


the **PLAIN TRUTH**

a magazine of understanding



**AMERICA AT
THE CROSSROADS**

What our READERS SAY

Auto Accidents

"'Death Rides the High Road' is by far the finest comprehensive article I have ever seen anywhere. I wish that other magazines would reprint this, not condensed, but in its entirety in an effort to get it before everyone in this land. In this, you have really covered the waterfront, the highroads and the byways—every angle of this subject that so badly needs covering!"

Mrs. V. M.,
Clarkrange, Tennessee

"I've taught driver education the past 14 years. Your article, 'Accidents Don't Happen'—They Are Caused,' was a very good one. In the prevention of accidents we should emphasize driver training and education as well as better roads, safer cars, and proper enforcement."

Stanley S.,
Onawa, Iowa

Arab-Israeli Impasse

"If there is any publication that clears much of the fog away from current issues, it is certainly *The PLAIN TRUTH*. One of the articles in particular, 'What's Behind the Arab-Israeli Impasse?' gave a precise explanation that I had never fully comprehended before. Now I can speak with confidence and direction on this issue. Thank you so much."

Ray C. C.,
Grants Pass, Oregon

Teen-age

"Being a teen-ager I live in my own little world of fantasy, not knowing much of what goes on in the outer world. I thank you sincerely for opening my eyes to what is happening to and in the world. Your magazine is truly a masterpiece and I find it so interesting that I try to read all of it the day I get it. Words cannot express my gratitude to you for opening my eyes."

Holly M.,
Gapland, Maryland

Oceans Full of Evidence

"This morning I scanned through your June *PLAIN TRUTH* and came to 'Oceans Full of Evidence.' Some years ago when I taught biological sciences, I could never go along even halfheartedly with the evolutionists, so I painstakingly presented the two opposing points of view—the evolutionary and the non-evolutionary. Your current article is extremely well-researched. The accompanying submarine pictures are stunningly well chosen and professionally captioned and laid out."

Dr. Arza L. D.,
Upper Montclair,
New Jersey

Mental Stability

"I've been hospitalized several times in a state mental hospital before, so I read your article on mental illness with particular interest. I agree, looking at my own personality, that emotional troubles are heightened if a person cannot find the purpose or meaning of life. A neurotic needs to follow a positive direction somewhere. Finding the purpose of life eases the loneliness of life, the confusion and doubt of thought. Mental health is a constant struggle for stability and positiveness."

Don M. S.,
Austin, Texas

Modern Dating

"As I sat here reading your *Modern Dating* book I decided I just had to write and tell you how thankful I am to you for your material. You'll never know how much I learned from your advice on marriage. It changed my whole outlook on life. Before, I thought that marriage was all fun and games. Even now, at age 15½, I was very tempted to marry. I even considered eloping. But after reading your book, we're both satisfied to wait."

Wanda S.,
Middleboro,
Massachusetts

the PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

November, 1969

Vol. XXXIV

No. 11

Circulation: 2,136,000 Copies

Published monthly at 300 West Green St., Pasadena, California, 91105; Watford, England; and North Sydney, Australia, by Ambassador College. French edition published monthly at Pasadena, California; Dutch and German editions at Watford, England; Spanish edition at Big Sandy, Texas, © 1969 Ambassador College. All rights reserved.

EDITOR
HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Garner Ted Armstrong

SENIOR EDITORS
Herman L. Hoeh
Roderick C. Meredith

MANAGING EDITOR
Arthur A. Ferdig

Associate Editors

William Dankenbring Gene H. Hogberg
Vern L. Farrow Paul W. Kroll
David Jon Hill Eugene M. Walter

Regional Editors: U. K.: Raymond F. McNair;
Aust.: C. Wayne Cole; S. Africa: Ernest
Williams; Germany: Frank Schnee; Philippines:
Arthur Docken; Switzerland: Colin Wilkins;
Latin America: Enrique Ruiz.

Contributing Editors: Gary L. Alexander, Dibar
K. Apartian, Robert C. Boraker, Charles V.
Dorothy, Jack R. Elliott, Gunar Freibergs, Robert
E. Gentet, Ernest L. Martin, Gerhard O.
Marx, L. Leroy Neff, Richard F. Plache, Richard
H. Sedliacik, Lynn E. Torrance, Basil
Wolverton, Clint C. Zimmerman.

James W. Robinson, Copy Editor

Research Staff: Dexter H. Faulkner, Donald D.
Schroeder. Coordinators: Karl Karlov, Paul O.
Knedel, David Price, Rodney A. Repp, Charles
P. Vorhes, W. R. Whitehart.

Photography: Norman A. Smith, Director;
Joseph Clayton, Assistant Director; Lyle Christ-
topherson, Howard A. Clark, Frank Clarke,
David Conn, Jerry J. Gentry, Ian Henderson,
John G. Kilburn, Salam I. Maidani.

Art Department: Terry Warren, Director; Ted
Herlofson, Assistant Director; Donald R. Faast,
Roy Lepeska, Robert McGuinness, James A.
Quigley, William S. Schuler, John Susco,
Herbert A. Viera, Jr., Andrew C. Voth, Peter
Whitting, Monte Wolverton.

Albert J. Portune, Business Manager

Circulation Managers: U. S. A.: John H. Wil-
son; U. K.: Charles F. Hunting; Canada: Dean
Wilson; Australia: Gene R. Hughes; Philip-
pines: Guy L. Ames; South Africa: Michael
Bousfield; Latin America: Louis Gutierrez.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION has been paid by
others. Bulk copies for distribution not given or
sold.

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS to the Editor at the
nearest address below:
United States: P.O. Box 111, Pasadena, Cali-
fornia 91109.

Canada: P.O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver
1, B. C.
Mexico: Institución Ambassador, Apartado
Postal 5-595, México 5, D. F.
United Kingdom and Europe: P.O. Box 111,
St. Albans, Herts., England.
South Africa: P.O. Box 1060, Johannesburg.
Australia: P.O. Box 345, North Sydney, NSW
2060, Australia.
New Zealand and Southeast Asia: P.O. Box
2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand.
The Philippines: P.O. Box 1111, Makati, Rizal
D-708.

Registered in Australia for transmission by post
as a book.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE paid at Pasadena, Cali-
fornia.

Entered as SECOND CLASS matter at Manila
Post Office on March 16, 1967.

BE SURE TO NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY of any
change in your address. Please include both old
and new address. IMPORTANT!

Personal from the Editor

TODAY THE WHOLE WORLD NEEDS a voice to *speak out*, in positive authority, with the ANSWERS to humanity's problems.

The PLAIN TRUTH is that voice. The WORLD TOMORROW, on radio worldwide, and on television, is that voice.

But how do we know the answers?

News media, TV documentaries, books, report the news, describe the world's ills; WE make plain the meaning. The PLAIN TRUTH — the WORLD TOMORROW — reveal the causes, give you the solutions, tell how these problems *will be* solved.

But how did *we* come to know?

Today people are bewildered. They are told they must adjust to living in a world of evils, *with no solutions!* Unrest, discontent, protest, violence are escalating. The BIG question, now, is that of human survival!

In all this moral and social decay people vent their frustrations in politics. "Let's throw out the party in power," they cry. They vote for a candidate who does no better.

People get behind movements — the SDS, Civil Rights, Black Power, the New Left.

Whitaker Chambers, writing in his book *Witness*, said two faiths were on trial. He said human societies, like human beings, live by faith and die when faith dies. He implied that this sick society needed a man whose faith in it — in this sick society — was so great that he would even give his life to defend it. He implied that he was that man. And he implied that the issue was a test of that faith against the equal faith of Communism.

All history is the chronicle of man replacing one unworkable and decadent system or culture with another, equally unworkable.

In a United States Presidential election, one man was quoted, saying,

"Thank God, *both* candidates can't win."

The PLAIN TRUTH dares to speak out *above* politics. It dares enlighten constantly increasing millions of the causes, and the solutions that *will come*. It tells its millions of readers with positive assurance a world of PEACE — a happy, prosperous, joyful WORLD TOMORROW — is just around the corner! *And this is no wishful thinking!*

But how did we come to KNOW?

We feel it ought to be made plain to our readers *how* we came to UNDERSTAND.

In the development of its organization, worldwide operations, and UNDERSTANDING, this activity is indeed unique. I know of no one — of no organization — that ever approached these bewildering questions in the same manner.

Often I have asked: How did *you* come to believe what you believe? Few, indeed, ever stopped to inquire in retrospect HOW they came to believe the things they believe. Everyone has ideas, convictions, beliefs. And others hold entirely *different* beliefs. Yet each is certain, in his own mind, he is right. What he probably does not realize is *how* these ideas found their way into his mind.

Few realize that *most* of the things they believe were simply taken for granted — carelessly assumed without any proof whatsoever. They believe this or that because they have "always heard it" — they have read it — or been taught it. They simply accept it. It lodges in the mind. It may be totally untrue, but they BELIEVE IT and often would fight to uphold its supposed factuality. That careless method probably accounts for 90 to 98 percent of what is in the average mind.

Then, secondly, people believe what they *want* to believe. They *refuse* to accept what they *don't* want to believe,

In This Issue:

What Our Readers Say	Inside Front Cover
Personal from the Editor	1
The Modern Romans	3
The Alarming Decline of the American Merchant Fleet . . .	9
Interview with Edwin M. Hood, President, Shipbuilders Council of America	13
Radio Log	16
What's Behind the Furor Over Sex Education?	19
TV Log	20
Evolution Gets the Horse Laugh!	23
"Food Glut" — Or Famine?	30
Thanksgiving Day . . . What Does It Mean to You? . . .	39
Interview with Biologist Dr. James Bonner	46
Advance News Reports Come Alive Today	48



Kilburn — Ambassador College

OUR COVER

United States Senator Alan Cranston speaks to several thousand demonstrators at Exposition Park adjoining the campus of the University of Southern California. His speech highlighted the October 15th, 1969, Los Angeles Moratorium Demonstrations. Senator Cranston received wild support from his audience with his pronouncements against the war in Vietnam.

right or wrong. Prejudice is a barrier to the entrance of *fact*, or truth, to the mind.

One says: "My mind is made up — don't disturb me with the *facts*!"

Then, too, most want to "belong." They go along with their group, their club, their party.

The system of education in this world is primarily one of memory training. One is expected to accept without question, and to believe, whatever is stated in the textbook, or whatever is taught in class. When final exams come along, one is graded, not on having investigated and proved or disproved what was taught, but on having memorized and recorded the teaching without question, true or false.

One small boy was asked in class, "Now tell us, who discovered America?" The boy answered, "The Indians." "You were taught that it was Columbus," snapped the teacher. "Yes," responded the youngster, "but weren't the Indians already here before Columbus arrived?" The boy was flunked on the question. He should have been complimented for *thinking*!

When scientists met at a convention, they agreed in advance that nothing supernatural or miraculous was to be introduced or even considered. This would be straying outside their field. And sometimes their "field" shrinks into tunnel vision. This is *refusal* to consider what might be fact. This closes the mind to more than is allowed by prior agreement. It is, nevertheless, the "scientific method." But it is *not* the way to truth or fact.

I am the executive head of a large-scale and fast-growing worldwide operation. Frequently it is my responsibility to make decisions involving the expenditure of millions of dollars. I learned early in my business career to get *ALL* the facts, before making a decision. To exclude some of them might prove very costly.

The educational system as established in the world perpetuates error in the guise of truth, and instills continued pursuit of false values. Few realize this evil. A glance at the definition of the word "education" as given in the *En-*

cyclopaedia Britannica, is illuminating at this point.

"Education . . . denotes an attempt on the part of the adult members of a human society to shape the development of the coming generation in accordance with its own ideals of life.

"Education may be said to be the efforts made by the community to *impose* its culture upon the growing generation." (article: Education.)

To answer the question of this *Personal* — HOW we came to UNDERSTAND — requires at least a minimal personal history. For a series of unusual circumstances and incidents led to this knowledge in a manner *entirely different* from the usual way of taking for granted what one hears, reads, or finds others believing.

My ancestors migrated to America from England with William Penn, a hundred years before the United States became a nation.

I was born and reared in Des Moines, Iowa, of upright and stable parents of solid Quaker ancestry. I had drifted away from religious interest, by age 18. I had chosen journalism and advertising as a life profession.

From a child I had had a passion for UNDERSTANDING. Always I wanted to know the "WHY" about things. At age 5 my father asserted that I would become a "Philadelphia lawyer" when I grew up, because I was always asking "so many tom-fool questions." I always had to ask "WHY?" about everything.

About age 16 I became fired with ambition to attain status in the business world. I began to haunt the philosophy, biography, and business administration shelves of the Des Moines public library after school hours, in extracurricular study. From then I spent evenings in study while other young men were seeking pleasures.

Early business training was in newspapers and magazines. By age 22, bulwarked by a broad-based education for that age, I became the "Idea Man" in the editorial department of America's largest-circulation trade journal. This assignment required continuous travel over the United States, interviewing retail merchants, industrial executives,

Chamber of Commerce secretaries. I was searching out ideas successfully used in business, beside experiences in community development, social conditions and problems. This material provided most of the reading contents of the magazine.

During this period I pioneered in conducting surveys, based on the law-of-average principle, obtaining, analyzing, classifying facts on business and social conditions, problems and opinions from hundreds of people of all classes.

Later, in my own business, seven years in Chicago, and subsequently on the West Coast, these surveys were continued professionally. They were conducted by personal interviews, supplemented by thousands of written questionnaires obtained by mail. In conducting the personal interviews, college graduates, specially trained for this type of questioning, were employed. These surveys were a pioneering forerunner of the public opinion and fact-finding samplings so widely used today by organizations such as the Gallup polls, and other sociological researches.

Meanwhile, in addition, my business had involved constant close personal contacts with chief executives of major corporations in the Middlewest and the East, and also with top officers of hundreds of banks of all sizes — from small-town banks, to those of America's largest banks — New York, Chicago, and other major cities. During the seven years in Chicago I attended the ABA (American Bankers' Association) national conventions beside many state bankers' conventions.

In these years, devoted to fact-finding, I was being made painfully aware of the troubles, the conditions and problems of modern civilization. I came to know PEOPLE — of all classes and levels. I was collecting and classifying the FACTS.

They revealed the "WHAT" — but not the "WHY."

It became distressingly evident we are living in a very sick world. It had been a shocking disillusionment to learn that the "successful" were seldom happy. Their bank accounts were full, but their lives were empty. I developed a passion to understand "WHY?"

Not only were the common people of
(Continued on page 42)

Despite awesome military power, America is confused about its goals. Witness the recent "Vietnam Moratorium." Britain's sun has set. What has led to the declining power and prestige of the two English-speaking powers? This fourth in a series explains.

by Garner Ted Armstrong
and Gene H. Hogberg

THE BIG NEWS of the future could be the decline and ultimate fall of Britain and the United States. And you could be reading those headlines already — while not comprehending what you are reading!

How many are aware of the full significance of America's October and November "Vietnam Moratoriums"?

We saw the headlines. We heard the dissent. But has the true import of these occasions really been understood?

Elements of National Power

Why are certain nations great? Why have certain nations gained the respect and admiration, sometimes the envy and jealousy of the rest of the world, for their leadership, their productivity — while others have stagnated or even gone backward?

Why are some nations strong and others weak? And not only in the military sense of a large standing army or of a strategic, geographical location, but in an overall sense of a bountiful economy, possession of raw materials, industrial capacity, resourcefulness, ingenuity, inventiveness, the genius of their people, good health and a cultural heritage.

What is the most important element of national power?

Believe it or not, it's none of the aforementioned elements. These *are* important aspects of national power. But the biggest factor that makes any nation great — that acts as a catalyst for all other elements — has been lost, passed over and forgotten in this modern age of materialism.

This key factor is *national character*

The MODERN ROMANS



MODERN ROMANS

— the combined character of the people making up the state.

Character of Early Rome

Strong, vibrant, moral character was the foundational underpinning of early Roman society.

Rome was sustained first not by its famed legions, its effective use of military power, but by the character of its citizens.

"First, at the bottom as it were of Roman society and forming its ultimate unit, was the family. . . The most important feature or element of this family group was the authority of the father . . .

"It would be difficult to overestimate the influence of this group [the family unit] upon the history and destiny of Rome. It was the cradle of at least some of those splendid virtues of the early Romans that contributed so much to the strength and greatness of Rome, and that helped to give her the dominion of the world." (*Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, by Myers, pp. 11, 12, 15.)

But gradually, the family began to crumble, as we showed in detail in Part I of this series.

The time-honored virtues of honesty, frugality, patriotism — no longer nourished and preserved in the family unit — withered. Eventually the twin economic evils of confiscatory taxation and inflation ruined Rome's economy. The maintenance of a huge military machine plus an overstuffed bureaucracy consumed much of the Roman "tax dollar."

With inflation and the high cost of living came unemployment and welfarism. This, in time, gave rise to the ugly spectacles of the Roman games and other endless rounds of sports and entertainments to keep a restless population quiescent. The significance of this was made clear in Part III.

Overlooked Factor

History also reveals that because of decaying conditions at home, the great

bulk of the descendants of the original Roman stock eventually fled the Italian peninsula to outlying parts of the Empire.

"...the native stock declined. The decay of agriculture . . .drove numbers of farmers into the towns, where, unwilling to engage in trade, they sank into unemployment and poverty, and where, in their endeavours to maintain a high standard of living, they were not able to support the cost of rearing children. Many of these free-born Latins were so poor that they often complained that the foreign slaves were much better off than they — and so they were. At the same time many were tempted to emigrate to the colonies across the sea which Julius Caesar and Augustus founded. Many went away to Romanize the provinces, while society was becoming

The five reasons for Rome's fall deduced from the writings of noted historians of the Roman world:

(1) The breakdown of the family and the rapid increase of divorce.

(2) The spiraling rise of taxes and extravagant spending.

(3) The mounting craze for pleasure and the brutalization of sports.

(4) The expanding production of armaments to fight ever-increasing threats of enemy attacks — when the real enemy was the decay of the society from within.

(5) The decay of religion into myriad and confusing forms, leaving the people without a uniform guide.

ing Orientalized at home. . . . The Roman thus gave away to the Easterner in Italy, while he made a place for himself in the provinces." (*Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, pp. 200-202.)

Left in positions of political power in the homeland were the descendants of freed slaves. These people — largely from the Middle East around Syria — were of entirely different stock and temperament. The impact of the race change in the Roman homeland has not been fully understood by historians.

The "new Romans" were indeed

different. They "did not spring from the soil of Rome, their recollections and affections were elsewhere . . . Whilst the statesmen and leading men wore themselves out in trying to preserve what remained of the ancient spirit and old customs, down below amongst those classes of the populace which were constantly being recruited from slavery, there was a continual working to destroy it." (*Historians History of the World*, vol. 6, p. 365.)

Prof. T. Frank, writing in the *American Historical Review*, July 1916, vol. 21, p. 705, said: "This Orientalization of Rome's populace has a more important bearing than is usually accorded to it, upon the larger question of why the spirit and acts of imperial Rome are totally different from those of the republic."

With this gradual but thorough change of temperament and population came a severe drop in patriotism and national feeling. The freed slaves, after all, had little regard for ancient Roman traditions and cultural heritage.

"...even before the frontiers of the Roman Empire had been pushed out to their greatest extent, the military spirit that animated the early Romans had become extinct, and all enthusiasm for the military life and the military virtues had been lost.

"Under the later empire, service in the army grew so unpopular and even odious that many cut off the fingers of the right hand in order to escape military duty . . . [A recent article in the *Los Angeles Times* revealed the growing problem of dissent, resistance to orders, demands for constitutional rights — even underground newspapers — among American servicemen].

"The empire was made up of hundreds of cities; but the citizens of these towns, with very few exceptions, took neither pride nor interest in imperial affairs . . . Men were no longer willing to die or to live either for their city or for the empire.

"It was this lack of spiritual ties binding in a vital union the cities and communities of the empire that the statesman-historian Guizot maintains was a chief cause of its dissolution. With the first blows of the barbarians it

fell to pieces." (*Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, by Myers, pp. 449, 451, 452.)

The formidable army of the Empire could not save Rome, which had been eaten out — cancer-like — from within.

