriate moral equivalent: "totally innocent."

This ruling will have its effect on religious programming as well. At Christmas, we'll have to sing about "round yon totally innocent" Mary, while Protestant preachers will be reduced to "heck-fire and darn-ation" sermons.


The next step is to clean up the violence. If a top cop show, such as *Kojak*, airs from 8:30 to 9:30, the first half hour would find old baldy sucking on a lollipop, keeping to the speed limit, and speaking gently to his inept cronies and criminal suspects. The second half hour, however, would have him chain smoking, shouting curses, browbeating drunks, and shooting the bad guy in a breathless car chase. The only problem with this is the ratings. *Kojak* could conceivably end up at both the top and bottom of the Nielsen ratings, depending on which half hour is surveyed.

The third and ultimate step of the

"family rule" should be to have all news banned from the 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. slot. Network news would have to stop all coverage of bad news, violence, crime, and war. After all, if violence is forbidden to actors, why should we allow the real thing?

Meanwhile, local news broadcasts will have to replace those handsome fashion models on "eyewitness news" with some typical uglies, oldies, and baldies from back in the copy room. After all, if sexy women are to be banned from the boob tube, I demand that all those sexy male newsmen be hidden behind the U.P.I. machine, far away from my impressionable wife. Let Irving R. Levine replace John Chancellor as NBC anchorman!

Eventually, of course, the "family hour" should become 24-hour policy. After all, my children must be at school early in the morning and are therefore seldom awake during the 8 p.m. to 9 p.m. "family hour," especially in winter. And, who knows, when I'm not home the little monsters may sneak a peak at the second half of *Kojak*. □



THE SUGAR CONSPIRACY

by Arthur W. Docken

In England, 90% of the children under 12 have dental caries — decayed teeth — and about 17 million Britons have lost all of their teeth. Seven hundred thousand Norwegians are toothless. In Scotland, 44% of the population over the age of 16 no longer possess their natural teeth.

Over 25 million Americans have lost their natural teeth, 98% of the U.S. population have cavities (a total of one billion cavities), and 75% have gum diseases which can cause loss of teeth. To repair all Americans' dental damage would cost an estimated \$8 billion a year — twice our current expenditure.

Dental researchers are looking continually for new ways to prevent this gigantic problem. Proposed solutions range from adding fluoride to drinking water to "glazing" the teeth with laser beams to using such things as sophisticated chemicals, vaccines made from organisms which dwell in the mouths of most people, natural cement produced by tiny sea animals, and the usual toothbrush-dental-floss-see-your-dentist-twice-a-year routine. In spite of all this extensive research, dental problems continue to be a big headache, or should we say "tooth-ache"?

Sugar the Big Culprit

Why are people having so much trouble with their teeth? More and more the experts are pointing to sugar and sugar-sweetened foods as the major culprit. Without sugar, tooth decay would probably be almost nonexistent. (Tooth decay is caused by bacteria in the mouth which ferment sugar and carbohydrates

to produce an acid that attacks tooth enamel.)

Normal Americans, on the average, eat 120 pounds of sweets annually. England claims the distinction of being the world's greatest consumer of sweets and sugar. In fact, most modern nations consume far more sugar than ever before, and they are loving it.

Between-meal snacks cost Americans \$2 billion in 1972 and probably accounted for a major share of their \$4-billion annual dental bill.

Candy isn't the only problem, of course. Americans gulp down an annual average of 20 gallons of soft drinks and fruit-flavored beverages, most of which contain high concentrations of sugar. Most Americans also start off their day with an instant breakfast cereal, which more than likely is sugar-coated.

The average American sits in front of his TV set five hours per day, being bombarded with up to 50 commercials, many of them using hard-sell tactics to peddle "junk food." Much to the dismay of nutrition experts, the viewer is often convinced that the sweetened variety of anything is the preferable commodity.