In fact, the final overthrow of the Imperial government was dealt by mutinous Roman legions whose soldiers had been recruited from neighboring "barbarian" nations.

Rome at its fall was not the same as Rome in the early days of the Republic, neither in the racial makeup of its people, nor its ideals, nor its national spirit.

The conclusion from all this is that nations can change character — and change drastically. And the changes are usually not for the good!

U. S., Britain Changed Too

No two modern nations have changed so drastically in national character and ideals in recent years as have the British and American peoples.

In his new book, *Decline and Fall? — Britain's Crisis in the Sixties*, author Paul Einzig clearly explains the real cause for the decline of Britain as a world power:

"Britain's most valuable asset had always been the character of her people... They are, or were until recently, as public-spirited as any nation and more so than most nations..."

"What has been the main cause of Britain's decline?... The answer is, the author regrets to say, the deterioration of some of those qualities of British character which had been responsible for the achievement of British greatness..."

"The [British] Empire was built up and maintained by the devotion of the British people to the cause of their country. That devotion seems to have declined to the vanishing point. Everybody, or at any rate the overwhelming majority, is now for himself and himself alone" (pp. 16, 28, 29).

How true. "Do your own thing" is the hue and cry of our age.

"When the author... reads books or sees films on the Battle of Britain period, he finds it somewhat difficult to believe that the people he encounters or reads about today can possibly belong to the same race as the people who gave

such a magnificent account of themselves in 1940 (p. 6).

"Over and above all, recent years have witnessed a progressive debasement of the British character... Selfishness and impatient greed demanding the advent of a millennium immediately have gained ground and 'growth-hysteria' has become a national disease..."

"Hard-faced trade unionists quite frankly admit that the only thing in which they are interested is to get the maximum of exclusive advantage for their members, and seldom worry about the effect of their selfishness on the rest of the community" (pp. 10, 11).

Author Einzig then asks "what has happened to the 'Spirit of Dunkirk'?"

"If it had not been for that spirit," he says, "Britain could not have survived as an independent nation. Had the men engaged in aircraft production slowed down for the sake of earning more overtime pay, or had they embarked on wildcat strikes at the slightest excuse, or had they been resisting measures aimed at increasing output or saving manpower, the R.A.F. could not possibly have been provided with the additional Spitfires that enabled them to win the Battle of Britain with a narrow margin."

"Unfortunately today the behaviour that was the exception in 1940 has become the rule, while the attitude that was the rule in 1940 has now become the rare exception. Almost all sections of the community are now much more interested in securing for themselves immunity from the sacrifices demanded by the situation..."

"Everybody, or almost everybody, is trying to get as much as possible out of the community and to give the community as little as possible in return... If the debasement of the British character is allowed to continue too long, the point of no return might be passed at some stage" (pp. 6, 7, 11).

One even wonders if the point of no return has not already been passed.

Downfall of American Character

What about the United States — her national character?

It is an undeniable fact that we are a nation of worsening bad character, a na-

tion leading the world in many evils, a nation that has lost its way, having no transcendental goal or purpose beyond hanging onto what we have.

America leads the world in wretched examples of family life. We lead the world in divorce, broken homes, and juvenile lawlessness.

We lead the world in fostering a disenchanted, turned-off, rebellious, thoroughly disgusted, isolated, futility-ridden generation of young people.

We lead the Western world in crime. We're far and away Number One, no contest, when it comes to a crime-ridden country. We lead them all. No one is our peer.

Years ago, F.B.I. Chief J. Edgar Hoover said we face the twin enemies of crime and Communism. Crime and moral decay are eating out America from within. And Communism stands ready to pick up the pieces.

Most people haven't thought of it this way, but Communism — except during periods of war or the aftermath of warfare — has never been able to subvert a society where there was little or no corruption or moral decay.

Communism is a political force that feeds on decaying social systems. It is like a political cancer. It subverts governments, infiltrates and agitates all potentially dissident groups and even hoodwinks members of the news media.

Our "Vietnam Moratoriums" should have taught us a valuable lesson.

If America persists on its path of self-destruction, no huge army, no \$80 billion-a-year defense budget can save us.

Becoming Our Own Enemies

America — once a peaceful land within its borders — has become a world leader in civil disorders. We largely ignore the cause and treat the effect.

Since August 1965, National Guard troops have been called out 268 times to quell civil disturbances.

This shocking figure was given to us recently by Major General Glen C. Ames, commanding general of the National Guard in the State of California.

Interviewed on *The World Tomorrow* television program, General Ames further stated that if full figures were

MODERN ROMANS

known, it is quite possible that as many troops have been involved in quelling civil disturbances within the United States in the past four years as have been directly confronting the enemy in Vietnam at any one time.

Americans, paradoxically, are becoming their own enemies. The same thing happened in Rome. Writes political science analyst Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé: "By the beginning of the third century, Rome's towns and cities had become unsafe places... The annals of Rome record the increase of riots, some culminating in conflagrations which destroyed whole towns." (*Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, February 9, 1969.)

Other Firsts

America leads or is among the world leaders in the production of pornography, in the manufacture of patently raw, twisted, unbelievably perverted pornographic material. Our movie moguls are striving, it seems, for world supremacy in the production of films with rotten, twisted, perverted sex themes. These are sent abroad as a hideous example of American art form. The latest Hollywood sex "kick" is a spate of movies about wife-swapping.

We lead the world in a maddened search for every type of pleasure and excitement.

Our people have become mentally and physically soft.

Our nation is divided, frustrated and confused. The furor over the recent Vietnam Moratorium vividly shows this.

We no longer have a strong, clearly defined national character.

What Good Character Is

Good character manifests itself in ways that not only benefit an individual but benefit other people and the nation as a whole.

Good character is based on self-sacrifice, on construction and building, on dedication to high national goals and purposes. It's not selfish. It's not

self-seeking. It's not introspective and inward looking.

It is first an outgoing concern for others. But instead we're a nation saying, "Do your own thing," isolate yourself, drift away from the crowd, adopt the philosophy of sitting around, picking a weed, watching the tide go out. As one recent song has it, "sittin' on the dock of the bay, watching the tide roll away."

We are a nation without transcendental, national goals. We're unsure of where we're heading or where we ought to be heading. There's no national purpose to which all people are dedicated and unified as if we were one.

Even the remarkable achievement of planting an American flag on the alien surface of the moon fails to excite us for any length of time.

It wasn't always this way.

We recently glanced at an old American popular magazine published in 1906, 63 years ago. The name of the magazine was *Everybody's Magazine*, long since defunct.

We had the same impression Paul Einzig had when he compared Britain of today with the British people when they were backed against the wall in 1940.

In the pages of that magazine was depicted a nation radically different from the America of today.

It was a nation of purpose and direction. Its foreign policy was vigorous. At the helm of the land was one of the proudest political figures in U.S. history, Teddy Roosevelt.

The lead article in the magazine dealt with the construction of the Panama Canal. The author on an inspection trip to the canal site assured his readers back home that all was going well, that the engineers and other personnel on the project were fired up with ambition to complete the awesome project despite the rigors of the tropics.

The author just knew America would succeed where the French, in an earlier attempt, had failed.

As an aside, the author reported that not only the morale, but the morals of the American contingent was good — except for a notorious few in a certain department whose lives he complained were "a scandal."

Today a scandalous life — if one can believe the polls taken about life on America's college campuses — is considered normal. To be chaste, pure, clean is the exception to the rule.

The author pardoned the excesses of the few scandalous individuals by saying there were loose-living individuals "even in such sanctified communities as San Francisco and New York."

Don't blink. You read that correctly. The author wasn't speaking tongue-in-cheek. San Francisco and New York, at the turn of the century, were considered "sanctified communities" — the center of culture, refinement, the arts, even morality.

How times have changed!

No Will to Fight

Our people seemingly no longer have the will to fight an enemy that is determined to overthrow us.

This fact was again brought home by statements made by Anatoly Kuznetsov, a popular Soviet writer who recently defected while visiting Great Britain.

The 39-year-old author had a close contact with Soviet leaders for several years. As a member of the editorial board of the Soviet magazine *Yunist*, which has a circulation of more than two million, Kuznetsov attended high-level meetings of Kremlin foreign-policy planners.

"The long objective of the foreign policy of the present Soviet leaders is to dominate the world," Kuznetsov told British intelligence officials during one debriefing session. "And they all agree that the U.S. is the only nation that can keep them from achieving this goal in their lifetime."

In high-level discussions of the war in Vietnam, Kuznetsov said Soviet officials stress that it is in the interest of the Soviet Union for the U.S. to become dispirited in Vietnam. They are intent upon breaking the will of the American people to oppose Communist insurgencies elsewhere in the future. The Soviets hope we will retreat from Vietnam — snatching defeat from the jaws of certain victory — and never dare oppose Communist takeover anywhere again.

This is why the growing anti-war

sentiment in the U. S. so interests Kremlin leaders. The Soviet news agency Tass praised the October 15 "War Moratorium" as the "greatest peace manifestation" in U. S. history.

Kuznetsov further confirmed what many U. S. military officers have long contended: that Russia, as the major military supplier of North Vietnam, could end the war tomorrow, if she wanted to, by cutting off supplies to Hanoi. The Soviets recently concluded additional military and economic aid agreements with North Vietnam.

Despite this evidence, a growing number of Americans seemingly dismiss the threat of Communism. Even the documented evidence of Communist influence in certain radical youth organizations causes virtually no alarm or is dismissed as mere propaganda.

PLAIN TRUTH correspondents present at a long "Moratorium Day" rally in Los Angeles were struck with one thing: Despite the impassioned pleas for peace, there was a virtual absence of national consciousness among those who attended the rally. The speeches were all inward directed — "Stop the war, bring the boys home NOW — pull out immediately, regardless of the cost" — the "party line" of Communist infiltrators.

What the cost — the enormous cost — of retreating in the face of the enemy would mean in human lives and to America's image and power in the world was overlooked or considered to be of no importance.

Americans have lost the spirit of a winner. And in a world of competing powers and superpowers, you are either a winner — or a loser.

It remains to be seen whether President Nixon's major policy speech of November 3 will alter the trend of America's national will. The spontaneous, enthusiastic response of the "Silent Majority" was encouraging to Administration officials. But some network newsmen's disgusting attempt to pick the President's address to pieces was surely very encouraging to Communists.

President Nixon warned that if the U. S. pulled out, the world would see a repeat of the blood bath in which 50,000 were cruelly murdered when America's policy of containment allowed


Ho Chi Minh to take over in North Vietnam.

"Softness and Self-Indulgence"

Loyalty and dedication and sacrifice will eventually make a nation more stable and stronger than all the billions upon billions of dollars in foreign aid and government handouts ever given to nations throughout all of history, because true national strength is developed in the character of its people.

Did you ever hear the words of the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who has long since gone the way of all old soldiers along with General Douglas MacArthur?

In his State of the Union message in



U. S. Air Force Photo
American jets over North Vietnam before bombing halt. U. S. has lost 6,000 planes and helicopters at cost of \$6,000,000,000.

January, 1960, former President Eisenhower said:

"A rich nation can for a time without noticeable damage to itself pursue a course of self-indulgence, making its single goal the material ease and comfort of its own citizens. But the enmities it will incur, the isolation into which it will descend, and the internal, moral, and physical softness that will be engendered will in the long term bring it to disaster.

"America did not become great through softness and self-indulgence," he continued. "Her miraculous progress and achievements flow from other qualities far more worthy and substantial. And those were," as he said, "adherence

to principles and methods constant with our religious philosophy, of satisfaction in hard work, the readiness to sacrifice for worthwhile causes, the courage to meet every challenge to our progress, the intellectual honesty and capacity to recognize the true path of our own best interests."

President Eisenhower was looked upon as a man of true substance — a man of certain good character. People could sense it, whether they voted for him or not. And when he died the nation honored him.

Arthur F. Burns, newly appointed chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said recently: "Our problem is not the gross national product which now, incidentally is at an annual rate of over \$900,000,000,000 a year."

But he said, "The quality of life in this country has been deteriorating. Most of us are still hard-working, but a sizeable minority — and I'm afraid a growing minority — has lost faith in our institutions!"

Then he cited the institution of the family — the high divorce and the growing illegitimacy rates. He mentioned loss of faith in churches, schools, colleges and government.

"We seem to have lost a sense of direction," he said. "We seem to have no sense of purpose. That is our problem."

Then he gave an interesting example, a down-to-earth and homespun way of looking at it. "Even in our rural areas you find that many people who could easily do so no longer even grow a vegetable garden."

A simple little observation. But it just shows a lack of pride, a lack of togetherness as a family, even a lack of a once-in-a-while goal for the kids and Mom and Dad — to take a peek every now and then to see how the carrots and rutabagas are doing! No, we don't have those things very much anymore.

Some will insist: "I don't need a garden. I can buy all the vegetables I need." But gardens produce more than vegetables — family togetherness, purpose, character. That is what Mr. Burns was stressing.

"The attitude towards work," he said, "has changed among a great deal

(Continued on page 41)



"Our merchant marine has been allowed to deteriorate. Now there are grave doubts that it is capable of adequate response to emergency security needs. The United States has drifted down from first place to sixth place in the world in the size of its merchant fleet."

—RICHARD M. NIXON—

The Alarming Decline of

The AMERICAN MERCHANT FLEET

WHY is the U. S. merchant fleet deteriorating at such an alarming rate? Why — while the USSR is fast becoming the world's No. 1 sea power? Where is this ominous trend leading? What does it portend for America's future — and for your personal way of life?

by Eugene M. Walter

THE security of America is at stake. President Nixon is alarmed. The reason: the American merchant marine is faltering. Ships flying the American flag carry but a paltry six percent of the U. S. import-export trade!

Even more alarmingly, 66 of the 76 raw materials recognized as strategic must be imported by the U. S. from overseas areas. Only four percent of the total volume of these strategic materials arrive at American ports in American ships. Ninety-six percent arrive in ships flying flags of other nations!

These facts are shocking — frightening!

Not only is America dependent on foreign nations for raw materials, but we are even dependent on the ships of other nations to bring these critical resources to our shores.

The Lifelines of America

For many decades the U. S. produced more raw materials than its growing industrial complex could consume. But

this is no longer true. It is a harsh but unavoidable fact of life that America is no longer self-sufficient. Almost half of the free-world mineral production is channeled to the needs of the American industrial machine.

America today is a nation deficient in raw materials — and dependent upon shipping to bring these materials to her.

Though he probably doesn't give it much thought, the average American is literally surrounded with goods and services which use materials that have been imported by ship. If you are an American, here is a small sampling of the imported materials you use in your everyday life:

The chromite for your toaster's heater element, nearly half of the 38 raw materials in your telephone, the morning coffee, cobalt for quality steel in your car, tin for your toothpaste tube, bauxite to make aluminum for pots and pans, copper and mica for your radio and TV receivers, tungsten for electric light bulbs — and the list goes on and on.

And this is to say nothing of the needs in making American military hardware — the missiles, rockets, jets and other sophisticated weapons of modern warfare.

If the supply of critical imported materials were impeded or stopped, the American economy would be shattered and our industry would grind to a chaotic halt. Our defense posture would be radically altered and our national security would be in jeopardy.

The sea lanes are the very lifelines of America!

Yet the American ships transporting critical materials through these lifelines are pitifully few and shamefully obsolete. Will an inadequate merchant fleet slowly but surely force the nation to turn the control of these lifelines over to others?

A Fleet of "Rustbuckets"

President Nixon has said, "Our merchant marine has been allowed to deteriorate. Now there are grave doubts that it is capable of adequate response to emergency security needs. The United States has drifted down from first place to sixth place in the world in the size of its merchant fleet."

From a fleet of some 5,000 ships totalling 50 million deadweight tons at the end of World War II, the U. S. merchant fleet has deteriorated to about 1,000 ships aggregating less than 15 million deadweight tons.

And even more shocking, some 80 percent of the ships in the American fleet are 25-year-old obsolete "rustbuckets"!

Because of high operating and maintenance costs and the inability to compete against modern, fast, foreign-flag vessels, most of these ships must be scrapped or laid up in the next four or five years.

The American Great Lakes fleet is in even worse shape. The average age of the more than 150 bulk carriers in this fleet exceeds 45 years!

What will happen when almost the

"The United States . . . has sunk to an ignominious position . . ."

EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

entire American merchant fleet becomes *inoperable* in just a few years?

The American shipbuilding program will not supply the need — at least not the way it is going now.

It is a shameful fact that the U. S. — the world's richest nation — now ranks twelfth in the world in the construction of new merchant ships! Even tiny Denmark is ahead of the U. S.

Listen! "The United States, which emerged from World War II as the supreme maritime power, in terms of merchant ships, shipyards, skilled manpower — seagoing and shoreside — has sunk to an ignominious position," states Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America.

The Russians, Meanwhile . . .

But while America has been allowing its merchant fleet to deteriorate, Russia has been striving to become the world's dominant sea power.


Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, said: "In a mere ten years, the Soviet Union with a dedication of purpose, huge outlays of funds, and with priorities equivalent to or even surpassing their space program, has transformed itself from a maritime nonentity to a major sea power."

And again quoting Edwin M. Hood of the Shipbuilders Council of America: "If one were to assess worldwide maritime developments of recent years, the phenomenal growth of Russia's merchant fleet would take top honors as the most notable achievement. And, if one were to designate the greatest maritime calamity of the same period, the dubious award would have to go to the United States — in accurate recognition of the steady decline of the American merchant marine to a third-rate status."

Look at what the Russians have done:

In 1950 the Russian merchant fleet

Privately Owned U. S. Flag Dry Cargo Fleet



U. S. MERCHANT FLEET DETERIORATES — If the present trend continues, in two years little more than one half of today's U. S.-flag dry cargo fleet will be newer than 25 years old.

consisted of only 432 ships (1,000 tons or over) totalling 1.8 million deadweight tons. Most of these vessels were relatively small, slow and old. In fact, the best vessels in this fleet were the 100 or so Libertys, tankers and other ships which the U. S. donated to the USSR as a part of the Lend-Lease Program.

By 1958 the Soviet fleet had doubled to 3.6 million tons. This same year, however, the Russians embarked on an ambitious shipbuilding program. This program has been so successful that by 1970 the Soviet Union will have a merchant fleet of more than 1500 vessels totaling about 14 million deadweight tons. And by 1975, according to the Leningrad Marine Transport Institute, the Soviet fleet will total 18 million tons.

Looking at it another way, between 1950 and 1966 the Soviet Union added 8.6 million deadweight tons and nearly 1,000 vessels to its fleet. During the same period the U. S. active fleet suffered a loss of more than 800 ships of a total 7 million tons. Small wonder the

Russian merchant fleet today outnumbers the active U. S. fleet!

But far more significant than mere numbers alone, about 80 percent of the Russian fleet is less than ten years old. In sharp contrast, some 80 percent of the American merchant fleet is about 25 years old!

In recent years the Russians have been spending between \$600 million and \$750 million annually in building ships. The U. S., on the other hand, has been geared to a program in which the Federal Government spends about \$100 million annually. This is why the Russians have been and are taking delivery of seven or eight ships for every one the U. S. delivers.

But why are the Russians so interested in sea power? What do they hope to gain?

The Lesson of History

Sea power has been important down through the ages. In ancient times the Phoenicians, the Romans, the Greeks and the Vikings — to name a few — built ships to trade with distant lands and to protect an integral part of the economic and defense stature of these ancient nations.

Throughout history, whole societies found their environments sharply altered by rare innovations in ships, naval warfare and commercial marine activities. Then, as now, the vigorous nations flourished, while the complacent fell behind.

The importance of sea power was proved again during World War II when the U. S. built and operated the world's largest merchant fleet and naval fleets and succeeded in gaining full military control of the seas and denying free access of them to the enemy.

The significance of sea power is also illustrated by the fact that Britain's eminence as a world power has diminished almost in direct proportion to her demise as a sea power. On the other hand, the Soviet ascendancy to world power status has been accompanied by a spectacular increase in her naval and maritime strength.

The Russians believe in the historically proved axiom that control of the 70 percent of the earth's surface that

is water is an important means of controlling the 30 percent that is land.

Americans believe in this axiom, too. Admiral David L. McDonald said: "Nations, and ours certainly is no exception, must view strength at sea — or the lack of it — as a large portion of national posture."

President Kennedy observed: "If there is any lesson of the 20th Century, and especially of the past few years, it is that in spite of the advances in space and in the air... this country must still move easily and safely across the seas of the world."

And President Johnson stated: "All through our nation's history the prosperity of our people and their safety have been tied very closely to the role we play on the seas of the world. That is a role we can never wisely or safely neglect."


But today America is neglecting that vital role! The nation gives lip service and says it believes in sea power. But believing and doing are two different things. The Russians don't just believe in sea power — they are actively, vigorously *doing* something about it.

In a report issued by the House Committee on Armed Services less than one year ago, a detailed assessment of the Soviet's sea power development and its significance to the U. S. and the free world was given.

This disquieting report pointed out that "The naval forces now being created by the Soviet Union and the uses of sea power now being made by the USSR are part of the overall Communist design of total victory in the struggle against the United States and other free-world nations."

The report continued: "It is not enough to consider the construction and deployment of warships. The USSR's maritime strategy also involves the build-up of a massive merchant fleet. This merchant fleet makes possible the leap-frogging of Soviet power from the contiguous land masses to countries that are dependent on sea transports, such as Cuba and North Vietnam."

The report emphasized that "to contemplate a loss of U. S. naval supremacy is to contemplate disaster on an epochal scale. The freedom of the United States



Ruiz — Ambassador College
Russian ship unloading in the port of Veracruz. Visitors were not allowed!

and its allies is anchored in control of the oceans... In order to prevent the Soviets from realizing their ambitions at sea, the United States will have to move aggressively in the next few years in a crash build-up of all sea-based strategic forces."

But will the U. S. embark on such a crash program? Or will she lose control of the seas?

An Undeclared War

Admiral John S. McCain, Commander of U. S. Forces in the Pacific, says that the U. S. is presently engaged in an undeclared — but very real — war with the Soviet Union: "It is a war of design and construction, of manpower and national resources, of money, planning and organization — and the signs are that we are losing it."

Those are frightening words — but true!

This undeclared war is not yet directly military. Rather, at this stage it is largely psychological, political and economic.

The psychological impact of seeing the stars and stripes flying above American vessels seemingly everywhere around the world cannot be over-emphasized. But today, ever increasingly, the stars and stripes are being replaced by the hammer and sickle in world ports. The Russian merchant fleet is stealing the show in the Far East, the Near East, the Atlantic, the Pacific and

around the world. The U. S. is losing the psychological part of this undeclared war.

It is also losing this war economically.

Since 1946 about 1,200 large commercial ships (more than 35 million deadweight tons) have been built in foreign shipyards for American companies or their affiliated interests. During the same period, slightly more than 400 ships of less than 8 million deadweight tons were built in U. S. shipyards for American-flag companies.

The purchase of these foreign-made ships has cost the U. S. an estimated total of \$6,000,000,000 in its balance of international payments.

But while U. S. yards were operating at only partial capacity, the Russians were working at full capacity in their shipyards. They have been conserving critically needed foreign exchange. Foreign building was used only to supplement what they could not build at home with production at maximum capacity.

Now that they have a substantial fleet, the Russians are further saving hard currency by transporting some 75 percent of their import-export trade in their own ships. By sorry contrast, the U. S. loses about \$1.5 billion annually as it pays foreign bottoms to transport 94 percent of its import-export trade.

U. S. international trade constitutes roughly one-fourth of the world total. This means that while the U. S. uses one

ship in four in world commerce to carry its goods, it supplies only one ship in forty. And those that are supplied are mostly slow, small and obsolete. This causes a further drain on the dollar—a drain it can ill afford and a drain which can be avoided by having an adequate fleet.

So America is losing the undeclared war economically, too. Will the nation continue in this state of decline until finally defeated militarily as well?

The High Risk of Relying on Others

Here is a striking example of the dangers confronting America by relying on others because of the inadequacy of the U. S. merchant fleet:

"Once again the United States has been reminded that it cannot depend on foreign ships to transport its cargoes.

"This time it was the West German Government which refused to grant permission for one of its merchantmen to transport M-60 tanks to Iran though there was a plea of urgency attached to the request.

"If West Germany, considered one of the United States' staunchest allies, rejects such a request, then the people of this country can rightly ask whether there is anyone other than ourselves on whom we can depend. . . .

"As a result of West Germany's rejection of the request, the tanks ultimately were shipped on two American World War II-built Victory ships and one Norwegian vessel chartered by an American steamship line. All the tanks had to be loaded and discharged by special cranes. And they arrived in Iran more than a month later than they would have on the Wallenfels. . . .

"Undoubtedly Germany had her own reasons for not granting permission," the article continues, "She certainly is entitled to them. But the United States should not be in the position of having to embarrass her friends with such requests because her own merchant fleet is inadequate (not a single heavy lift in it) and, in turn, be embarrassed because of their rejection" (*Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 20, 1967).

What a disgraceful state of affairs!

This same article listed five other incidents involving ships flying the flags of Mexico, Greece, and Britain—the latter with Indian and Chinese crews—which refused to transport U. S. military cargoes to Vietnam.

And this was in 1967! A number of similar incidents have occurred since that time—and will continue to occur.

Right now about one third of the U. S. merchant fleet is involved in carrying supplies to Vietnam. And Vietnam is just a "limited" war. What would happen if another war started in a different part of the world?

Also, American-owned ships flying "flags of convenience" are presently carrying about 40% of oil and bulk commodities. These flags-of-convenience ships (ships registered for economic advantages in other nations and flying their flags) constitute a larger fleet than the U. S. flag fleet. But one must never forget that these are ships of *convenience*. In a real national emergency they might not necessarily deem it "convenient" to carry our goods.

Dependence on the uncertain service of ships not under our flag is a tenuous thread on which to predicate national survival!

How did the U. S. ever manage to get into such a bind? And will the nation be able to get out of it before it is too late?

A Question of National Will

As stated in an interview following this article, the U. S. maritime fleet is in its present sad state because of expedencies—because of taking what temporarily was the easy way out.

Because other more urgent problems demanded national attention, it was easy to neglect the maritime industry.

Further, since building ships in foreign yards costs about half of what it costs to build in U. S. yards, this, too, seemed expedient.

But shipbuilding and shipping are unique. They are among the few national activities in which a direct confrontation occurs between U. S. and foreign wage scales. This is because a ship is its own means of transport, requires no special packaging, etc. These factors make the maritime industry extremely

vulnerable to low-cost foreign competition.

So unless shipping and shipbuilding are embarked upon in a vigorous national program—with high priorities and adequate funds—this industry in the U. S. will continue to lose out to foreign competition.

During the past year the author has visited leading shipyards in England, Italy, Sweden and Germany. A number of shipyards all over the U. S. have also been visited. The American shipbuilding industry is not technologically inferior to that in foreign countries. One new plant on the Gulf Coast—costing \$130 million—will probably be the most efficient and advanced shipyard on earth when it is shortly completed. New techniques of multiple or series construction can help build a new fleet at great savings.

Officials at every American yard which was visited all pointed out that there is no doubt about America's ability to become a maritime leader again.

But there were grave doubts about the national will to do so.


Yet, "Unless greatly enlarged shipbuilding programs are generated in the years immediately ahead, the United States could find itself inferior to the Soviet Union in naval strength, and for all practical purposes could cease to exist as even a fifth-rate maritime nation" (Statement from Shipbuilders Council of America 1968 Yearbook).

In the decades since the close of World War II, more has deteriorated in America than just the merchant marine. Something has also been eroding away in the American character and sense of values. The U. S. is still strong and powerful, but for some reason, the nation seems to have lost the pride in its power. (Our book, *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy* explains why—and where this trend is leading. Ask for your free copy.)

Will America recapture the pride in her power before it is too late? Will she rebuild her merchant fleet?

Or will the U. S. continue to neglect it until the nation has lost control of the seas—and control of its destiny?

"Why is the MERCHANT MARINE so important to the national interest?"



EDWIN M. HOOD

President, Shipbuilders Council
of America

Washington, D. C.

QUESTION: Mr. Hood, what is the present condition of the U. S. merchant fleet?

ANSWER: The American merchant marine is in a deplorable state. This isn't just my opinion, this is the description applied to it by the Maritime Administrator. It is the opinion of a majority of the Congress.

QUESTION: Why is this?

ANSWER: Primarily because ship construction over the past decade has not been equal to the creeping obsolescence of our fleet. About 80 percent of the vessels in the American merchant marine today were built in World War II. So they're 20 years of age and older. Because of other national commitments and budgetary stringencies, there has not been sufficient money appropriated to cover the Government's share in the construction of needed ships to offset this obsolescence.

QUESTION: How does the U. S. presently rank as a shipbuilding nation?

ANSWER: From its position as the world's greatest shipbuilding nation at the end of World War II, the United States has slipped to 12th

Suddenly a new crisis has hit America. Officials have become painfully aware of drastic deterioration in the U. S. merchant fleet. To bring our readers an in-depth report *The PLAIN TRUTH* sent one of its editors to Washington, D. C. for a personal interview with Edwin M. Hood, President, Shipbuilders Council of America.

place in terms of annual output of commercial ship tonnage. Such countries as Denmark, Greece, Norway and Spain, which are not noted for heavy industrial production, exceed the United States in merchant ship construction.

As of mid-1969, American shipyards had 57 large merchant ships totaling 1.4 million gross tons under construction or on order. This tonnage represented less than 3 percent of the world orderbook and relegated our country to 12th place behind the Soviet Union.

It should be mentioned, however, that the United States leads the rest of the world in naval shipbuilding, although Russia is currently challenging our leadership in this field.

QUESTION: Why is the merchant marine so important to the national interest?

ANSWER: The merchant marine is important for several reasons. First, of course, is national security. Another reason is our well-being in terms of national economy. Shipping is a critical item in terms of the persistent balance of international payments problem. Finally, our merchant fleet is a medium by which our trade and commerce—or, if you will, the way a particular philosophy of life—is projected throughout the world.

QUESTION: How does an inadequate merchant marine hurt America in its international balance of payments problem?

ANSWER: In a study made two years ago, it was demonstrated that if all the U. S. trade and commerce that had been carried aboard foreign-flag ships in recent years had instead been carried aboard American-flag ships, there would be no balance of payments problem whatsoever. Shipping is a critical factor, a sensitive factor, in the balance of payments situation.

QUESTION: Would increasing the




Photo: Shipbuilders Council of America

American shipbuilders have the know-how and efficiency to outproduce any in the world. The problem is with the economy and in the nation's faltering will to survive. Photo shows ship hull built upside down and equipment for rotating it so superstructure can be added.

U. S. merchant fleet by purchasing foreign-made vessels help?

ANSWER: This course would constitute a further drain on the balance of payments, though, I suppose, in a period of years after foreign-built ships are operated, under the American flag, they would contribute something to the plus side. But meanwhile they are not helping the imbalance of payments.

QUESTION: Why do some then seem to favor foreign shipbuilding?

ANSWER: Because of expediencies — expediencies that relate to money, primarily. We've been in a budget squeeze — we're still in a budget squeeze — and there's no walking away from the very clear fact that to cure the maritime problem you are going to have to spend money — whether you build ships in this country or abroad. The people who advocate foreign building think that foreign construction minimizes the

overall cost or impact. But when you take into account the balance of payments and other economic factors, shipbuilders don't agree with that view. Remember that you're talking about employment for American citizens when ships are built in the U. S. You're talking about components produced by American companies. This production is diffused throughout the entire United States — throughout the entire American economy. Every State in the Union provides something that goes into the construction of every ship in an American shipyard.

QUESTION: Is there a difference in the quality of American-built ships and, say, Japanese-built ships?

ANSWER: Japanese shipyards — and most foreign yards — build very good ships. The difference, however, between the Japanese-built, foreign-built and U. S.-built ships is primarily in terms of regulatory and specifica-

tion requirements. We must incorporate in U. S.-built ships some 20 to 25 different groups of safety and quality requirements, all of which are cost additive.

QUESTION: How much can foreign builders undercut the American cost of building ships?

ANSWER: The popular statement is that it costs twice as much to build a ship in the U. S. as it does in a foreign shipyard. This is not an absolute statement of fact because all sorts of factors and influences must be considered, not the least of which are the specifications and regulatory requirements mentioned a moment ago. We're talking about roughly 15 to 20 percent of the value of the ship in just those requirements. Then there is the matter of wages. Shipyard wages in this country are roughly four times those of Japan. Productivity of American shipyards is generally superior to that of Japa-

nese shipyards. But to overcome the wage differential alone would require a tremendous amount of improvement in productivity which I don't think is humanly possible.

QUESTION: Why do so many ship operators choose to sail under flags of convenience?

ANSWER: This is not really in my field, but as I understand it, there are some 1200 ships owned by American interests which are registered under the flags of other nations — the flags of convenience. Some of these operate in American foreign trade, others in what is called the offshore trade. The unions have very emphatic views on this subject because registering the ships under foreign flags means decreased employment for American seamen. Interestingly, since the end of World War II, there have been just about 1200 ships built in foreign shipyards for American interests. I would say less than ten of these have been brought under American registry. To do so the owners would have to immediately modify the ships to meet U.S. safety and regulatory requirements, and agree to crewing the ships with American citizens at American wage levels. The lower wages paid to a non-American crew are one of the biggest appeals in flying the flags of convenience.

QUESTION: What are the dangers of these flags of convenience?

ANSWER: The dangers are that we probably can never be sure that these ships will be available for U.S. needs when we need them. There is, of course, the so-called doctrine of effective control. The Pentagon has agreements with some of the owners of these flags of convenience ships that, in the event of emergency, they would be returned immediately to American control. How this might actually work out in a real national crisis is uncertain.

QUESTION: What do you feel it would take to revitalize the American maritime fleet?

ANSWER: This is really an open-ended question. But here's perhaps the best

WORLD MERCHANT FLEET STANDINGS

(BY TONNAGE)

1. LIBERIA
2. NORWAY
3. BRITAIN
4. JAPAN
5. UNITED STATES
6. RUSSIA

SOURCE: FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

way to look at it: We are now carrying roughly six percent (by volume) of our trade and commerce on American-flag ships. President Nixon has indicated that the goal should be 30 percent by sometime in the 1970's. This is a reasonable goal. It is a goal about which none of our allies could quibble because in many instances other maritime countries, including Russia, are carrying 50, 60 and 75 percent of their own trade and commerce on their own ships. Obviously, a jump from six to 30 percent would require a considerable volume of merchant shipbuilding.

QUESTION: What would such an undertaking cost?

ANSWER: That would depend on the type of ships being built. For example, container ships, which are becoming increasingly popular, are costly ships. Likewise when you get into the nuclear area, you're talking about costly ships. In other words, you are talking about costly initial outlays which will produce savings in the ship operations. I would say that a Government support program of \$300 million a year could produce significant improvements.

QUESTION: Three hundred million per year over a period of years?

ANSWER: Right. This much in Federal support is really quite small when you consider the space program, for example. If you look at a list of

subsidy-like programs of the Federal Government you go down the list, and down the list, and what's at the bottom, right above miscellaneous? Merchant ship construction. Yet, ship construction capability shares vital importance to the national interest.

QUESTION: If the money were appropriated for a crash shipbuilding program, would we lack the ability to carry it out? Is our technology behind the other shipbuilding nations?

ANSWER: I don't think so. We have two new yards which will be among the most technically advanced in the world when completed early next year. And nearly every major shipbuilding facility in the country is improving or expanding its capacity, primarily to achieve a better output. Shipbuilding is no different than any other industry or activity. American inventiveness, ingenuity and free enterprise will respond to the market place. Shipbuilders are businessmen. If an enlarged program were enacted, the shipbuilding industry would react as any other industry or business would.

QUESTION: Is there a need for public education concerning the importance of shipping and shipbuilding?

ANSWER: Definitely. In my judgment, the average person knows little about this subject. This is why the Shipbuilders Council of America has just produced a film called "Shipbuilding for the Seventies." We recently showed this film to a group of people in the investment community. We were amazed at their reaction. Even these fairly sophisticated people knew very little about our problems, technology and progress. So there is a great deal that needs to be done by way of public education to show what a maritime industrial base, including shipyards, means to the national economy, the balance of payments, our commercial and military strength on the oceans, etc. Informative articles in the public interest are certainly beneficial in helping to achieve this education.

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

MAJOR STATIONS

East

WOR — New York — 710 kc., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WHN — New York — 1050 kc., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WHAM — Rochester — 1180 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
WWVA — Wheeling, W. Va. — 1170 kc., 98.7 FM, 5 a.m. and 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
*WRKO — Boston — 680 kc., 6:30 a.m. Sun. (WROR 98.5 FM, 8:30 a.m. Sun.)
WBAL — Baltimore — 1090 kc., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
WRVA — Richmond — 1140 kc., 10 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
WPTF — Raleigh, N. C. — 680 kc., 94.7 FM, 1:30 & 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WBT — Charlotte, N. C. — 1110 kc., 8 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:05 p.m. Sun.

Central States

WLAC — Nashville — 1510 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7 p.m. daily, 6:30 a.m. Sun.
WSM — Nashville — 650 kc., 9 p.m. Sun.
WCKY — Cincinnati — 1530 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 5:30 a.m. Sat., 12 midnight Tues.-Sun., 7, 9:30 p.m. Sun.
*WLW — Cincinnati — 700 kc., 7 a.m. and 11 p.m. Sun.
WJJD — Chicago — 1160 kc., 11 a.m. Sun.
*WISN — Milwaukee, Wis. — 1130 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9 a.m. Sun., 97.3 FM, 11 p.m. daily.
KSTP — Minneapolis-St. Paul — 1500 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
KXEL — Waterloo — 1540 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.
KRVN — Lexington, Nebr. — 880 kc., 3 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
KXEN — St. Louis — 1010 kc., 7:15 a.m. & 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. & 4 p.m. Sun.

South

KRLD — Dallas — 1080 kc., 8:10 p.m. daily.
WFAA — Dallas — 820 kc., 10:45 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
KTRH — Houston — 740 kc., 7:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
WOAI — San Antonio — 1200 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:05 p.m. Sun.
KWKH — Shreveport — 1130 kc., 1 p.m. & 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:30 a.m. & 11:30 p.m. Sat., 10:30 a.m. & 9:30 p.m. Sun.
WNOE — New Orleans — 1060 kc., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
KAAY — Little Rock — 1090 kc., 5:15 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WGUN — Atlanta — 1010 kc., 11 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4 p.m. Sun.
WAPI — Birmingham — 1070 kc., 10 a.m. Sun.
WMOO — Mobile — 1550 kc., 7 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
WINQ — Tampa — 1010 kc., 12 noon Mon.-Fri., 12:10 p.m. Sat., Sun.

*Asterisk indicates new station or time change.

KRMG — Tulsa — 740 kc., 10 a.m. Sun.
XEG — 1050 kc., 9:30 p.m. daily. (CST)

Mountain States

KOA — Denver — 850 kc., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
KSWB — Roswell, N. Mex. — 1020 kc., 6:30 a.m. daily.
KSL — Salt Lake City — 1160 kc., 5:30 a.m., 11:15 p.m. daily.
XELO — 800 kc., 8 p.m. daily. (MST)

West Coast

KIRO — Seattle — 710 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
KRAK — Sacramento — 1140 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
KFAX — San Francisco — 1100 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KFI — Los Angeles — 640 kc., 9 p.m. Sun.
KGBS — Los Angeles — 1020 kc., 97.0 FM, 6:05 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
XERB — Lower Calif. — 1090 kc., 7 p.m. daily.