Dental experts point out in vain that chewing gum, all-day suckers, chewy toffee, and caramels keep the teeth awash in an enamel-destroying acid for long periods of time. Soft drinks flood the mouth with a worthless concoction of chemicals and sugar that can help to eventually destroy not only one's teeth but his general health as well. Even sweetened toothpaste can help cause decay.

One study in Scandinavia showed

that the tooth-decay rate was cut in half during World War II when there was a serious sugar shortage. After the war and the return of high quantities of sugar to the diet, however, the rate became higher than ever.

The fact is, parents who allow their children to over-indulge in sweets show little regard for their children's teeth and overall health.

Nutritionist Jean Mayer declares that "the promotion of high-sugar cereals, snacks, and soft drinks to children is a dental disaster and may be a factor in increasing the likelihood of diabetes in those individuals whose families show a history of that disease" (*Life and Health Magazine*, Sept. 1974). Others warn that too much sugar in the diet causes obesity which can lead to heart disease.

People, when faced with the facts about how harmful sugar can be to their teeth, often throw up their hands in dismay, remarking, "Well, if one can't use sugar as a sweetening agent, what's left?" Believe it or not, there is something else available: honey.

Honey: A Natural Sugar Substitute

Honey is a natural sweetener that has been used by men since their creation. It was almost the only source of sugar available to the ancients, who also valued it for its medicinal benefits. Honey is even recommended by the biblical book of Proverbs, written some 3,000 years ago. Solomon writes, "My son, eat honey, for it is good" (Proverbs 24:13, RSV). He also warns that "it is not good to eat much honey. . . . eat only enough for you, lest you be satiated with it and vomit it" (Prov. 25:27, 16, RSV). (It should be stated that it would be best, if possible, to avoid buying honey which has been processed and heated because this type of honey has lost much of its nutritional value.)

What You Can Do!

What can you do to prevent dental problems? Most experts say that the first and most important step is to change your diet. Get rid of sweets and eat more natural foods. Eat foods that are rich in tooth-building minerals such as dairy products, nuts, vegetables, fruits, and whole-grain cereals. If you must eat between-meal snacks, try fruits, raisins, or vegetables such as carrots or celery which actually help clean your teeth. Avoid drinking soft drinks or using sugar in tea and coffee.

Brushing your teeth is also important. A mixture of salt and baking soda makes a good tooth powder at a fraction of the cost of commercial toothpastes. Many toothpastes contain expensive additives of doubtful worth, and some have even proven to be harmful. In fact, some nutritionists claim that the best "toothbrush" is an apple, which cleans your teeth and stimulates saliva flow.

The current high cost of sugar may be a blessing in disguise for you. If you reduce the amount of sugar and sugar-rich foods you eat, you will not only save money on your grocery budget, but you will probably save even more in doctor and dentist bills.

What it all boils down to is this: If you want to have a sweet smile, cut out the sweets. □

YOUR STAKE IN THE BEEF CRISIS

by Dr. Allen L. Stout

Despite present adequate supplies of beef in the United States, economic pressures are drastically reshaping the beef industry and, therefore, the price of the steak or hamburger on your table. The average consumer caught up in today's economic problems is little aware of the crisis afflicting the beef industry, since the meat counters are still full. But changes on the ranges may again empty our supermarkets.

Beef's Vital Statistics

Beef has become America's most desired food product and the leader in terms of income for American agriculture. Beef consumption per capita set a new record last year, almost 117 pounds. This is double the amount consumed at the close of World War II.

Beef ranks supreme as both a staple item in the average American diet and as a delicacy for the international gourmet. Moreover, beef is one of the most versatile of foods in that it can be used in so many different ways, ranging from a juicy hamburger to a sizzling t-bone steak.