LEADING LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

East

WBMD — Baltimore — 750 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
*WRCP — Philadelphia — 1540 kc., 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
WPIT — Pittsburgh — 730 kc., 101.5 FM, 12 noon Mon.-Fri., 1:30 p.m. Sat., 11 a.m. Sun.
WEDO — Pittsburgh — 810 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WHP — Harrisburg, Pa. — 580 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WSAN — Allentown, Pa. — 1470 kc., 6:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:05 p.m. Sat., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WSCR — Scranton, Pa. — 1320 kc., 12:30 & 6:30 p.m. daily.
WBRE — Wilkes-Barre Pa. — 1340 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:30 p.m. daily.
WCHS — Charleston, W. Va. — 580 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily.
WCAW — Charleston, W. Va. — 680 kc., 12 noon daily.
WVHY — Huntington, W. Va. — 1470 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
WTVR — Richmond, Va. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
WCYB — Bristol, Va. — 690 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WPAQ — Mount Airy, N. C. — 740 kc., 1:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WENC — Fayetteville, N. C. — 940 kc., 98.1 FM, 1 p.m. daily.
WNCT — Greenville, N. C. — 1070 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
WVNJ — Newark, N. J. — 620 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
*WAAT — Trenton, N. J. — 1300 kc., 6 a.m. daily, 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WEVD — New York — 1330 kc., 97.9 FM, 10 p.m. daily.
WBNX — New York — 1380 kc., 9:15 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
WOKO — Albany, N. Y. — 1460 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WIBX — Utica, N. Y. — 950 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.

WWOL — Buffalo, N.Y. — 1120 kc., 4 p.m. Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
WHLD — Niagara Falls, N.Y. — 1270 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
WWNH — Rochester, N. H. — 930 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
WDEV — Waterbury, Vt. — 550 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.
WPOR — Portland, Me. — 1490 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
WCSH — Portland, Me. — 970 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WCOU — Lewiston, Me. — 1240 kc., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
WLBZ — Bangor, Me. — 620 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WRYT — Boston — 950 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12 noon Sun.
WMAS — Springfield, Mass. — 1450 kc., 94.7 FM, 6:30 p.m. Sun.
WACE — Chicopee, Mass. — 730 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WJAR — Providence, R. I. — 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WNLC — New London, Conn. — 1510 kc., 8:30 p.m. Sun.

Central

WSPD — Toledo, Ohio — 1370 kc., 9:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 p.m. Sun.
WERE — Cleveland — 1300 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
WSLR — Akron, Ohio — 1350 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
WFMJ — Youngstown, Ohio — 1390 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
WBNS — Columbus, Ohio — 1460 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
WBRJ — Marietta, Ohio — 910 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WCLU — Cincinnati — 1320 kc., 12 noon daily.
WBCK — Battle Creek, Mich. — 930 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:30 p.m. Sat., Sun.
WKMF — Flint, Mich. — 1470 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WBCM — Bay City, Mich. — 1440 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WDBC — Escanaba, Mich. — 680 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WJPD — Ishpeming, Mich. — 1240 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KWKY — Des Moines, Iowa — 1150 kc., 12:30 p.m., 9:30 p.m. daily.
WMT — Cedar Rapids — 600 kc., 11:30 a.m. Sun.
KMA — Shenandoah, Ia. — 960 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
WOC — Davenport, Ia. — 1420 kc., 10 p.m. daily.
KGLO — Mason City, Ia. — 1300 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
KOZN — Omaha, Nebr. — 660 kc., 12:20 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:30 p.m. Sun.
KMMJ — Grand Island, Nebr. — 750 kc., 4 p.m. daily.
KSOO — Sioux Falls, S. Dak. — 1140 kc., 6:45 p.m. daily.
WNAX — Yankton, S. Dak. — 570 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
KFYR — Bismarck, N. Dak. — 550 kc., 7 p.m. daily.

(Continued on next page)

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

KFGO — Fargo, N. Dak. — 790 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:10 p.m. Sat. & Sun.
 WEAW — Chicago — 1330 kc., 8 a.m. & 12:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun. (105.1 FM, 7 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.)
 WJOL — Joliet, Ill. — 1340 kc., 9:30 p.m. daily.
 WXCL — Peoria — 1350 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
 WITY — Danville, Ill. — 980 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 WWCA — Gary, Ind. — 1270 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 4 p.m. Sun.
 WSBT — South Bend — 960 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
 WJOB — Hammond, Ind. — 1230 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 p.m. Sun.
 WIBC — Indianapolis — 1070 kc., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
 WGBF — Evansville, Ind. — 1280 kc., 6 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 KLIK — Jefferson City, Mo. — 950 kc., 1 p.m. daily.
 KFVS — Cape Girardeau, Mo. — 960 kc., 7 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:15 a.m. & 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 KWTO — Springfield, Mo. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KFEQ — St. Joseph, Mo. — 680 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KUDL — Kansas City, Mo. — 1380 kc., 5:40 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:30 a.m. & 11 p.m. Sun.
 WIBW — Topeka, Kans. — 580 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
 KFH — Wichita, Kans. — 1330 kc., 100.3 FM, 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 KBEA — Mission, Kans. — 1480 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KGGF — Coffeyville, Kans. — 690 kc., 6 p.m. daily.
 KUPK — Garden City, Kans. — 1050 kc., 97.3 FM, 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:15 p.m. Sun.
 KXXX — Colby, Kans. — 790 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:30 a.m. Sun.
 KQRS — Minneapolis — 1440 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 WEBC — Duluth, Minn. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 WIBA — Madison, Wis. — 1310 kc., 7:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 6:05 p.m. Sat., Sun.
 WYLO — Milwaukee, Wis. — 540 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 WNFL — Green Bay — 1440 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5 p.m. Sun.
 WSAU — Wausau, Wis. — 550 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 WCOW — Sparta, Wis. — 1290 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.

South

KEES — Gladewater, Tex. — 1430 kc., 12 noon daily.
 KTBB — Tyler, Tex. — 600 kc., 12 noon daily.
 KLVI — Beaumont, Tex. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KTBC — Austin — 590 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.

KMAC — San Antonio — 630 kc., 7:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
 KCTA — Corpus Christi, Tex. — 1030 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 4:30 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
 KTLU — Rusk, Tex. — 1580 kc., 1 p.m. Sun.
 KMIL — Cameron, Tex. — 1330 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:30 p.m. Sun.
 XEWG — El Paso — 1240 kc., 9 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
 KWEL — Midland, Tex. — 1600 kc., 5:30 p.m. daily.
 KNIT — Abilene, Tex. — 1280 kc., 8:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
 *KFYO — Lubbock, Tex. — 790 kc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4:30 p.m. Sun.
 KGNC — Amarillo — 710 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KCTX — Childress, Tex. — 1500 kc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:15 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
 KWFT — Wichita Falls — 620 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4:30 p.m. Sun.
 KFMJ — Tulsa — 1050 kc., 12 noon daily.
 KBYE — Oklahoma City — 890 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 KSIW — Woodward, Okla. — 1450 kc., 1 p.m. daily.
 KBHS — Hot Springs, Ark. — 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 *WWOM — New Orleans, La. — 600 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
 KWAM — Memphis — 990 kc., 11 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 WMQM — Memphis — 1480 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 1 p.m. Sun.
 WHBQ — Memphis — 560 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
 WFWL — Camden, Tenn. — 1220 kc., 2 p.m. Sun.
 WDEF — Chattanooga — 1370 kc., 92.3 FM, 7:30 p.m. daily.
 WKXV — Knoxville — 900 kc., 12 noon daily.
 WBRC — Birmingham — 960 kc., 106.9 FM, 7:30 p.m. daily.
 WYDE — Birmingham — 850 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 WAAX — Gadsden, Ala. — 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12 noon Sun.
 WCOV — Montgomery — 1170 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 WMEN — Tallahassee — 1330 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 WFLA — Tampa — 970 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
 WINZ — Miami — 940 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 WGBS — Miami — 710 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
 WFAB — Miami — 990 kc., 9 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
 WFIV — Kissimmee, Fla. — 1080 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:30 p.m. Sun.
 WBIX — Jacksonville, Fla. — 1010 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
 WEAS — Savannah, Ga. — 900 kc., 12 noon daily.
 WMGA — Moultrie, Ga. — 1130 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:30 p.m. Sun.

WCSC — Charleston, S. C. — 1390 kc., 7:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 p.m. Sun.
 WKSC — Kershaw, S. C. — 1300 kc., 1:15 p.m. Sun.
 WLAP — Lexington, Ky. — 6:30 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 WKYX — Paducah, Ky. — 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.

Mountain States

KASA — Phoenix — 1540 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
 KTUC — Tucson — 1400 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
 KYUM — Yuma, Ariz. — 560 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
 KCLS — Flagstaff, Ariz. — 600 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
 KGGM — Albuquerque — 610 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KLZ — Denver — 560 kc., 106.7 FM, 7:15 p.m. daily.
 KREX — Grand Junction, Colo. — 920 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
 KTWO — Casper, Wyo. — 1030 kc., 6:05 p.m. daily.
 KMOR — Salt Lake City — 1230 kc., 6:35 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
 KBET — Reno — 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KIDO — Boise, Idaho — 630 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
 KBOI — Boise — 670 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KTFI — Twin Falls, Idaho — 1270 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
 KSEI — Pocatello, Idaho — 930 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
 KMON — Great Falls, Mont. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.
 KOFI — Kalispell, Mont. — 1180 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

West Coast

KHQ — Spokane — 590 kc., 8:05 p.m. daily.
 KEPR — Pasco, Wash. — 610 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KIMA — Yakima, Wash. — 1460 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KVI — Seattle — 570 kc., 8 a.m. Sun.
 KBLE — Seattle — 1050 kc., 12 noon daily.
 KTW — Seattle — 1250 kc., 102.5 FM, 7:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 KMO — Tacoma, Wash. — 1360 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 KARI — Bellingham — 550 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KWJJ — Portland — 1080 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 p.m. Sun.
 KLIQ — Portland — 1290 kc., 92.3 FM, 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 1 p.m. Sun.
 KEX — Portland — 1190 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
 KGAY — Salem — 1430 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
 KUGN — Eugene — 590 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KUMA — Pendleton, Ore. — 1290 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 KYJC — Medford, Ore. — 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

(Continued on next page)

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

KWIN — Ashland, Ore. — 580 kc., 7:30 a.m. daily.
 KAGO — Klamath Falls, Ore. — 1150 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 *KSAY — San Francisco — 1010 kc., 12:05 noon Mon.-Sat., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
 KFRC — San Francisco — 610 kc., 106.1 FM, 7 a.m. Sun.
 KKHI — San Francisco — 1550 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
 KTRT — Truckee, Calif. — 1400 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
 KFIV — Modesto — 1360 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 KTOM — Salinas — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KBIF — Fresno — 900 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 4 p.m. Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 KNGS — Hanford, Calif. — 620 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
 KCHJ — Delano, Calif. — 1010 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
 KGEE — Bakersfield — 1230 kc., 5 p.m. daily.
 KVEC — San Luis Obispo, Calif. — 920 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 KDB — Santa Barbara — 1490 kc., 93.7 FM, 7 p.m. daily.
 *KRKD — Los Angeles — 1150 kc., 96.3 FM, 7 p.m. daily, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 KTYM — Inglewood — 1460 kc., 12 noon Mon.-Fri.
 KFOX — Long Beach — 1280 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:35 p.m. Sun.
 KACE — San Bernardino-Riverside — 1570 kc., 7:05 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
 KCKC — San Bernardino — 1350 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
 KMEN — San Bernardino — 1290 kc., 6 a.m. Sun.
 KOGO — San Diego — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
 XEMO — Tijuana — 860 kc., 6 p.m. daily.
 KALI — Los Angeles — 1430 kc., 4:45 p.m. Sun. (in Spanish).

Alaska & Hawaii

KFQD — Anchorage, Alaska — 750 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 KFRB — Fairbanks — 900 kc., 6 p.m. daily.
 KNDI — Honolulu, Hawaii — 1270 kc., 6 a.m., 6 p.m. daily.
 KTRG — Honolulu, Hawaii — 990 kc., 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12 noon Sun.

CANADA

VOCM — St. John's, Nfld. — 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CJCH — Halifax, N. S. — 920 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 p.m. Sun.
 *CFBC — St. John, N. B. — 930 kc., 8:30 a.m., 98.9 FM, 7 p.m. daily.
 CFMB — Montreal, Que. — 1410 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKOY — Ottawa, Ont. — 1310 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
 CJET — Smith Falls, Ont. — 630 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 *CKWS — Kingston, Ont. — 960 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
 CHEX — Peterborough, Ont. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sat.

CKFH — Toronto, Ont. — 1430 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 CHIN — Toronto, Ont. — 1540 kc., 12:00 p.m. daily.
 CKPC — Brantford, Ont. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 CHLO — St. Thomas, Ont. — 680 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:30 p.m. Sun.
 CHYR — Leamington, Ont. — 5:30 a.m. daily at 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily at 710 kc.
 CFCH — North Bay, Ont. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7 a.m. Sun.
 CKSO — Sudbury, Ont. — 790 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKCY — Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. — 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CJLX — Fort William, Ont. — 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:25 p.m. Sun.
 CKY — Winnipeg, Man. — 580 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7 a.m. Sun.
 CKDM — Dauphin, Man. — 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CKRM — Regina, Sask. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 *CHAB — Moose Jaw, Sask. — 800 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:05 p.m. Sun.
 CJGX — Yorkton, Sask. — 940 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CFQC — Saskatoon, Sask. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 CKBI — Prince Albert, Sask. — 900 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
 CFCW — Camrose, Alta. — 790 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJDV — Drumheller, Alta. — 910 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 CHEC — Lethbridge, Alta. — 1090 kc., AM, 100.9 FM, 9 p.m. daily.
 CKYL — Peace River, Alta. — 610 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJVI — Victoria, B. C. — 900 kc., 8:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
 CKLG — Vancouver, B. C. — 730 kc., 99.3 FM, 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 a.m. Sun. AM, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri. FM.
 CKOK — Penticton, B.C. — 800 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKOO — Oliver, B.C. — 1240 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJAT — Trail, B. C. — 610 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 CHTK — Prince Rupert, B. C. — 560 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 CKTK — Kitimat, B. C. — 1230 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 CFTK — Terrace, B. C. — 590 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.

In French —

CFMB — Montreal — 1410 kc., 5 p.m. Sat., Sun.
 CKJL — St. Jerome, Que. — 900 kc., 10:15 a.m. Sun.
 CKBL — Matane, Que. — 1250 kc., 10:45 a.m. Sat., Sun.
 CJSA — Ste. Agathe des Monts, Que. — 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon., Wed., Fri.

In Italian —

CFMB — Montreal — 1410 kc., 7:45 p.m. Sat.
 CHIN — Toronto — 1540 kc., 4:15 p.m. Sat.

EUROPE

In English —

MANX RADIO — 188 m. (1594 kc.) medium wave, 10:30 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:45, 7:45 p.m. Sun.; 89 mc. VHF 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:45 p.m. Sun.

In Spanish

RADIO ESPAÑA — Madrid — 917 kc., 10:30 p.m. Wed.
 RADIO PANADES — Barcelona — 1106 kc., 7:25 p.m. Fri.
 RADIO MIRAMAR — Porto, Portugal — 782 kc., 10:30 p.m. Sat.

ASIA

Guam

RADIO GUAM — KUAM — 610 kc., 6 p.m. Sun.

Okinaawa

RADIO OKINAWA — KSBK — 880 kc., 12:06 p.m. Sun.

CARIBBEAN AND LATIN AMERICA

In English —

ZBM 1 — Hamilton, Bermuda — 1235 kc., 8 p.m. Sun.
 ZBM 2 — Hamilton, Bermuda — 1340 kc., 2:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
 ZFB 1 — RADIO BERMUDA — 960 kc., 1:30 p.m. daily.
 JAMAICA BROADCASTING — Kingston — 560 kc., 12 midnight daily.
 Mandeville — 620 kc., 12 midnight daily.
 Montego Bay — 700 kc., 12 midnight daily.
 Port Maria (Port Galina) — 750 kc., 12 midnight daily.
 RADIO ANTILLES — Montserrat, W. I. — 930 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 RADIO BARBADOS — Pine Hill, Barbados — 795 kc., 9:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 RADIO REDIFFUSION — Bridgetown, Barbados — 10:20 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 a.m. Sat. & Sun.
 RADIO GUARDIAN, Trinidad — 10 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:15 p.m. Sun.
 GUYANA BROADCASTING SERVICE — Georgetown — 560 kc., 1:30 p.m. Mon.
 RADIO SURINAM — Paramaribo — 725 kc., between 7 and 8:30 p.m. or 10 a.m. and 1 p.m. daily.
 HOC21 — Panama City — 1115 kc.;
 HP5A — Panama City — 1170 kc.;
 HOK — Colon, Panama — 640 kc.;
 HP5K — Colon, Panama — 6005 kc. — 7 p.m. Sun.

In French —

RADIO ANTILLES — Montserrat, W. I. — 930 kc., 8:45 p.m. Mon., Thurs., Sat.
 4VBM — Port au Prince, Haiti — 1430 kc., 7:45 p.m. Wed.
 4VGM — Port au Prince, Haiti — 6165 kc., 7:45 p.m. Wed.
 RADIO CARAIBES — St. Lucia, W. I. — 840 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

For a complete worldwide Radio Log, write the Editor.

What's behind the FUROR over SEX EDUCATION?

Millions are concerned about the latest trend in U. S. education — sex education beginning in kindergarten. Outraged, indignant parents protest. Others approve. What is all the uproar about?

by William F. Dankenbring

AND NOW, sex education has erupted onto the scene. Newer than the New Math, sex education has become one of the hottest, most controversial topics of our day.

In communities throughout the United States, parents have organized to combat modern progressive trends in sex education. They are especially opposed to sex education in primary grades.

Millions of others are confused, perplexed. They wonder, "Isn't sex education a good thing?" "Shouldn't young children learn about sex at school?"

The battle lines have been drawn between the advocates of "the Old Morality" and "the New Morality." Much of the growing concern over sex education comes from the middle class.

It is time we looked at the real answers to today's questions about sex education for children.

Once a Hushed Subject

Years ago, any public discussion of sex was forbidden. Sex was a hush-hush subject. Because of Victorian

HOME INFLUENCE NEEDED

Schools Can't End Sex Delinquency

Sermon on Sex Prove

Psychologist's View

Expert Urges Sex Education In Kindergarten

Girl, 13, Worried: Mother Mixed Up on Facts of Life

WHY THE FUROR OVER SEX EDUCATION

public schools, but urged that all materials used in the teaching of sex be thoroughly monitored at the local level by responsible educators and physicians. A Gallup Poll has reported that 71 per cent of adult Americans favor sex education in the schools.

"Communitistic" sex? Yet taking sides increasingly.

Unlearning all those sex taboos

Sex education in schools is blossoming into controversy that creates deep and often bitter divisions across the nation. Instruction of the young in the facts of life—explicitly and comprehensively—has become more and more widespread in recent years, often as a part of "family life" programs stretching

schools, but urged that all materials used in the teaching of sex be thoroughly monitored at the local level by responsible educators and physicians. A Gallup Poll has reported that 71 per cent of adult Americans favor sex education in the schools.

gml t WOMAN

integral part of the curriculum including planned and sequential program of anti-sex-education rallies have been made to carry out this directive. As many as 700 parents turned out by meetings sponsored by explain sex-education plan of Maryland's county toward installation of instruction on the local and physicians. sorted that 71 ans favor sex et parents are over this ques- school programs unimistic" or Others see sex children from Hills: Mich. mother said: tended a par- showed us the and descried vor of it. The by the ninth the funda-

the local and physicians. sorted that 71 ans favor sex et parents are over this ques- school programs unimistic" or Others see sex children from Hills: Mich. mother said: tended a par- showed us the and descried vor of it. The by the ninth the funda-

Citing the successful suit brought by a Maryland atheist, Mrs. Madalyn Murray O'Hair, to ban prayers in public schools, Weiner said: "We want to get rid of the prayers."

public schools, but urged that all materials used in the teaching of sex be thoroughly monitored at the local level by responsible educators and physicians. A Gallup Poll has reported that 71 per cent of adult Americans favor sex education in the schools. "Communitistic" sex? Yet parents are taking sides increasingly over this question. denounce school programs "communitistic" or

prudery, sex education was taboo. Religious teaching made sex appear a terrible sin — something to be ashamed of, embarrassed about, or guilty of.

Since 1917 a great rebellion has taken place. The pendulum is fast swinging in the opposite direction — to the point where "anything goes."

We live, therefore, in a world of fast-changing moral values. Americans and Britons are far more permissive about morals than they were only a few years ago! Traditional values, "the Old Morality," are being rejected. In moral matters there are two different Americas — the moral conservatives who cling to traditional views of morality; and the moral liberals who endorse the "New Morality."

A large majority of persons over the age of 30 say premarital sex relations are wrong, but adults in their 20's are closely divided in their opinions. In a nationwide Gallup Poll, 68 percent of adults said premarital sex is wrong. When the identical question was put to 1,030 college students, however, 66 percent said sex relations before marriage are not wrong! A similar Gallup survey in Sweden revealed even more liberal attitudes toward sex: 85 percent of Swedes interviewed said that it is not wrong for persons who think they are in love to have intercourse without marriage.

But what does this have to do with "sex education"? A great deal. But first, let's look at the results of the sexual revolution.

Worldwide SEXplosion

Because increasing numbers of young people have rejected the prudish, Victorian attitudes toward sex of the older generation, and are turning to a permissive, "anything goes" type of sexual experimentation, big changes are occurring in society.

First, divorce is rampant. The Harris Poll revealed that divorce is sanctioned today by 72 percent of the American public! Nationwide, one out of three marriages statistically ends in divorce.

A few years ago very few would have condoned sex perversion and homosexuality. Today, a large minority — 30 percent — finds nothing wrong with homosexual acts between consenting

adults! This type of sexual activity is rapidly growing.

Because of the new permissiveness toward sex, venereal disease is skyrocketing faster than any other contagious disease! Venereal disease infects about 900 American teen-agers every day. It infects more American GIs in the Vietnam war than in any war in history. Government estimates of the extent of the disease vary between 1,500,000 and 4,000,000 new cases every year.

Because of the world's sexplosion, unwanted, illegitimate pregnancies are rocketing upward. In 1965 about 300,000 illegitimate babies were born in the United States — one of every 15 births! In the 1970s, it will reach one in ten, if present trends continue. And it would be much higher were it not for abortions — legal or illegal.

But what does this have to do with sex education in the schools?

What the Uproar Is About

The moral changes in the Western world are tied in intimately with the sex education problem. The advocates of massive sex education, beginning in kindergarten and the elementary grades, blame the shocking increases in venereal disease, illegitimacy, and promiscuity on lack of proper sex education. They claim parents — having been brought up with Victorian principles and looking on sex as "hush-hush," and feeling embarrassed to teach it to their children — are all too often ignorant of sex themselves, are not fulfilling their responsibility toward their children, and are unqualified to teach the subject. Therefore, they claim school is the best place for sex to be taught.

The need, they claim, is self-evident. Witness the rising rates of VD and illegitimacy. Since children all too often are not learning about sex at home — since too many parents have abdicated their responsibility — they have generally been learning about sex in the "gutter," from others their own age or a little older. How much better, they say, it would be for children to learn about sex from educators and authorities than "on the street."

And in principle, of course, they have

TELEVISION

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

NEW STATIONS:

*WCAE — St. John, Ind. — Channels 50 and 72, 8 p.m. Wed.

*WGR — Buffalo, N.Y. — Channel 2, 11:30 a.m. Sun.

KWHY — Los Angeles — Channel 22, 8:30 p.m. Sun.

KTLA — Los Angeles — Channel 5, 10:30 p.m. Sun.

KERO — Bakersfield, Calif. — Channel 23, 6 p.m. Sun.

KJEO — Fresno, Calif. — Channel 47, 10:30 p.m. Sat.

KNTV — San Jose, Calif. — Channel 11, 1 p.m. Sun.

*KLTC — Henderson, Nev. — Channel 5, 5:30 p.m. Sun.

KSL — Salt Lake City — Channel 5, 3:30 p.m. Sat.

KHQ — Spokane, Wash. — Channel 6, 12:30 p.m. Sun.

KVOS — Bellingham, Wash. — Channel 12, 3:30 p.m. Sat.

KOIN — Portland, Ore. — Channel 6, 5 p.m. Sun.

*KCND — Pembina, N. Dak. — Channel 12, 5 p.m. Sun.

*KLTV — Tyler, Texas — Channel 7, 5 p.m. Mon., 10:30 p.m. Sun.

KTAL — Texarkana-Shreveport — Channel 6, 4 p.m. Sun.

WSIX — Nashville, Tenn. — Channel 8, 11:30 a.m. Sun.

WTCN — Minneapolis — Channel 11, 10 p.m. Sun.

CFCF — Montreal, Que. — Channel 12, 4 p.m. Sun.

CKMI — Quebec City, Que. — Channel 5, 10:30 p.m. Mon.

CFQC — Saskatoon, Sask. — Channel 8, 12 noon Sun.

CKBI NETWORK — 4 p.m. Sat.

Prince Albert, Sask. — Channel 5.

Alticane, Sask. — Channel 10.

North Battleford, Sask. — Channel 7.

Nipawin, Sask. — Channel 2.

Greenwater, Sask. — Channel 4.

Big River, Sask. — Channel 9.

CFRN NETWORK — 11:30 a.m. Sun.

Edmonton, Alta. — Channel 3.

Whitecourt, Alta. — Channel 12.

Ashmont, Alta. — Channel 12.

CFCN NETWORK — 2 p.m. Sun.

Calgary, Alta. — Channel 4.

Drumheller/Hand Hills, Alta. — Channel 12.

Banff, Alta. — Channel 8.

Brooks, Alta. — Channel 9.

Lake Louise, Alta. — Channel 6.

Lethbridge, Alta. — Channel 13.

Drumheller, Alta. — Channel 10.

Kimberley, B.C. — Channel 3.

Columbia Valley, B.C. — Channel 6.

Jubilee Mt., B.C. — Channel 8.

* Asterisk indicates new station or time change.

a very strong point. Something obviously needs to be done! Letting children learn about sex from other children is not the answer!

If parents had studied the subject themselves and become qualified to teach their children about sex, there would have been no uproar — no need to emphasize sex in the school classroom. But millions of parents don't want this responsibility. They much prefer having schoolteachers handle this touchy matter!

The issue, then, is not sex education as such. Everybody agrees that children need to be taught about sex. The issue is who is going to do the teaching? And from what approach or viewpoint are the children going to be taught? Here is where the great controversy comes in!

Will sex education in school solve the rising problems of venereal disease, illegitimacy, divorce? Will it prepare children to grow to become mature, sound-minded, balanced adults?

Perhaps a glance at Sweden and Denmark will give us the answers.

The Evidence from Sweden and Denmark

Sex education has been compulsory in Swedish schools since 1956. Every child, from age 6 to 16, is taught about sex. What are the results?

Physicians say gonorrhea and syphilis are more widespread in Sweden today than in any other civilized country in the world. A study revealed that about half of all boys who had VD admitted having sexual relations with at least 40 different girls. Ten percent said they had had relations with as many as two hundred!

A recent Swedish study entitled *On Sexual Life in Sweden* concluded that the young people in Sweden are having sex relations with more persons and starting a sex life earlier than their parents.

Ninety-three percent of all Swedes accept sex relations between engaged couples or those "going steady." Ninety-eight percent of the married population had intercourse before marriage. Of women over 30, twenty percent waited until their wedding night

for their first sexual experience; but of those under 30, only nine percent!

An estimated 38 percent of Swedish brides are pregnant at their weddings. One child out of every seven is born outside of marriage!

These are the conditions in Sweden, today. Two conclusions should be obvious: First, sex education in the schools in Sweden has not solved Sweden's morality problems! It has not stopped or curbed either the rate of venereal diseases, nor the numbers of illegitimate children! Second, the kind of sex education adopted in Sweden has had the exact opposite effect! As a result, one hundred and forty Swedish physicians and the King's physician petitioned the government about the "sexual hysteria" in young people, charging that the problem "appears to be a product of modern education in our schools' sex education program"!

Those Swedes who blindly trusted in sex education programs to solve the rising incidence in venereal diseases and promiscuity, and increasing illegitimacy, were gravely mistaken. What went wrong?

Denmark has also had a sex education program in the schools for years. The results have been similar to those in Sweden. One third of brides are pregnant at the altar. Venereal diseases have hit catastrophic proportions. Teen-age marriages are rapidly increasing — several hundred percent in the last decade. Twenty-five percent of pregnancies end in abortion!

Is this the route you want to go? Is this the way you want your children to end up? True, the prudish Victorian "hush-hush" attitude toward sex failed the younger and older generations! But sex education in schools, as practiced in Sweden and Denmark, has equally failed!

Why? What is the answer?

The Causes of the Crisis in Sex Education

The basic problem with sex education, as it is being promoted today, is twofold. What should be taught to what age group? And how?

The general approach by educators is not to advocate promiscuity, as some

seem to believe. It is not to promulgate "free sex." The general approach is to mention all views of sex, and then leave the final decisions up to the students themselves. This approach, though not strictly immoral in outlook, is definitely amoral! It results in skyrocketing social problems.

The question of morality is left up to each individual student.

Proponents of sex education make statements like: "Morals are relative and should consist only of exercising responsibility toward another person." Each young student is left to interpret the word "responsibility" however it suits him! The doors are left wide open for human nature, with its lusts and desires, to express itself without restraint.

The usual approach is not to condemn masturbation or homosexuality, but to "understand" it. This approach does not condemn premarital intercourse or promiscuity — it merely defines them. It mentions what the potential problems of such conduct might be, and then leaves the ultimate decision up to each individual student.

This approach is the root cause of the rising rates of VD, divorce, and all the sexual problems facing people today! It leaves the final choices to young minds, still too immature to have to make such decisions!

Many advocates of sex education have no objection toward premarital sexual experimentation among adolescents. Some, in fact, are in favor of it, "provided consideration is given to the partner"!

This approach, expressed in class, has already led to some serious problems in schools where sex education is being taught. A mother in Phoenix wrote a letter, later printed in the *Phoenix American*, claiming her 12-year-old son was taught a class in sex education. Nine weeks later she caught him sexually molesting their 4-year-old daughter. He told her he was taught about intercourse at school and wanted to "try it out" on his sister.

In the Sarasota, Florida county medical society's journal, Dr. William Campbell Douglass gave the example of one school, where the sex education

teacher "herded her little charges into a darkened room and had them feel each other."

What Is Planned for YOUR Children?

Promoting sex education in the United States is the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, called SIECUS. By 1970 plans are to reach every school in the country. Mary Calderone, the director of SIECUS, desires sex education courses from kindergarten through high school. What kind of education is involved?

According to the program, young elementary pupils would be shown a film of animals in the act of intercourse and finally a man and woman under a sheet as a voice explains, "Mummie and Daddy are doing what the dogs were doing."

A series of colored slides titled *How Babies Are Made* depict paper sculptures of animals, flowers, and human beings in the act of intercourse. While children watch attentively, the narrator uses adult, medical terms to describe what is happening.

As children progress through school, greater detail is used by the teachers to explain about intercourse. Subjects such as dating, petting, premarital relations, homosexuality, and masturbation are discussed in a frank classroom atmosphere.

What is basically wrong with such education? What it advocates seemingly fail to see is how such a program, from kindergarten through high school, taught from a non-moral, clinical approach, focuses the child's mind on sex instead of marital love.

Cramming this kind of knowledge about sex into the minds of little children, causing them to become overly conscious of sex, heightening their interest and curiosity, can create unnecessary anxiety in the child. It can lead to childish experimentation, even arouse sexual excitement in the young child.

Even if the technical information is accurate, forcing it upon children not ready mentally or emotionally to receive it interferes with the development of healthy, normal emotions and intellect.

Children should not be overwhelmed with sex, sex, sex at young impression-

able ages when their normal interest is in fun and games, natural friendships, and simply learning how to be little boys and little girls. To create premature interest in sex in children can eventually twist and warp personality development.

Deliberately arousing a child's curiosity and stimulating his mind to sexual preoccupations is criminal. Take another look at Sweden and Denmark and the rising venereal diseases and morality problems they have experienced. If you believe there is too much venereal disease, now, and too many illegitimate babies, now, the situation would be far worse if unnatural and premature sex education is foisted off on little children all the way from kindergarten to their last school year!

Sex education catapults little children into a field which they are unequipped to properly evaluate. And more tragic, many of the teachers themselves are far from being qualified to teach this subject properly, with discretion and true wisdom!

For teachers to simply teach "the facts of life" is not enough. Straight information, accurate facts, details and statistics, are not enough. Children must be approached properly with this subject. It requires delicate tact, wisdom, and real understanding of human nature! How many teachers, today, really qualify? Very, very few!

Unfortunately, parents too are in the same boat! Most parents are no better equipped to deal with the subject of sex than the teachers. Both, in most cases, are found extremely wanting — lacking.

What is the answer, then?

Right Kind of Sex Education

Certainly, the half-truths, the evasions, the distortions, falsehoods, and deceptions of the Old Morality are not the answer. Ignoring the interest of children, their natural curiosity about where they came from, is wrong. "Putting them off" with bland, inept, meaningless mouthings caused the sex revolution.

Forcing too much sex education upon too young children is having an equally terrible result. Using an academic, clinical, amoral approach can only make sex — which God created beautiful and

clean — an instrument for wrecking marriages, ruining lives, increasing diseases, abortions, illegitimacy and divorce.

The answer, then, comes to this. True sex education — from a God-given moral, factual approach — is vitally necessary, but generally missing in both home and school.

You are responsible for your children and their education. You brought them into the world. They are your responsibility. You need to teach them early the basic facts of life, beginning at home.

As a loving parent, you yourself need to understand sex, its meaning and God-intended purpose — the meaning of marriage, why sex outside of marriage is wrong. You need to study to make yourself qualified to teach your children the truth about where they came from — and, as they grow a little older, why God made us male and female and what sex is all about!

What YOU Should Do

How can you properly fulfill this God-given responsibility?

No doubt this question has crossed your mind, and you desperately want the answer. Here it is — what you have been waiting for!

Ambassador College Graduate School of Theology publishes a vitally important book entitled *God Speaks Out On "The New Morality."* This tremendous book explains the purpose of sex, why we are male and female, the reason for marriage. It gives vital, necessary instruction on the right principles about sex.

In order to teach your children rightly, and to get rid of your own ignorance and false concepts, you need to read this book!


It lays the foundation for true sexual understanding. If you would like to have your own personal free copy, then write to the address on the inside front cover of this magazine. Regrettably we cannot send this book to unmarried minors. But, if you are married, or engaged to be married, or single but over 21 years of age, then be sure to write immediately for your free copy. Unmarried minors can ask their parents to write for it and teach them from it. There has never been a book like it.

EVOLUTION GETS

The HORSE LAUGH!

Did giant draft horses and sleek Thoroughbreds evolve from rabbit-sized ancestors? Neat diagrams in science textbooks say yes. But re-search the details and you find a horse of a different color! Increasingly, scientists are questioning what has been the greatest array of "evidence" ever assembled in favor of evolution.

by Paul W. Kroll



FOR THE last three years, *The PLAIN TRUTH* has published numerous articles examining the traditional proofs of evolution.

Many thousands — teachers, college students, housewives, businessmen, scientists — have written, expressing their gratitude for this exposé of evolution.

Others, understandably, are still skeptical.

Some claim we have only hit the "weak spots" in evolution. Admittedly, they say, evolution does have its multiple weak points. We ought to pick on the "strong points" of the evolution theory, they say.

Almost invariably, they cite the supposed evolution of the horse as a prime example.

Did the Horse Evolve?

The saga of supposed horse evolution is found in countless texts in general science. Teachers pointing to neat, scientific-appearing diagrams tell their students, "Here is a simple, easy-to-understand proof that the modern-day horse evolved from a small, doglike ancestor."

One individual challenged us to take on this "proof" of evolution and attempt to refute it. In this reader's own words:

"I noticed that you perpetually pick on the areas of the evolutionary scheme that are weak. Weak spots do not make a thing wrong. Weak spots indicate a lack of time for drawing evidences. Why don't you pick on some of the well-proven parts of evolution. *The evolution of the horse, for example.* Every good encyclopedia in the world has that in it. Would they print false information in research books?"

This letter illustrates again how much FAITH people have in science. It seemed unbelievable to this person that any untruths could appear in "research books." But research books are not the words of divinity, but the notions of men. And they have contained, in the past, everything from the Piltdown Man hoax to the supposition that mice leapt into being spontaneously from piles of rotten rags.

Unfortunately, there are very few scientists who agree among themselves, and there exist almost as many ideas in the evolutionary patchwork of guesses as there

are individual scientists to postulate them.

But let's get to the point — and not horse around about it.

What CAN Evolution Explain?

We might, of course, ask *how many* weak points are allowed for a theory? Evolution cannot explain the origin of the universe, the origin of matter, the origin of life. Those are more than just weak spots — they are patently obvious flaws.

Evolutionists admit they have no proof for the origin of plants, insects, mammals in the fossil record. In fact, the fossil record, they admit, is weakest in the most crucial points! Since fossils can give the only *tangible* "proof" for evolution, that is also a mammoth flaw.

Evolutionists cannot explain the intricate *design* found among all living things. The complex interrelationship of life leaves them without an answer. These are also gaping holes in the theory.

We might, in fact, ask, "What strong points — if any — are there in the theory of evolution?"

Some evolutionists would immediately point to the evolution of the horse. Here at last, they say, is tangible proof from the fossil record that evolution did occur.

Is the supposed evolution of the horse scientific truth?

You will see.

The All-Important Fossil Record

Look in any textbook on geology or paleontology. You find each contains some statement as:

"The most direct sort of evidence on the truth of evolution must, after all, be provided by the fossil record" (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, pp. 220, 221).

Here, then, is where evolutionists stand and fight. And they have chosen the horse as their most mighty weapon! The question is: Will the idea of horse evolution stand up under the cold, hard light of close scrutiny?

For over one hundred years, paleontologists have been amassing fossils, trying to patch together a genealogy for the horse.

It all really began about 1859 when Charles Darwin published his book,

The Origin of Species. Paleontologists rushed to the fields searching for fossils. With bones of many animals in hand, they began to construct various sequences purporting to show how a particular animal might have evolved from some other form.

Their greatest "success" came in putting together sequences of bones to make up the evolution of the horse story. By 1900 the tale was complete. Only minor details have been filled in since then.

A Classroom Tool

This supposed horse sequence is still the best tool evolutionists have to convince others that evolution is a fact.

Simpson candidly tells us:

"The beautiful series of ancient and modern horses displayed in many museums are still the simplest way to convince any open-minded person that evolution is a fact. You can see it with your own eyes." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, p. xxxiii.)

You are confidently informed that fossils of an animal called eohippus (e-o-hip'-us) gradually changed his teeth, lost three toes and grew in stature to become the horse of today.

The average high school or college student is told without hesitation that this is an incontrovertible fact. He is not encouraged to research for himself to find whether the supposed evolution, in fact, did occur. What dozens of paleontologists have put together over a span of one hundred years surely could not be wrong.

Or could it?

Can Scientists Be Wrong?

Is it possible then, that the paleontological facts which have been unearthed with spade, shovel and scratcher — were wrongly interpreted?

In this article we challenge the interpretation of the facts, not the facts themselves. We quote the admissions of the scientists themselves. Every quote in every article is from a leading scientist respected by his colleagues.

Our articles are merely a commentary on their admissions of where the theory is unproven. And, when you amass all the information, shockingly you find — the theory of evolution is unproved everywhere!

In most cases, the scientists themselves do not realize the significance of the admissions they make. With this in mind, let's delve into the horse story and see what the paleontologists do admit.

Under Grave Suspicion?

Reading through a book on mammals by a well-known scientist, one is shocked to read that some scientists doubt the neat picture of the horse story.

"The origin of the horse was until recently thought to be better known than that of any other mammal; this was based on a series of complete fossil skeletons of dozens of different extinct creatures, starting with simple animals of the size and shape of small dogs with five fingers and four toes, and ending with the modern Thoroughbred.

"However, this pleasantly neat evolutionary picture of orderly progression in tooth structure, loss of toes, increase in size, and wrist and ankle elongation has now unfortunately come under grave suspicion.

"So many side-branches have been brought to light, so many intermediary forms are completely lacking that we can now only say that the classic description is no more than a guide to the probable steps by which the modern horse evolved." (*Mammals of the World*, Ivan T. Sanderson, p. 222.)

What is this?

The simplistic idea of horse evolution under grave suspicion? Too many intermediary or transitional forms completely lacking? Too many "side-branches"?

Only a "guide" to the probable steps?