It is estimated that only 2.5% of the average American's disposable income is spent on beef products, but beef accounts for 25% of the gross return to U.S. agriculture. Each dollar spent in cattle production directly generates an additional \$5 to \$8 in business activity in the supply and processing industries, as well as those engaged in transportation, marketing, feeds, vaccines, antibiotics, and financial agencies that thrive by servicing the beef industry. About two million people work in supplying livestock and livestock feed. Another 11 million process and market farm products. And 25% of all trucks are bought by farmers and ranchers.

What happens when these 2 million full- and part-time cattle producers or feeders are put through the economic wringer?

Foreclosure on the Range

In the twelve-month period from January 1974 to January 1975, America's beef-cattle industry suffered a \$21 billion setback. The nation's cattle, valued at \$37 billion in January 1974, were worth only \$21 billion (even with four million more cattle) in January 1975. That's a \$16-billion devaluation on our national "inventory" of cattle. Higher production costs and lower cattle prices caused the additional \$5 billion operating loss.

For most of the past year and a half, cattle feeders sustained losses of \$100 or more per head, while cow-calf and stocker operators (who produce feeder cattle and grass-fed beef) lost \$50 to \$100 on every animal marketed.

Put another way, as a report issued by Kansas State University revealed, the average cattle producer lost \$11,000 to \$37,000 last year, depending on the type

of operation. Of course, that's worse than being unemployed with zero income, but most full-time ranchers and feeders have too big an investment in land, machinery, time and labor to just "get out" when times are tough. A study in Nebraska showed that the investment required by a rancher to make just \$15,000 net income in a good year (1972) was \$1,765,000 of capital and 22,000 acres of land!

A 33-year-old owner of a large feedlot in western Kansas, who lost \$250,000 last year, said he figured he could make that back in five to seven years if prices got straightened out, but he felt sorry for the old-timer in the area who had lost what he'd taken a lifetime to build and was too old to recoup his losses.

The nation's largest feedlot, in Greeley, Colorado, lost \$10.8 million feeding cattle during the first six months of 1974. The cattle-feeding industry suffered 19 months of devastating losses that approached \$3 billion, before prices from slaughter houses finally began improving last April. According to Monfort (of Greeley), "The industry's financial problems finally got bad enough to create a shortage of fed cattle." Feedlots thinned their population to 8.5 million — 36% below the January 1973 peak of 13.3 million head.

From Boom to Bust

A rapid increase in cattle population in the late 1960's and early 1970's has, according to USDA economists, resulted in an oversupply. Beef population increased about 20% from 1969 to 1974 due to the abundance of low-cost feeds and growing demand for beef. Favorable weather through the 1960's and early 1970's resulted in bumper crops. Growing prosperity in the industrialized nations added to the demand for grain-fed beef. As a result, the feedlot business boomed. As Joe Lane Wood, market analyst for the Texas Cattle Feeder's Association, put it, "In the early 1970's, the speculators took over like a herd of blind elephants," investing large amounts of money in feedlots. Feeder calves temporarily went as high as 55¢ to 70¢ per pound, as feedlots competed for available calves.

Then, in 1972, unfavorable weather caused a poor wheat crop in Russia. The consequent U.S.-Russia wheat deal in the spring of 1973 triggered a sudden jump in feed-grain prices. Corn jumped, 82% in a matter of months and other foodstuffs as high as 230% in the same period. Feed costs normally account for about 80% of the cost of fattening cattle for the market. This almost doubled feeding costs.

At the same time all this happened, the government slapped a price ceiling on beef (the first ever) at the consumers' (voters') demand. Evidently, American consumers had decided that the beef growers should provide them with beef at less than cost. Politicians responding to the power of the vote penalized the cattle producers.

The packers and merchants, caught in the pinch, drastically cut back their activities. Some of them temporarily shut down, but cattle feeders had no such option. They had to either sell at a loss or continue to feed high-cost grain to

their cattle and wait for the price ceiling to be lifted. Many waited, creating a temporary beef shortage, but when the ceiling was lifted, the backlog of overfat beef flooded the market, driving prices down.