George G. Simpson, well-known paleontologist, reveals other problems with the horse history chart so blithely reproduced in the average textbook.

Picky Paleontologists

His admission is shocking:

"Earlier students usually pointed to the evolution of the horse as a typical example of orthogenesis [straight-line, constant evolution] and the best proof of that theory. It is now seen that this was a serious mistake, a mistake caused




Photo courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

WAS THIS A HORSE? — Artist's concept of eohippus — claimed to be a horse ancestor. Notice what appears to be horse-like head. See article for admissions by paleontologists that skeletal remains demonstrate eohippus was not a "hippus" — did not have a horse-like head.

in part by inadequate evidence and in still larger part by superficial and erroneous methods of study.

"Some students of evolution who were not really well acquainted with the whole picture of horse evolution simply picked out parts of it that seemed to fit an orthogenetic interpretation, and their false conclusions were accepted and endlessly repeated by others who knew still less about these subjects . . . There was, for instance, no constant and overall increase in size . . . The feet did not steadily change from four toes to three and then to one . . . And so it goes for all the changes that have occurred in the history of the family; not one of them shows the constant, guided change in a single direction that is demanded by the theory of orthogenesis." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, pp. 270, 271.)

Scientists picked out parts that made the theory appear right? False conclusions accepted and repeated by

others? No steady changes in one direction?

The Facts

If the theory of evolution is so logical, so capable of explaining everything — how did such mistakes occur?

Simpson admits there is no proof that the toes steadily changed from four to three (what happened to two?) to one. Paleontologists have no neatly linked transitional creatures. If evolution were a fact, one should see a neat progression — with all intermediate steps logically following each other. But one simply doesn't — not even among the supposed star proof of evolution — our maligned horse.

Simpson is not the only paleontologist who discusses this problem. Another well-known scientist frankly tells us:

"The horses are often cited as an outstanding example of 'straight-line evolution' or of 'orthogenesis,' and it is frequently maintained that these animals

evolved with little deviation, along a straight-line path from the little Eocene *Hyracotherium* or eohippus to the modern horse, *Equus* . . .

"When all fossils are taken into account the history of horses in North America is seen to be anything but a simple progression along a single line of development." (*Evolution of the Vertebrates*, Edwin S. Colbert, pp. 360, 361.)

When you take all the fossils into account, there is, in fact, no evidence of evolution. Paleontologists — in spite of denials — still take the bones that seem to fit their theory.

Of course, many questions can be raised. If a five-toed ancestor is "primitive" and a one-toed horse is "progressive" — where does man fit? Man has five toes on each foot, not one. Is man to be considered "primitive"? Evolutionists don't usually consider such "problems."

Some scientists were candid enough

to face the problems. They did not, of course, renounce evolution — but they at least had the candor to admit there were problems.

To Count or Not To Count

Regarding the supposed reduction of toes, one of the proofs given of horse evolution, Simpson admitted:

"Regarding the feet, the old idea of a steady, uninterrupted reduction in number of toes is, as has lately become clear, not only over-simplified but also *ESSENTIALLY FALSE*... simply counting the toes gives hardly any idea of what was really going on in regard to the functioning foot in the living animals." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, p. 256.)

But "counting the toes" is crucial to the idea of horse evolution. The concept of toe reduction and tooth changes are the *two major proofs* cited for horse evolution. If these are not true, the theory has little by which to defend itself.

A Pony Tale

Let's take the supposed genealogy of the horse step by step. Let's scrutinize each step and see if indeed evolution has occurred.

The story of how the horse genealogy was built up is an intriguing one. It goes back to the year 1838. Before this time there were no known bones of such an animal called eohippus. But in that year a discovery of bones was made which took its place at the beginning of the supposed genealogy of the horse.

In 1838, William Colchester, an English brickmaster, was digging in the clay banks of the river Deben. He dug so deep that his shovel hit sand. In a shovelfull of sand he noticed what looked like an old tooth.

In the next year another Englishman, William Richardson, was rummaging around a place called Studd Hill on the coast of Kent. He found a large part of an ancient skull — with most of the teeth well preserved.

These have been called the first "horse" fossils discovered. But did they really look like horses? Let's take them at face value — without interpretation. Here is one plain admission.

"No one even suspected at that time these were ancestral horses. How could

they? The specimens found by Colchester and Richardson had almost no special resemblance to the living horse.

"The teeth, instead of the great, ridged, grinding prisms of our present horse, were small, low, and cusped, really more like monkey teeth than horse teeth. The little skull... looked [as its first describer, Richard Owen, remarked] rather like 'that of the *Hare* or other timid Rodentia.'

"From the evidence then available, it would have been most unscientific to jump to the conclusion that this queer little beast was a sort of a horse. Owen named it *Hyracotherium* [Hie-ra-co-thee'-ri-um]. (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, p. 114.)

Calling a Hare a Horse

Aha! Then eohippus is not a hippus (horse)! Its bones look like a hare or one of the scientific family of Rodentia (such as squirrels, beavers, and porcupines). Perhaps like a modern hyrax, or even the Biblical "coney," sometimes confused with a rabbit.

Simpson admits it would have been *unscientific* to claim this beast was a horse. Then what possible reason would you have for calling it a horse? It didn't look like a horse — different teeth, different skull, different body, different feet!

George Gaylord Simpson explains why paleontologists later called this UN-horselike fossil a horse.

"Owen compared the small Eocene mammal with the hyraxes... which, indeed, it resembles more than it does the recent horses... When, much later, similar fossils were found in the Eocene of North America, the principle of evolution had been well established.

"Professor Marsh [eminent 19th century paleontologist] was therefore able to recognize that these fossils were horse ancestors, and he coined for them the apt and euphonious name Eohippus, 'dawn horse,' referring also to the fact that they occur in the Eocene, 'dawn of the recent,' epoch." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, pp. 147, 148, 149.)

Instead of taking the bones at face value, as Owen did, Marsh interpreted the bones according to the theory of evolution. He forced the facts to fit the theory.

As Simpson admitted in an article appearing some years ago in the magazine *Natural History*, "The description of Owen would not seem amiss if our mental image of *Hyracotherium* were not so colored by later knowledge [?] that it was ancestral to the horse." ("Resurrection of the Dawn Horse," George Gaylord Simpson, *Natural History*, November, 1940.)

Any paleontologist wanting to preserve his professional status would never have considered *Hyracotherium* or Eohippus a horse in 1839. They all called it exactly what it was.

"When in 1839 part of a skull was found... in London clays, even the most eminent paleontologists of the day little suspected that the 'Eohippus' belonged to the horse family... in fact Sir Richard Owen named its genus *Hyracotherium*... when he compared it with conies (hyrax), pigs and rodents." (*Time, Life and Man*, R. A. Stirton, p. 465.)

Eohippus After Evolution

Even as late as 1872 — some 13 years after Darwin published his ideas on evolution — we find the American evolutionary paleontologist, E. D. Cope, still thinking eohippus fossils were what they looked like, not what an evolutionist arbitrarily claimed them to be.

Cope found a fragment of a lower jaw and one tooth at Evanstown, Wyoming in 1872. "Cope was no more able to deduce its horse relationships from this fragment than Owen could from similar fragments found in Suffolk... Cope also at first confused some of the teeth of dawn-horses [which they are not] and those of monkey-like animals." ("Resurrection of the Dawn Horse," George Gaylord Simpson, *Natural History*, November, 1940.)

Then why were these innocent, rabbit-like bones dumped into the horse family? Let Professor Simpson answer:

"The theory of evolution was soon [after 1859] accepted by practically all scientists.

"With the firm establishment of this theory, students of fossils, that is, paleontologists, naturally began to look around to see whether they could not,





Photo courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History



EOHIPPIUS



EQUUS

A FAMILY AFFAIR — Top photo shows skeleton of modern horse alongside reconstruction of its supposed ancestor, eohippus. Paleontologists admit there is no reason to connect eohippus with the horse family — as even the above comparison indicates. Below, four-toed eohippus compared with one-toed horse. Both are distinct mammals with no relationship to each other except in name.

by *comparing ancient animals* of different ages, find the ancestors of living animals." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, p. 115.)

What Was Eohippus?

It's time we cut through the confusion. Let's understand what eohippus was not and what he WAS. The work, in fact, has already been done for us. Scientists simply haven't understood the import of what they say.

Note the following which clearly tells us what eohippus was:

"The first discovery, made in Europe, was called *Hyracotherium* [same as eohippus] because of a superficial resemblance to the Old World cony, or HYRAX... some species were 10 inches high at the shoulder, weighed 8 or 9 pounds, and compared with an alley cat in build. Others were 20 inches high and weighed about four times as much. All had arched, flexible backs and high hindquarters, which gave the beasts an almost *rabbitlike appearance*." (*The Fossil Book*, Carroll Lane Fenton and Mildred Adams Fenton, p. 417.)

There is your answer! The bones called "eohippus" are similar to those of an Old World hyrax, often confused with the coney. Although to make a positive assertion today that eohippus was a type of hyrax would be looked upon as foolish.

But to call eohippus a "horse" is absolutely ridiculous. It has no connection with the horse family. Its looks prove it was not an ancestor of the horse.

No Need for Eohippus to Evolve

Besides, why should "eohippus" evolve? He was a creature *perfectly made* to fit in his own environmental niche.

A leading paleontologist admits this to be true:

"Eohippus was NOT an imperfect model that needed to have the teeth, feet and other parts rebuilt to make it into *Equus*. Eohippus was a *going concern on its own*, a well-adapted animal that got along very well in its own world and following its own habits." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, p. 230.)

If eohippus got along well in the

world, why did he have to evolve? If you claim he DID evolve, why are there little creatures alive *today* which so closely resemble eohippus?

Evolution cannot answer.

This forest-dwelling browser's brain didn't even resemble a horse's brain. One authority admits: "Another MOST UNHORSELIKE characteristic of *Hyracotherium* was its brain." (*Introduction to Evolution*, Paul Amos Moody, p. 203.)

But in spite of no obvious relationship, evolutionists tried to make eohippus look like a horse. They were determined to have their own way.

This little bit of hanky-panky is commented on by Simpson:

"Proportions [for eohippus] are so different from *Equus* that the head of eohippus, *WHEN CORRECTLY RESTORED*, does not look like a small horse's head. The snout does taper slightly and suggest the beginning of a muzzle, but at this stage the development is so slight that we should not notice it particularly *if we did not know what was to come later*. The brain was small and its structure was so primitive that it suggests the most primitive mammal brains, or even the brain of a reptile, more than it does that of the living horse." (*Horses*, George Gaylord Simpson, pp. 152, 153.)

The head DID NOT look like a small horse's head. But scientists, desperately wanting evolution to be true, drew eohippus' head to look like a horse's head!

What kind of science is this?

Done in the Name of Science

Why scientists did this is clear. Assuming that "what was to come later" was *evolution*, evolutionists imagined that eohippus fulfilled their analogy. Hence, he was the "primitive" ancestor of the horse!

A small example of how scientists tried to make rabbit-like eohippus look like a horse was not discovered until 1956.

"The scapula [shoulder blade] of *Hyracotherium* has usually been restored to resemble that of later horses... In the collection of the California Institute of Technology are a partial skull and nearly complete post-cranial skeleton

from the Gray Bull beds of the Big Horn Basin of Wyoming.

"Both scapulae [shoulder blades] are virtually complete and are to my knowledge the *only ones* in existence with the blade intact. I have examined casts of both scapulae. *They are far more dog-like than horse-like*... the areas of muscle insertion on the medial side of the scapula are as nearly as can be determined from the cast, *ALMOST EXACTLY* as they are in *Canis*." (*American Hyracotherium*, David B. Kitts, 1956, p. 21.)

So artists were guilty of *stylizing their drawings* to force eohippus to fit into the evolutionary theory. What we have are tacit admissions by evolutionists that the neat artists' concepts you see in your science textbooks are NOT ACCURATE.

Scientist Theodosius Dobzhansky states without hesitation:

"Many textbooks and popular accounts of biology represent the evolution of the horse family as starting with eohippus and progressing in a direct line towards the modern horse, *Equus*... according to Simpson, *this over-simplification really amounts to a FALSIFICATION*" (Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Evolution, Genetics, and Man*, p. 302).

Did you grasp that? Here an *eminent scientist quotes another eminent scientist*. He tells us that what teachers and college science students read about this subject in their science textbooks is an "over-simplification" — "a falsification"!

Well, it looks like poor eohippus has been rather widely misrepresented. If the animal were alive and could think, he would literally turn over in his grave.

Eohippus and the Hyrax

When you *carefully examine* the record IN DETAIL some startling parallels between eohippus and the hyrax become evident:

One writer says this of eohippus:

"The grinding teeth [of eohippus], which had low crowns, were fit only for eating *SOFT LEAVES AND PULPY FRUITS*, the front feet had four toes, each with a hoof; the hind feet possessed only three" (C. L. Fenton, *The Fossil Book*, p. 418).

Then compare this with a description

of the modern hyrax, which some have confused with the cud-chewing coney of the Bible:

"A small group of plantigrade-Herbivorous ungulates with HOOFS . . . FOUR TOES ON THE ANTERIOR [FRONT] limbs and three toes on the posterior [hind] limbs!" (L. A. Adams, *Introduction to the Vertebrates*, p. 44.)

How clear from the characteristics given!

The "horse ancestor" was not a horse at all. It was an animal *very similar* to the hyrax. Both were herbivorous — feeding on plants, soft leaves and pulpy fruits!

Notice also that *both eohippus* and the modern hyrax had four toes on their front limbs — and three on the hind limbs!

There are *many other* likenesses that prove the fossils to be of the same family as the hyrax and not the horse!

"In size these animals [hyrax and coney] may be compared roughly to rabbits and hares, and they have rodent-like habits of *hunching* up their backs" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, vol. 14, art. "Hyracoidea").

Both the modern hyrax and the eohippus fossil are "rabbit-like." Both hunch up their backs — another *obvious similarity*.

Both Had Dog-Like Pads

Hyraxes, like conies, are rock-dwelling animals (see Psalm 104:18; Prov. 30:26). They have pad-like feet to insure a stable under-footing in such rugged country.

"The hyracoidea [hyrax family], a group of small, hoofed mammals, including the Biblical coney . . . climb easily, clinging even to almost vertical surfaces with the PADS ON THEIR FEET" (*Encyclopedia Americana*, art. "Hyracoidea").

"The feet are completely distinctive, being four toes on the front feet, three on the hind . . . a *single* pad makes up the bottom of each foot" (Edwin Colbert, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, p. 403).

Now compare the modern hyrax — described above — with the assumed ancestor of the horse. You will find the *same characteristics* present in eohippus:

"Most of the weight was carried by DOGLIKE PADS on the soles of the feet, not by the hoofs" (C. L. Fenton, *The Fossil Book*, p. 418). Of course, scientists cannot absolutely tell from the skeletons whether the foot had one single pad like the hyrax or one for each toe like the dog.

Again, from another author, the same fact is admitted:

"Though there were little hoofs . . . most of the weight was borne on CUSHIONED PADS back of the hoof" (R. A. Stirton, *Time, Life and Man*, p. 468).

Continued Next Time

That does it! Eohippus is a *fossil type* similar to the *living* hyrax — not the horse.

In other words, modern evolutionists gave a *wrong name* to *hyrax-like fossils* they found in certain rock strata. They should never have been called "eohippus."

The evidence presented in this article has only been a small portion of what is available. In a coming installment, we will see if the next stage of supposed horse evolution, called *Mesohippus*, can stand up under the cold light of hard fact.

As is already abundantly clear, the "strong proof" of evolution, the horse, gives evolution the horse laugh.

It's time we take stock of the theories of men. Just because a theory is published in an expensive volume and endorsed by the scientific community DOES NOT necessarily make it so. It's time we opened our eyes and our minds to think for ourselves.

Have you ever stopped to think that perhaps God DOES exist? That the myriad creatures, the vast universe, the interdependent life cycles on this earth are the product of this Creator God? You need to look into this important question. You *can find out* by writing for our booklet, *Does God Exist?* Also, you can find out why this universe is here by writing for our highly illustrated brochure, *Our Awesome Universe*.

You can receive this educational literature FREE. It is sent in the public interest. You can obtain your copies by simply writing to the address nearest you, found in our staff box on the inside front cover.

EDITOR'S ANNOUNCEMENT

Many enthusiastic readers have requested us to send prepaid subscriptions to one or more others, supplying us with names and addresses.

They feel, of course, that these others would be as interested in this magazine as they themselves are.

And we agree that these others ought to be. But it is simply human nature to resent having something forced on one that he has not himself requested.

Naturally, we have wanted to accommodate our subscribers who would like to have their friends receive *The PLAIN TRUTH*. But in doing so we have received many letters from recipients, resenting having it forced on them. Too often these friends of our subscribers refuse even to open the magazine to see what it is. Sometimes they take offense, throw it into the waste basket unopened, and write us a not-too-friendly letter.

Now we don't want to offend either our subscribers who want their friends to read this publication — or their friends who do not realize what this magazine is like.

It is not our policy to try to "cram truth or understanding down anyone's throat." We sincerely want to SERVE — to HELP — without causing offense to any.

Of course, if you assure us that you know your friend or friends DO, themselves, want the subscription and have asked you to request it for them, we shall be most happy to oblige.

Otherwise, we feel it obligatory to announce the policy that we cannot send sample copies or prepaid subscriptions to any, except those who request it for themselves. Instead, therefore, of sending in names and addresses, requesting that they be added to the subscription list, why not show your friends your copy of this magazine, and ask them to send in their own subscriptions? That way, no one is offended. THANKS!

News of a supposed "Worldwide Food Glut" has made headlines. Some think the danger of a population explosion is past! Others say the population bomb is still relentlessly ticking away. Is the world on the way to self-sufficiency? The answer is in this article.

"FOOD GLUT"-or

by William F. Dankenbring and Gary Alexander

"THERE is no starvation in India at all," announced the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung. "There is no such thing as starvation in India," he continued. "Scarcity is an old-fashioned word because of our agricultural progress."

Ambassador Jung said his country expects to be self-sufficient in food production within a maximum of three years and to be exporting grain within five years.

Journalists who follow Ambassador Jung's thinking speak of a "global food glut" and "soaring surpluses."

A Different Story

At the same time, equally important officials of the Indian government say the opposite:

India's President Dr. Zakir Husain said, "I would like to caution against too much talk of an agricultural revolution. We are not free from the vagaries of monsoons. There are too many imponderables."

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reported in 1968 that "it would be a mistake . . . to jump to the conclusion that the world's food problem has been solved, either temporarily or permanently."

Why the controversy?

It is time we looked at the facts!

The 1969 Wheat Crop

When scientists speak of the "food glut" they refer mainly to grain crops, and most commonly wheat, corn, and rice. Corn, or maize, is largely fed to livestock. Rice is usually consumed in the country where it is grown. So it is wheat that is usually the focal point of trade and commerce of food.

In 1967, 1968, and 1969, wheat crops were very good, especially in Western nations. The wheat crops of 1969 were very high in the United States, Russia, Australia, and Canada,

but low in South America (especially the key nation of Argentina), in Asia, and Africa.

Asia's crop dropped by a million tons. Africa's crop increased slightly but produced only one-fourteenth as much as the Soviet Union alone! (These production statistics come from the FAO. They refer to 1969 spring harvest and the 1968 fall harvest.)

The worldwide total for 1968-69 was an increase of 13 percent in wheat. According to early reports, the 1969 fall harvest of wheat is down only 7 percent from the 1968 fall total (*Journal of Commerce*, August 5, 1969).

Thus we can look upon 1968-69 as a very good year for wheat. Maize and "miracle-rice" also had good years of production. This is very good news. But unfortunately, the good news ends here. The problem is that the "food glut" is not getting to the mouths of starving Africans, Asians, and South Americans.

There are six problems generated by the "Global Food Glut."

I. The "Food Glut" Causes Price Wars

Almost by definition, the food glut is a price war. Over-supply pushes food prices downward so that farmers cannot sell at a profit. Producing nations are locked in a price war, as they fight to get rid of their one-year over-supply.