With feedlots taking a beating, they cut way back on buying feeder cattle. This caused cattle producers to pile up massive losses. Even now, though there is a shortage of fattened cattle, a severe glut of range cattle has kept the price unprofitable since late 1973.

The oil crisis and inflation in general added to the woes of the cattlemen, as other operating costs went up, along with the increased cost of living. Beef producers were caught in the jaws of the worst cost-price squeeze ever to hit the industry.

Some of the cattlemen made an analysis of their problems, and they found that not only was the government not offering any help, but they added to the cattlemen's woes by allowing beef import programs to hold prices down. The Nixon administration suspended quotas limiting meat imports and continued to keep the door open to foreign beef through 1974. The USDA reported in 1974 that beef imports represent about 7% of total domestic consumption.

A group of East Texas cattlemen, headed by Billy Joe Davis and Horace McQueen, went to Washington at their own expense and checked the USDA records, finding that beef imports actually amounted to over 10% of total consumption in 1973 and 1974. "Almost a million head of live animals imported from Mexico and Canada and slaughtered in the U.S. were counted as domestic production. Total imported beef amounted to an equivalent of 6.7 million head.


According to John H. Hopkin, head of Texas A & M University's Agricultural Economics Department, "U.S. cattlemen must send about 10 million cows to slaughter this year to reduce the oversupply and bring it back in balance with demand, or they will face substantially more perilous times in 1976 and 1977." Imports have prevented the liquidation of the surplus cattle. Even much of the beef purchased by the USDA for school lunch programs was found to be imported, despite the fact that domestic beef should, by law, be purchased first as long as it is available. Imported beef is often not subjected to the rigorous inspection requirements of domestic beef.

It is unfortunate that agriculture, America's largest and most vital industry, is not adequately represented in government. It could be a serious problem when one beef producer, who provides the hamburger and steaks for 100 fellow Americans, is voted out of business by the consumers and businessmen he supplies. □

Allen Stout, D.V.M., served as Assistant State Veterinarian in Oregon, in disease control and eradication problems, 1963-1964, after which he became Assistant Professor in Agricultural Sciences at Ambassador College, Big Sandy, Texas.

For further information concerning the agricultural situation, write for "World Crisis in Agriculture," co-authored by Dr. Stout. Call (800) 423-4444 for your free copy.

WORLD CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE—



and only 10%
of Earth's land surface
is under cultivation.


The 1974 Rome World Food Conference simply verified what people already knew — the few "have" nations again must feed the "have-nots." But how much will it take? For how long? And with what? No one is sure.

Find the answers in the free booklet *World Crisis in Agriculture*. Researched by the Ambassador College Agricultural Research Department, the booklet examines farming's biggest questions — quantity and quality, economics and the government.

Request your free booklet *World Crisis in Agriculture*.

Call 800-423-4444* toll-free for your free booklet

*California, Hawaii and Alaska call (213)-577-5225




plain truth Pasadena, CA. 91123
Please send me the free booklet, *WORLD CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE*.

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

If you are a *Plain Truth* subscriber, please enter subscription number from your *Plain Truth* mailing label.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

P 185



**Garner Ted Armstrong
SPEAKS OUT!**

Empty Optimism

Not long ago I spoke out on behalf of the office of the President of the United States in decrying the strange preoccupation of the American press with a Presidential "slip" (*Plain Truth*, June 21, 1975).

I very much respect the office of the President of the United States and respect the man who occupies that office.

I also respectfully disagree with many of the things Mr. Ford has said.

Recently, President Ford felt like rebuking the U.S. "prophets of doom" in a strong partisan speech to five thousand Republican women in Dallas.

He said, "I have heard too much from people who say everything is falling apart, how the quality of life in America is sliding downhill, how the dollar is worthless, how murderers and muggers have driven everyone behind locked doors, and how even the President of the United States should stop visiting public places and seeing the American people."