For instance, wheat price per bushel has descended from \$1.83 in 1967 to about \$1.50 in 1969 in the United States. Some grades of wheat in the U. S. Southwest are bringing only \$1.20. This cuts the farmer's profit margin to very little or nothing. The farmer then pushes for government support of the price. Most governments cannot afford this, and underdeveloped countries are not rich enough to buy at even the low price. Thus the farmers or governments hold on to the wheat and hope that the glut will go away the next year.

Meanwhile the wheat sits idly in storage. And while the food lies in storage, mildew, rats, and other infestations

Famine?

ruin one pound in every five. While the rats get fat, Asians and Africans starve. This brings us to problem number two.

II. "Food Glut" Isn't Feeding the Hungry

In all the plethora of articles on the food glut, you'll never read one about the "glutted" nations feeding the starving nations. The United States is the main country which has shipped a large tonnage of surplus to the hungry at low prices. And even that has declined recently.

The food is going to storage, while thousands starve. As one newspaper headline said, "*Too Much Wheat* — but Many Millions are Going Hungry."

Canada and Australia have surpluses, but they don't usually have large tonnages of surplus to sell at a loss or give away.

Russia, who grows more wheat than all North America, South America, Africa, and Australia combined, could easily feed India. Their surplus could feed the equivalent of three loaves of bread every week to every Indian — but they don't.

If nations can't get their profit, they'll keep the wheat. Meanwhile, very few Asians and Africans are being glutted by the "Food Glut."

III. STARCH, not PROTEIN

The constant reference to food surpluses usually dwells on wheat, corn, and rice. What most people don't realize is that the average Indian eats more calories of grain per day than the average American! Unfortunately, most of it is rice.

Proteins are a different story. According to the U.N. F.A.O. *Production Yearbook*, the average Indian eats 6 calories of meat per day, while the average American eats 600! The same Indian eats 1 calorie of eggs and 4 calories of fish, while the same American eats 70 and 25 calories, respectively. An American drinks three glasses of milk (about 400 calories) to the Indian's half-a-glass (about 80 calories) each day.

Thus, the American's animal protein intake is 1000%



Wide World Photo

While the "have" nations endure a "food glut," millions starve in "have not" nations.



Wide World Photo

If nations can't get their profit, they'll keep the wheat... Very few Asians and Africans are being glutted by the "food glut."

to 1200% greater than the Indian's. The average Indian consumes 6 pounds of meat a *year*, while many Americans eat that much in a *week*.

Grains make up 60 percent of the Indian diet (1150 calories), while they make up only 20 percent of the American diet (650 calories). Thus, even if the grain glut reached Asia, it would help their nutritional level very little; the starving millions need more complete proteins available only through meat or animal products.

It is easy to say India leads the world in livestock population. It is easy to say that the Indian Ocean is one of the richest fishing grounds in the world. But it is not easy to convince an Indian to alter his sincere religious beliefs to tap these protein-rich sources.

IV. Crops Depend Heavily on WEATHER

The bumper crops of the last three years are unanimously attributed to exceptional weather: "The increase in food production [in 1968] was largely due to good weather." (*The Daily Telegraph*, September 13, 1968.)

"A major reason for the glut is bumper crops resulting from good

weather" (*Time*, Sept. 12, 1969, p. 90).

Weather is the major reason why nobody can predict famines or surpluses. Because one year or three years are blessed with good weather doesn't mean the following year will be good. Because monsoons may have been favorable for three years doesn't mean they cease their history of unpredictability.

Many scientists and authors have predicted the middle 1970's as the target date for famines. Among these are William and Paul Paddock, authors of *Famine 1975* and *Hungry Nations*. In an interview with *Rotarian Magazine*, they admitted that weather is the key factor in predicting these dates.

"Luckily," they said, "these last two years have seen exceptionally fine weather throughout most of the agricultural world. As a result we may have a couple of years of extra grace before our prediction comes true.

"Of course, when crops are good," they added, "government officials take the credit by pointing to their excellent planning in providing fertilizer, improved seeds, financing, etc. When crops are poor, the same officials blame the low yields on bad weather.



Ambassador College Photo

Some haven't yet learned of the "food glut."

"No, the big increase is due to the excellent weather God has given... The *fundamental problems* on which we based our predictions remain *unsolved*. Although these advances may *delay* the day of reckoning, the *real problem remains*: the population explosion." (*Rotarian Magazine*, June, 1969, p. 17, emphasis ours.)

V. Population vs. Food Production

The true problem is the population explosion. Because of social, economic and political situations prevailing in some hunger-plagued nations, there is at present no way for the masses to increase food production enough to keep pace with population growth. No matter how fast food grows, it increases arithmetically (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.). But population increases geometrically (1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc.).

Percentages of population growth are rising (from about 1.8% per year in 1950 to about 2.1% per year today), while food increases are declining.

One, two, or even three good years

(Continued on page 44)

The STORY of MAN

for children five to one hundred five

Everyone should know the true story of mankind. In the guise of scholarship, fables have been substituted for fact. A few have researched the truth. The evolutionary approach has been disproved, and the Biblical record proved true. Basil Wolverton has made a significant contribution to the literature of our time by faithfully sifting out the story of mankind in continuity, putting the thrilling story in simple and beautiful style for people of all ages.

by Basil Wolverton

CHAPTER ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-THREE

WHEN A NATION TURNS TO IDOLS

QUEEN mother Athaliah, having ruled Judah for six years after usurping the throne, was one Sabbath morning bothered by music and shouts from the temple. Surrounded by a few of the royal guard and carried by four husky men in her curtained sedan chair, she was taken to the temple to see for herself what was happening. (II Kings 11:1-13; II Chronicles 22:10-12; 23:1-12.)

When she saw the unusually large, vocal crowd, and the temple surrounded by army commanders and armed clan chiefs, she became suspicious and angry.

"Stop here!" she commanded, and quickly stepped out of the lowered sedan chair before anyone could aid her.

End of an Evil Reign

As she set out up the steps to the crowded temple porch, guards leaped to her sides. She waved

them disdainfully back and went on by herself. As soon as she reached the porch she took in the figures by the altar — especially the boy with the crown on his head and the armed priests all around him. The scene had a shocking meaning for her. Furious, she shoved and elbowed her way into the crowd.

"This is treason!" she shrieked. "Who is responsible for trying to crown some child as king behind my back?"

By now all eyes were on the angry queen, including those of the high priest, who held up his hands to quiet the murmuring congregation.

"This child is your grandson Jehoash!" Jehoiada, the high priest, called out to Athaliah. "He escaped your murderous hands six years ago! He is the rightful ruler of Judah! There isn't room on the throne for more than one!"

The queen flew into a rage, tearing wildly at her

clothing. Screaming madly, she ripped her costly tunic to shreds.

"Take her out of here!" the high priest ordered. "Don't let her die in the temple of God! And execute anyone who tries to stop you."

Many hands closed on the screeching woman, forcing her back down the temple steps. Her guards, seeing the stalwart officers of the army and chiefs of the clans arrayed against them, held their peace.

"Go call the rest of the guards!" Athaliah screamed at them. "Summon the army!"

But the guards saw it was too late to carry any messages. The fiercely remonstrating queen was half dragged and half carried to a back street by which horses, mules and donkeys conveyed people to and from the palace. There Athaliah was slain. (II Kings 11:14-16; II Chronicles 23:13-15.)

While the people were still at the temple, Jehoiada told them that then was the time for looking fervently to God for the right way of living. He enjoined them to be obedient to the Creator and loyal to their new king.

An End to Baalism

During her reign, Athaliah had caused a temple to be built for the worship of Baal in Jerusalem. Gold bowls, basins and other valuable utensils and furnishings had been stolen from God's temple and taken to the pagan temple to be used in the worship of Baal.

Soon after Athaliah's death, a crowd swarmed eagerly into the pagan temple. Mattan, the overbearing head priest, reluctantly emerged from the private quarters of the temple women to perform the repetitious rituals and mumble and chant invocations for his visitors. When he saw their expressions, he knew that they hadn't come to worship.

"We have come to take back the things that were stolen from the temple of God," one of the crowd firmly informed Mattan.

"Think twice before you attempt to desecrate this temple," Mattan said, furtively signaling one of his priests to call the royal guard. "Any who stir the great god Baal to wrath shall surely suffer for it!"

"If you won't give us the things we came for,



Having discovered that her young grandson Jehoash was alive and had been crowned king of Judah, the angry queen mother Athaliah would gladly have murdered him. Instead her life was taken only minutes later on a nearby back street.

we'll get them for ourselves!" another man in the crowd shouted. "If that makes Baal angry, we'll pull him down and scorch his nose on his own altar!"

"Sacrilege!" Mattan exclaimed angrily. "Leave before the royal guard gets here!"

At a word from the leader of the crowd there was a scramble for the doors, but not to those leading outside. Men broke into every room to ferret out what had been taken from God's temple.

The haughty head priest glared as the articles were carried away. His glare turned to abrupt fright when he glanced up to see the main image of Baal toppling toward him. It crashed down on the altar and from there smashed to bits on the floor moments after the priest had leaped back.

The men who had tipped over the image then threw all the smaller Baal replicas to the floor and went around the interior of the building to tear down and smash everything they could reach. Mattan and his priests and women fled outside, only to be seized by Jehoiada's men.

Mattan was put to death. There was no royal guard to save him because there was no longer a queen to use the guard for the defense of the priests of Baal. Jehoiada's men left nothing untouched in the pagan temple. They didn't stop until even the walls were pulled down and the building and its contents were a mass of rubble. This was the end of the evil thing Athaliah had brought to Judah. (II Kings 11:17-18; II Chronicles 23:16-17.)

Worship of God at the temple Solomon had built had declined during Athaliah's reign. Now, with none to interfere, people began to return. Jehoiada put more priests into service and stepped up activity at the temple of Solomon. He even reorganized the royal guard. Accompanied by these soldiers and marching bands, Jehoash was paraded from the temple to the palace, where he was to live for many years. (II Kings 11:19-21; II Chronicles 23:18-21.)

Restoring the Faith

Under the priest's influence, Jehoash grew up to be a just and capable ruler. Although he followed God most of his life, he did little to abolish the sacrificing that occasionally took place in other places

besides the temple, which had been vandalized by Athaliah's sons. (II Chronicles 24:7.) It was Jehoash's ambition, as he matured, to have it repaired, even though it would be very costly to restore it close to its original condition. To raise the money, Jehoash suggested to Jehoiada and his priests that some of them travel around Judah and ask for contributions, as God had commanded through Moses. (Exodus 35:4-10.) The priests didn't succeed in collecting very much money, nor did they try very diligently. Jehoiada was a courageous and righteous high priest. But in this case he was somewhat slack in asking others to do their duty. (II Kings 12:1-8; II Chronicles 24:1-6.)

Jehoash was disappointed. But he did not lose faith in God or confidence in his high priest. He spoke to Jehoiada again about the matter a long time later, telling the priest to have a large chest placed at the gate of the temple by the right side of the altar. This heavy chest had a small opening at the top through which coins and gold and silver in other forms could be dropped by those who visited the temple or who went by. It was announced throughout the country what the chest was for.

After a few days the chest was brought to the palace and opened. Both Jehoash and Jehoiada were surprised to find a great amount of coins, gold and silver in it. They were pleased at this display of generosity by the people. For weeks the wooden chest was put by the altar every morning and emptied every night. Enough money was taken in to finally start repair of the temple on a large scale. (II Kings 12:9-10; II Chronicles 24:8-11.)

For many months, skilled masons, carpenters and metalsmiths worked on the temple. Together with their helpers and laborers, the work force was considerable. Thousands of stones were replaced, much new woodwork and many beams put in and metal decorations restored. When the work was finished there was more than enough money to pay for labor and materials. Jehoiada used most of what remained to fashion gold and silver bowls and utensils to be used by the priests in their functions.

With the beauty and equipment of the temple restored, more and more people came to worship. It

was an era when the right kind of rulership resulted in greater welfare for the people, because so many of them, including the priests and honest workmen, followed their king's good example. (II Kings 12:11-16; II Chronicles 24:12-14.)

Thus conditions in Judah were much better, for two or three decades, than they had been since Jehoshaphat's time. Then an unfortunate event took place. It was Jehoiada's death at the age of a hundred and thirty years. For a long time this exceptional priest, aided by a wonderful wife, had exerted the power of a king, and to the country's advantage. He was considered so close to being a ruler that he was honored by being buried among the kings of Judah at Jerusalem. (II Chronicles 24:15-16.)

Idolatry Creeps In

From then on, without the wise influence of Jehoiada, matters in Judah took a turn in the wrong direction. The change started when leaders from all parts of the nation came to bring gifts to the king and praise and flatter him. They also came to ask a favor of him. (Deuteronomy 16:18-20; II Chronicles 24:17.)

"Our people have been offering sacrifices at the temple in great numbers," one of the leaders told Jehoash. "They have been coming here so often that many are becoming needy because of the time and expense required to make the round trip to Jerusalem. They want to continue being obedient, but they have no choice but to remain at home. Would it not be better to allow them to worship and sacrifice at nearer altars built at several more convenient locations in Judah?"


The king pondered. He knew what it could mean if people were allowed to worship at other altars in places of their own choosing. Jehoash felt that this situation was somewhat exaggerated. The matter had been brought to him before. He had agreed with Jehoiada that there should be one place of worship — Jerusalem. But now, with Jehoiada gone, the king could gain a great measure of popularity by acceding to the desires of these influential men who had brought him such costly gifts in a deliberate attempt to wrongly influence his judgment.

"I wish everyone in Judah could come often to

the temple," Jehoash observed, "but rather than have some miss the opportunity to make their offerings, now that the situation is growing worse, I think that it should be made possible for them to go to locations nearer their homes."

If he had studied God's law as required, he would have known it was prohibited to make sacrifices and offerings at altars in other places, and that God didn't expect the people to do more than they were able to afford. (Deuteronomy 10:12, 13; 12:1-7; 16:16-17; 17:18-20; I Kings 14:21.)

The visitors were elated at the king's decision, which meant that the idolatry they secretly favored would have more freedom to spread in Judah. At first, when the people learned that they weren't required to go to Jerusalem, they sacrificed only to



Leaders of Judah talked king Jehoash into allowing sacrifices to be made away from the temple at Jerusalem. This soon led to people slipping back into the worship of idols.



The Arameans were greedily impressed by the great value of the gifts received from the king of Judah.

God on their various altars. Influenced by so-called priests who wanted to substitute other gods for the God of Israel, they were soon back to worshipping idols, including images of Baal and other hideous likenesses of animals.

This turn of events displeased God, but instead of immediately punishing the idolaters, He sent prophets to warn of disaster to come unless the idol worship ceased. The warnings were ignored. (II Chronicles 24:18-19.)

Jehoiada's sons took over management of the temple functions after the death of the high priest. Because of the influence of exceptional parents, they were very faithful to their responsibilities. One of them, Zechariah, one day was inspired to give his audience the same kind of warning the prophets had been delivering.

An Evil King's Verdict

"Our king and many of the lesser leaders of Judah are breaking God's commandments by encouraging our people to follow pagan gods," Zecha-

riah declared. "Neither they nor the people seem concerned about the terrible price they will have to pay for this corruption. They have forsaken God. Now God will forsake them. They will have no protection when calamity comes, and it's coming soon."

Zechariah's words were immediately reported to Jehoash, who was far from happy to learn that he had been referred to in any but a complimentary manner. Even though Zechariah's aged father and mother had saved Jehoash from being murdered when he was a child, king Jehoash, now influenced by evil younger leaders, callously issued a shocking order.

"I'm weary of prophets and priests nagging and advising me," Jehoash muttered angrily. "I'm going to make an example of Zechariah. Have people stone him. Use people who will appear to be a cross-section of the public, so that observers will receive the impression that many inhabitants of Judah don't approve of what he says."

An unusually large crowd gathered at the

temple. Men and women throughout the congregation surged toward the priest and hurled stones at him. Most of the missiles missed Zechariah, but the few that found their mark fatally injured him. There was much shouting, running and confusion.

"Don't be too concerned about my attackers," Zechariah told those who tried to help him just before he died. "God will deal with them just as He will deal with whoever told them to do this thing." (II Chronicles 24:20-22.)

Meanwhile, in Samaria . . .

Before this, up in Samaria, king Jehu had begun to be troubled by invasions of Arameans in Syria under the command of Hazael, as Elisha predicted would happen. After Jehu died, his son Jehoahaz became king of the ten tribes of Israel. (II Kings 10:30-36.)

At first he wasn't much of an improvement over his father, but after struggling through a miserable period of war with the Arameans, he decided to look to God for help.

By this time the Arameans had taken over Israel's territory east of the Jordan river, which was land belonging to the tribes of Manasseh, Reuben and Gad. The invaders moved westward slaughtering most of Jehoahaz' army. They brought most of the people of the ten tribes under subjection, and it was at this point that the king of Israel desperately appealed to God to spare the nation.

God intended to bring Israel out of the grip of the Arameans, but not through Jehoahaz or because of his prayers for help. The king of Israel did nothing to put idolatry out of his nation nor even out of Samaria.

Worship of the goddess Astarte or Ishtar, who was supposed to have come from an egg, had become almost as popular as that of Baal. Most people today believe we have no part in pagan practices. We do in many ways, however. Many observe Easter (the word came from the name Ishtar or Astarte) with displays of colored eggs, which are rolled, given away in baskets, hidden for children to find, etc.

Anxious to push on to further conquest, the Arameans left Samaria and moved southward,

leaving Jehoahaz with only fifty horsemen, ten chariots and ten thousand foot soldiers left alive — a small fighting force for most of the tribes of Israel. (II Kings 13:1-8.)

The coming of the invaders into Judah was a shock to Jehoash, who had vainly hoped that Hazael would be content with overrunning only the northern nation of Israel. As the hordes of Arameans neared Jerusalem, the king became increasingly frantic. He was convinced that it would be the same as suicide to pit his army against that of the enemy. He could see only one possible way of avoiding an attack on Jerusalem and its capture, and that possibility seemed very slim.

King Hazael, riding at the head of his army, was puzzled when he met a number of soldiers carrying boxes instead of arms and equipment. Through interpreters he learned that they had come up from Jerusalem to meet him.

"King Jehoash wishes you to know that he wants to remain at peace with you," the officer in charge explained. "To prove his sincerity, he has sent you gifts."

The men put the containers before Hazael, who told his officers to open a few of them. When the Arameans saw the beautiful gold vessels, silver trumpets and ornaments set with precious stones, they grinned with pleasure. (II Kings 12:17-18.)

"If all the gifts are this valuable, there is a great fortune here," one of Hazael's officers whispered to him.

"I know," Hazael replied in a low voice. "What I'd also like to know is whether this is to pay us to stay out of Judah or whether it's bait to make certain we go directly to Jerusalem for more — and fall into some kind of trap."

"Your army is too big to trap, sir," the officer said.

"The God of Judah is supposed to live at Jerusalem," Hazael said. "He has done some unbelievable things to Judah's enemies."

The king of Syria was trying to decide whether to go on to attack Jerusalem or turn around and return to his native country.

(To be continued next issue)

Thanksgiving Day...

What does it mean to YOU?


To many Americans Thanksgiving Day means sumptuous turkey dinners, family reunions and football games. Most seem to forget that the very name of this traditional holiday means to give thanks. But give thanks to whom? For what? And why?

by Eugene M. Walter

IN 1630 the little 350-ton *Arbella* was plowing westward through the rough Atlantic to the Massachusetts coast. From its deck John Winthrop preached a striking sermon that accurately predicted America's future.

"Wee shall be," prophesied Winthrop, "as a Citty upon a Hill, the Eies of all people are uppon us; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke we have undertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a by-word through the world."

Those are remarkable words! They indicate that at least some of the early colonists sensed that their endeavors



were being favored by the hand of God.

These early settlers seemed to grasp that they were being given very special opportunities, special blessings — and special responsibilities. For all this, the indications are, some were grateful, at first.

The Early Thanksgivings

In 1621 the first American thanksgiving was held by Plymouth colony. It was observed in gratitude for the ending of a difficult year and a bountiful harvest. The native foods — fruits and vegetables, wild turkeys, pumpkin pies and such — constituted the fare of that first thanksgiving day and became the traditional food for the day.

In succeeding years, thanksgiving festivals became very popular in New England. The colonists celebrated thanksgiving days in recognition of such happy events as good harvests and victories over Indians. President Washington issued the first presidential thanksgiving proclamation in honor of the new constitution in 1789.