The President said he "had had it with pessimists saying such things who seem to be writing a 'self-fulfilling prophecy' of doom for America."

"I reject such pessimistic scenarios," said the President.

Mr. President, I respectfully disagree. Surely Mr. Ford does not mean to imply that, simply because he has "heard too much," the things these alleged prophets of doom are saying are therefore wrong?

It happens to be a simple fact, Mr. President, that the quality of life in America is sliding downhill. The dollar is becoming more and more worthless. Murderers and muggers do drive innocent citizens behind locked doors, and the President himself has been subjected to two assassination attempts within a very short period of time.

Over the years I have continually spoken out against the game of "hide-and-go-seek" played by too many Americans.

By hiding our eyes from the myriad problems around us and seeking instead our own personal pleasures, we seem bent upon submerging ourselves in petty day-to-day trivia, all the while ignoring the truly monstrous problems confronting the entirety of the human race, the United States in particular, and each of us individually.

Evil will never disappear by ignoring it. We cannot wish it away, and simple optimism in the face of bad news will never whisk away the problems or quietly sweep them under the carpet and out of view.

What is happening in the United States today? Crime is up, soaring above all understandable relationships to population growth. The FBI says the chance of being victimized by a violent crime has increased 24% since 1968, and more than 50% in the past few years!

As I reported in this column recently, the average urban American baby boy born since 1974 faces a greater likelihood of dying a victim of murder than did the average American soldier wearing khaki in World War III!

Attacks upon the family and the home continue to soar beyond any known example in the history of the human race. A recent survey by a group of university sociologists found that of 2,300 wives, fully half felt they would eventually go outside of their marriages for sexual ex-

periences! And one out of every three between the ages of 26 and 30 freely admitted she already had!


Another study, conducted by the national foundation, March of Dimes, shows that mothers under 16 giving birth to children rose by 80% in the thirteen years between 1960 and 1973.

And then there's our entertainment. It was more than three decades ago when Rhett Butler said to Scarlett O'Hara, "Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn," in the epic film *Gone With the Wind*. Even though fully knowing what to expect, audiences all over the United States frequently lined up two abreast around the block to see that motion picture and to collectively gasp in shock at the utterance of the "forbidden" word.

Compare that, if you will, to the unbelievably flagrant violation of anything representing the last vestiges of sensitivity or decency which is common tablefare for the average American home via the medium of television or motion pictures today.

Our teen-agers can attend motion pictures where the most violent, unrestricted and raw abuses in the form of profanity and filthy speech, coupled with violence and sex, are presented on the screen. It does little good for parents to very carefully attempt to train their children at home in the correct use of the English language and in high principles of morality. Training them to respect the property and persons of fellow human beings is of little benefit when the public media in one dramatic moment in a darkened theater can sweep aside much of the painstaking and careful education given at home.

The United States is in a moral landslide!



Just last season, for example, American television showed the rape of housewives, delved into the story of the private life of a prostitute, and highlighted the day-to-day existence of a homosexual couple. These are all topics which would not have even been mentioned on the air only a few years ago. One major production for "adult" audiences, *Beacon Hill*, has taken viewers through various and sundry episodes of political corruption, showed various sexual relationships between employees and their mistresses, invited the viewer to watch a striptease, and highlighted flagrant violations of prohibition laws.

It appears that it is not enough that the news is filled with shoot-outs, assassinations, kidnappings, bombings, premarital sex, extra-marital relationships, abortions, women's lib, the gay liberation movement, blackmail, murders, drugs, wiretapping, embezzlement, and international bribery by big business.

Our "entertainment" also seems totally obsessed and preoccupied with the same fare. Open, raw, unbelievable violence, sexual permissiveness, thievery, lying, cheating, and every assorted form of brutality is the current trend in television as well as in motion pictures. We are living through a "TV era" which is dramatically affecting social patterns in the United States.

And do you ever listen to the lyrics in popular and country-western music these days? Even the words of most songs reflect and emphasize these same themes.

Another aspect of the insanity in American television is the modern daytime quiz show. Some of these shows feature everything from roulette and dice games to pinball machines, blackjack, horse-races, and virtually every kind of game which would normally be found in Las Vegas or Reno. Participants appear to be mindless children, leaping and jumping up and down, pounding their heads, slapping their hands together, rolling their eyes, biting and gnawing on their tongues and lips, getting so excited one honestly wonders whether a heart attack is not imminent when they are told they have won one of our modern "adult toys" such as a stereo, a color television set, or an automobile.


All in all, the United States of America is very much sick.

Rather than speaking out AGAINST these evils, which would, in my opinion, GREATLY enhance the stature and integrity of Mr. Ford, the President chose to attack the "doomsdayers" and portray himself as a man who believes in a bright future.

He said, "I did not take the sacred oath of office to preside over the decline and fall of the United States of America."

No one can fault those words, nor the sentiment behind them. However, as we view America today in the midst of a landslide into the ultimate debauchery of a modern Sodom and Gomorrah, we must all realize that empty optimism cannot stand up against the rapid decline in the quality of life in America, the deep economic sickness which threatens the value of our money, and the insane rise in violent crimes.

It may be instructive to ponder whether, like it or not, intended or not, the President of the United States of America may indeed be presiding over the decline and the fall of the United States of America. □



plain truth

Pasadena, California 91123

Please send me a free subscription to Good News magazine. No charge or obligation.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

P 185

16 reasons why you need The Good News

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 Coping with Change | 9 Jesus Christ—Fact or Fiction? |
| 2 Therapy for Ailing Marriages | 10 Garbage In... Garbage Out |
| 3 Can Prophecy Fail? | 11 Here's How to Change Your World |
| 4 The Path to True Greatness | 12 The Transformation of Planet Earth |
| 5 The Answer to Sin | 13 Your Best Investment |
| 6 Do You Hate Yourself? | 14 How Liberated Can You Get? |
| 7 The God Family | 15 Why Did Christ Have to Die? |
| 8 The Second Resurrection | 16 The Battle for Your Mind |

The above is a brief sampling of article titles from the last 20 issues of *The Good News*, the magazine of Biblical understanding.

It's a completely up-to-date publication

that relates the Bible to the times we're living through. And when you really understand it, there's hardly anything more important than that! Of course, despite inflation, *The Good News* is still yours for the asking.

Call 800-423-4444* FOR A FREE SUBSCRIPTION

*California, Hawaii and Alaska call (1) 213-577-5225

plain truth

WRITE TO:


- **UNITED STATES:** P.O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91123
- **Canada:** Plain Truth, P.O. Box 44, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2M2
- **México:** Institución Embassador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D.F.
- **Colombia:** Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.
- **United Kingdom and Europe:** P.O. Box 11, St. Albans, Herts., England
- **South Africa, Mauritius and Malawi:** P.O. Box 1060, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa 2000
- **Rhodesia:** P.O. Box U.A.30 Union Ave., Salisbury
- **Australia and S.E. Asia:** P.O. Box 202, Burleigh Heads, Queensland 4220
- **New Zealand and Pacific Isles:** P.O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, N.Z.
- **The Philippines:** P.O. Box 2603, Manila, 2801
- **West Indies:** G.P.O. Box 6063, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Be sure to notify us immediately of any change in your address. Please include your old mailing label and your new address. Important! The publisher assumes no responsibility for return of unsolicited art work, photographs, or manuscripts.

plain truth

WEEK ENDING NOVEMBER 1, 1975

THE STRANGE ORIGIN OF HALLOWEEN SPAIN BRACES FOR MORE TROUBLE



GETTING OFF THE MATERIALISTIC MERRY-GO-ROUND

Ken Evans — Plain Truth