During the 19th century, an increasing number of states observed the day annually, each appointing its own date.

As America grew, there was ever more to be thankful for. In the years that had passed since John Winthrop's prophetic sermon, America had truly become the "Citty upon a Hill." As the Civil War ended, the downtrodden masses of the world looked expectantly to America as the new land of hope and opportunity. Immigrants from many lands arrived on American shores to try to catch the American dream.

But success and prosperity were bringing the problems and pitfalls which John Winthrop had so vividly foreseen. President Lincoln also recognized these problems and was quick to act.

Lincoln's Sober Warning

"We find ourselves," Lincoln said, "in the peaceful possession of the fairest portion of the earth, as regards fertility of soil, extent of territory, and sa-

lubrity of climate . . . We . . . find ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings. We toiled not in the acquirement or the establishment of them."

On April 30, 1863, President Lincoln proclaimed a national day of fasting and prayer. In making this proclamation he said:

"It is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God . . . and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord. . . . We have been the recipients of the choicest blessings of heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation ever has grown; BUT WE HAVE FORGOTTEN GOD! We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own."

President Lincoln saw a nation drunk with success not due to its own efforts. He saw a nation taking all the credit and glory to itself. This great president called upon the nation for a day of fasting and prayer to confess this national sin before God.

That petition was heard — and the nation was then spared.

Later that same year, on October 3, Lincoln proclaimed the last Thursday of November as Thanksgiving Day — a day to give thanks to God for the multitudinous blessings He had bestowed. (Today Thanksgiving Day is observed on the fourth Thursday of November as set by Congress in December, 1941).

America's Greatest Years — and Now

In the years that followed Lincoln, America rose to become the greatest single power, and the most wealthy nation this world has ever known.

At the zenith of her power, America's six percent of the world's population possessed some 50 percent of the world's wealth. In commodity after commodity, and in product after product, America led the world.

But with the Korean War in the early 1950's, America began to slip. Troubles began to mount on all sides — at home and abroad. Where, before, everything seemed to turn out in our favor, now it seemed that nothing was turning out well.

What happened — and what is continuing to happen? Why is America fast losing its reputation as a "Citty upon a Hill"?

Today America is torn by strife and dissension. We have no national goal. We have recklessly squandered our fabulous wealth, and indescribably polluted our beautiful land.

Greed, selfishness and ingratitude form the warp and woof of society. "Has the American Dream become the American damnation, a formula for selfishness rather than equality and excellence?" asks *Time* (Jan. 24, 1969).

Other nations are no longer impressed with America and the way Americans do things. "Very few people are enamoured of the American way of life," says British historian Sir Denis Brogan.

Historians are now speculating on whether the tenure of the U. S. as the first power in the world will not also be one of the briefest in history.

What does all this mean — and what does it have to do with Thanksgiving?

Just this: our careless, godless, decadent way of life has stripped the value and meaning from the Thanksgiving Day holiday.

How to Make Thanksgiving Meaningful

There is nothing necessarily wrong with good food, family reunions and football games on Thanksgiving Day. But all too many use these activities wrongly and forget the purpose for the holiday. Many glut themselves with far more food than they ought to eat;

few, however, stop to give God thanks for this food — even on Thanksgiving Day.

Family reunions all too often turn out to be family brawls. Many a tense Thanksgiving Day with relatives ends in violence. And in recent years, there have been several cases of someone jumping up from the Thanksgiving dinner to grab a gun and shoot some member of his or her family!

Millions of others push and shove one another in large crowds at football games and parades, and kill one another on the highway as they madly strive to

make sure they get their fair quota of pleasure.

And where is the giving of thanks in all this? In the overwhelming vast majority of the cases, it is nowhere to be found! What a travesty!

As we observe Thanksgiving Day this year, we need to stop and soberly reflect on why we have so much, why we are losing it so fast, and where we are headed. As perhaps no other literature you might read, our free book on *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy* will help you do this. If you have not yet received your copy, write for it immediately.

But Thanksgiving is not just for Americans and should not be limited to one day a year. It should be a daily occurrence for all of us. We all have much to be thankful for — all the time.

Now as never before, we need to stop and thank God for the many blessings we still have — and change from our wrong ways so that the blessings we have lost can be restored.

If we fail to do this, and if we fail to acknowledge God as the Giver of all our blessings, He will surely “withdraw his present help from us, [and] we *shall* be made a story and a by-word through the world.”

Modern Romans

(Continued from page 7)

of the population. A portion of Americans feel that they just no longer need to work. They feel society is sort of responsible for their conditions of living. It's not their fault. By virtue of their birth and where they are and the part of the city where they live — well, somebody else is guilty!”

No, it's never the fault of the guy who is doing the griping.

About a decade ago, a noted economist who is now dead, Roger Babson, wrote in his syndicated newspaper column, “The test of a nation is the growth of its people, physically, intellectually, and spiritually. Money and so-called prosperity are of very little account!”

“Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain, and France,” he said, “all had their turn in being the richest in the world.” And the very fact they had their turn is significant, because it was just their turn at being great. And then they declined. “And instead of saving them,” continued Babson, their so-called prosperity proved to be the ruin of them.

“Our nation is now the richest, but it could easily become a second-class nation and head downward. Money will not save us!”

Neither will moratoriums based on hostile, bitter dissent save us.

Babson concluded, and you'll have to

take issue with him if you disagree, but he's dead now, “Only a sane, spiritual revival which changes the desires of our people will save us! We must be filled with the desire to render service, to seek strength rather than security, to put character ahead of profit!”

Not by Might

Mr. Babson could have added, that even the mightiest military force in the history of the world will not save us either. Vietnam shows this.

The United States has spent about one trillion dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000) on armaments since the end of World War II.

And in an attempt to maintain its power and position in the world, the U. S. spends nearly \$80,000,000,000 a year on defense. This expenditure represents 92 cents out of every \$10 spent for all purposes, public and private.

Despite this awesome power potential, the U. S. lost the Pueblo and apologized in order to get the crew back — without the ship.

Despite America's mighty military machine, a tenth-rate power may push the United States out of Southeast Asia.

Why? How could such a paradoxical situation come about?

A few years back a Navy official, Commander P. N. Searls, spoke out against the declining moral standards of society and specifically the new recruits he had to deal with.

“We can have the best missiles and ships and planes in the world,” he said, “but they are no better than the men who operate them.”

Then he referred to Rome's fall.

“Effete and overcivilized Rome lost its national will and national purpose and was overrun by the Vandals. Civilizations with a low standard of morality have been pushed to the grave throughout history by people with a low standard of dying.”

Character is the important thing. That's where the strength of a nation comes from — the character of its people. Not only because there are moral laws which work and that are active and alive, but because there is also a God in heaven above who, after all, like any loving parent, blesses for obedience and punishes for disobedience!

And we have been living, lately, under some strange kind of a curse!

You need to know more about what made the United States and the British Commonwealth of nations strong.

You need to know where we got our wealth. How we came to be where we are. What are our true national origins? And why do we have all of the problems we do today? What are the solutions? What's the way out?

Our book on *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy* will make it clear to you. It's hard-hitting; it tells you the truth about where we came from and what's ahead in the future.

HOW your PLAIN TRUTH subscription has been paid

Many ask, "HOW has my subscription been prepaid? WHY can't I pay for my own? HOW can you publish a magazine of such quality without advertising revenue?"

The answer is both simple and astonishing. This organization is doing something that has never been done before. It operates in a way none ever did before.

The entire worldwide activity started very small, in Eugene, Oregon. The editor of this magazine had given a series of lectures, in 1933, on the meaning and purpose of life, recapturing the true values, and the laws of success in life. The individual failures, the collective world troubles, were shown to be the natural result of a wrong principle which motivates human society. This world's approach to life operates on the philosophy of SELF-centeredness — of getting, taking, acquiring, of envy, jealousy and hatred.

The lectures reversed the approach, showing that the way to the *wanted* things — peace, contentment, *real* success, enjoyable and abundant well-being — is the way of giving, sharing, helping, serving, of outgoing concern for others.

Response was enthusiastic. A number of lives made an about-face.

The manager of radio station KORE, and about a dozen others of very ordinary means, volunteered to contribute regularly toward getting this knowledge to more people by radio. For seven years previously, the editor had envisioned a monthly magazine to be named *The PLAIN TRUTH*. Now the way had opened.

The first week in January, 1934, the *WORLD TOMORROW* program started on the air. February 1, 1934, Volume I, Number 1 of *The PLAIN TRUTH* was issued — then a small, home-made "magazine" printed on a borrowed mimeograph. Nothing could have made a more humble start. But response was surprising, immediate, electric! It was something *different*!

It was something *right*! It was something *needed*!

There was no request for contributions. But a small few contributors joined in the cause *voluntarily*! Gradually, a very few at a time, listeners and readers became *volunteer* Co-Workers, making regular contributions — most of them small in amount. They *wanted* to have a part in expanding this unique and needed Work. They *gave*, according to their *ability* to give. As the number of these regular contributors increased, the operation grew.

Growth seemed slow, but it was steady and continuous, at the rate of approximately 30% a year. One additional radio outlet was added — then two, then more, and more, and more through the years. In due time *The PLAIN TRUTH* was printed, no longer mimeographed. But all subscriptions were pre-paid — made possible by the gradually increasing number of volunteer Co-Workers. We were proclaiming *THE WAY* of *GIVING*, *SERVING*. To put a price on our literature would be inconsistent with that *WAY*.

Through the years this same financial policy has been rigidly maintained, never to request financial support from the public — never to put a price on the *priceless* knowledge being disseminated. We *BELIEVE* in what we are doing, and *the way* it is being done! Our growing family of Co-Workers *BELIEVE* in it, and gladly *GIVE* of their financial incomes, that we, with them, may *GIVE* these precious success secrets to an ever-widening number of readers, hearers, viewers.

The size and scope of this operation has continued a growth of between 25% and 30% per year. The operation today is huge, having impact on an approximate 150 MILLION people, worldwide! It is one of the success stories of our time. It has helped countless thousands to make a success of *their* lives.

Our happy Co-Workers join in a sincere *THANK YOU* for allowing us to serve you. It has given *us* lasting pleasure!

Personal from the Editor

(Continued from page 2)

affluent America filled with unrest, discontent, general unhappiness. Vast populations of earth's billions of human beings were existing in the depths of wretchedness and disease, ignorance and poverty, filth and squalor. But *WHY*?

WHY all this unrest, discontent, misery and suffering in the world? *WHY* wars? *WHY* no peace? It made me *THINK*! It ought to make *everybody* think!

Nobody had the answers. Science had never produced them. Business, commerce and industry were seeking increased profits, not solutions to humanity's ills. Religion had failed utterly to make this a better world. Governments, committed to bettering the lot of their peoples, had never found the way. Education was not turning out future leaders with either *UNDERSTANDING*, or skills in ending strife, confusion, and suffering.

Then in the autumn of 1926, at 34 years of age, I was shocked with dismay when my wife accepted a doctrine that was new and strange to me, and therefore seemed like off-balance religion. And I had always striven for sound *balance*, in thought, and in ways of life. She said she found this doctrine in the Bible. Although I had long since allowed all religious interest to run dormant, I had been reared as a child in the traditional Christian faith. And what she claimed to have found, I knew, was certainly contrary to my childhood instruction. And therefore, I assumed, it had to be *contrary* to Biblical teaching.

But arguments failed to dislodge her. Since we both believed marriage was "until death do us part," divorce offered no happy solution. Unable to settle the dispute any other way, I entered upon an intensive study of the Bible and other source materials on the particular subject.

But I was aware that, in general, science and "enlightened" education had virtually relegated that "Book Nobody Knows," as ad-man Bruce Barton had

called it, to the limbo of long-dead, forgotten superstition, and medieval ignorance. Evolution was the current educational and scientific concept through which all knowledge and truth was received.

At the outset I had to face the question, Does God exist?

In the dormant recesses of mind, I had *assumed* the existence of God from childhood teaching. But this assumption seldom if ever came to the mental surface of active belief. Now I realized it was an assumption, taken for granted without question or proof because I had heard it, read it, been taught it as a child.

Before I could give credence to that now-questioned Book supposed to be His revelation to man, I had to know whether "He" existed. This involved a new and in-depth research into the question of "evolution vs. special creation." Was evolution *proven fact*, or assumed theory? *HOW* had most men in science and education come to believe it?

I knew, then, *WHY* most believe what they do, and *HOW* they came to believe it! I went to "the trunk of the tree" of the evolutionary hypothesis. I read Lamarck, Darwin, Haeckel, Huxley, Spencer, Voght. I checked thoroughly many works by learned Ph.D.'s — mostly for, a very few against, the theory. When I got to the trunk of the tree — the one supposed fact that could constitute *proof*, it was easily chopped down. And all the supporting branch arguments, hypotheses and explanations fell dead with it.

By laws of science, by logic, by reason, by many *PROOFS*, (too numerous for elaboration here), I *proved*, to my satisfaction, irrefutably and conclusively, that the living God exists. No longer was this careless assumption, taken for granted on hearsay. Nor was it, for that matter, what I necessarily *wanted* to believe — for it was leading directly into that which I definitely *did not want* to believe.

The research continued — virtually night and day — often until 1 or 2 a.m. I found incontrovertible *PROOF* of the inspiration and authority of the Maker's Instruction Book to the humanity which is the product of His manufacture.

To my mortification and chagrin, I discovered my wife had been correct. I was not, now, taking carelessly for granted what I had heard, read or been taught. I was not "going along" with my crowd, club, group. I was not accepting only what I *wanted* to believe, rejecting that against which I was prejudiced. I was getting proved *FACT* in a humiliating and unwanted manner. But I had an analytical mind, trained in examination and analysis.

My shocking disillusionment ran much deeper. Many of the teachings of traditional Christianity I remembered from boyhood teaching now proved to be *diametrically contrary to the Biblical record*.

But now I made two *positive* discoveries.

I began to *UNDERSTAND WHY* the learned of higher education and of science, almost en masse, disbelieve in God and reject the authority of revelation. At least *one* of the reasons why. They *ASSUMED* that this Book taught what traditional Christianity was teaching — and these teachings were contrary to their trained scientific thought. Of course, other factors entered into their rejection. They had carelessly *ASSUMED* what they were taught in the educational process. They were accepting what they *wanted* to believe, refusing to believe what they didn't. There was the factor of prejudice. There was the factor of "belonging" — going along with the supposed intellectual. There was the appeal to intellectual vanity. There was the *FEAR* of what their scientific and educational colleagues would say.

And now I, myself, faced that disturbing question.

If I accepted the Bible — and its *WAY OF LIFE* — for I discovered that was precisely what it *IS*, the Maker's instruction in the right *WAY OF LIFE* — *what would my former business colleagues think?*

My life's one burning ambition had been to attain status in their eyes — to be considered "important" by these executives whom I considered important. It meant giving up my life's ambition! It meant giving up everything I had considered desirable and important. Everything to which I had attached value.

But now I began to realize I had pre-

viously had a false sense of values. I began to see how most of humanity is pursuing false values which never satisfy.

Vanity was wounded. But I began to realize vanity is a false value.

I had to make a decision. It was the most difficult, the most painful decision of my life. I saw, now, *how wrong* I had been. And to admit one is wrong is perhaps the most difficult thing in life. Vanity is *SELF* — and *SELF* doesn't want to die.

It was humiliating. It was painful. But my mind had been opened. My choice was to accept what I now found to be *TRUE*, or deliberately reject it, and try to bolster up arguments and reasonings I knew to be false, to deceive others. That, I couldn't do, either.

I made the painful decision.

But the other really great *positive* discovery was this: In this "Book Nobody Knows" — this Book rejected through prejudice, ignorance, willful reluctance, I *FOUND, AT LAST, THE ANSWERS TO THE REALLY BIG AND LONG HAUNTING QUESTIONS OF MAN'S UNHAPPY STATE IN THIS WORLD!*

I found the *CAUSES* of humanity's ills!

I found the reason why religion has not solved those ills.

I learned how our human problems *are going to be solved!*

I found truth *that made sense!*

I found what neither Science, nor Education, nor Religion, nor Government, nor Sociology can give you — *THE ANSWERS* to all these fast-escalating problems.

That is why *The PLAIN TRUTH* and the *WORLD TOMORROW* *speak out* today with a *positive* voice of *AUTHORITY* in a world so woefully needing this positive *ASSURANCE*.

We did not come to believe what we believe in the usual manner. And everything about this great worldwide Work of true education is as *different* as the manner in which we were led into the true *UNDERSTANDING*.

My study and research into truth, started in the autumn of 1926, has never ceased. Like it or not, at the time — *and I didn't* — I had found the *AUTHORITATIVE SOURCE* I was bound to accept. It was the *FOUNDATION* of true

knowledge. We have built on that foundation. We are still building. We are still eliminating error wherever found.

And now, 43 years later, this knowledge and TRUE WAY is being heard or read by more than 150 millions, worldwide. Untold thousands of human lives have been changed, enriched, made more useful and happy.

But UNDERSTAND, please. *The PLAIN TRUTH* is *not* intended to be a religious publication. It is a SECULAR oriented magazine. But we recognize that the great MISSING DIMENSION in education is knowledge of the true meaning of life — knowledge of the true values that pay off in your own life — knowledge of THE WAY that brings you REWARDS and not troubles, unhappiness, pain, suffering, frustrations.

It is our purpose to publish those BASICS of right knowledge — and if we cannot find that knowledge in the fields of science, modern education, human philosophy, sociology, psychology or other popularly recognized sources, but we *do* find that *practical, workable* knowledge in the one Book most seem to be prejudiced against, we are going to disseminate it without apology.

And remember, we never ask our readers to believe what we say or write *because we say it*. CHECK IT! Believe what you see PROVED! We do!

CORRECTION: The credit and copyright statement for the photograph of the Andromeda Nebula which appeared in *The PLAIN TRUTH*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 7 (July, 1969), on page 47, should have included the following information: *Photograph from the Mount Wilson and Palomar Observatories — Copyright by California Institute of Technology and the Carnegie Institution of Washington.*

FOOD GLUT

(Continued from page 32)

do not erase the trend of two decades. There have always been good and bad years, but long-range trends are the important statistics to watch.

Right after World War II the widespread use of fertilizers and pesticides began. Reserve acres of land were brought under cultivation. This brought

many years of excellent increases, but those years had to come to an end. The land can be "fertilized" and "pesticided" just so much, and the number of reserve acres is limited.

That turning point came in the middle 1960's. From 1950 to 1955 food was up 20%, from 1955 to 1960, it was up 15%, from 1960 to 1965, it was up 11%. Each recent five-year percentage has dropped about one-fourth off the growth rate.

Meanwhile population rises 11% each five years! This makes world per-capita food production less each year on a long-term basis.

World yields per acre only grew an average of one percent per year between 1961 and 1965. Meanwhile, population grew a full two percent per year. Many lands are nearly "worn out," and could begin failing the farmer any year.

Reserve arable land is now at a premium. The only major "escape valve" left open to man is to plant the pasture lands, and this requires mass slaughtering of livestock. Depleted livestock numbers mean much fewer calories and less protein for future years.

VI. Surpluses Won't Last Long

The vaunted surpluses resulting from three consecutive bumper crops are not as much as one may think. A recent government study revealed that the United States has only 40 days of processed food available in case of famine: 9 days' supply on housewives' shelves; 15 days' supply with retailers; and 16 days' supply with wholesalers and factories.

In addition, the raw grain surplus and the entire national supply of livestock would provide food for about one year! Knowing the food riots that historically result from a famine situation, this supply could disappear in much less than one year.

And this is the United States — one of the best fed countries in the world! How much harder would a famine year strike a country with little or no food reserve — which includes most of the world!

But articles about today's "food glut" express confidence this won't happen: "The world supply of wheat has grown so large that even a serious drought in

one or two countries would not wipe out the global surplus" (*Time*, September 12, 1969, p. 90).

That sounds reassuring. But it is a hollow reassurance when one analyzes it. The world is safe if there is drought in only one or two wheat-producing countries for one year. But how about three or four of the big producers? How about for two years? Or seven?

The world would survive a worldwide drought for only a matter of a very few months. It would take years, maybe decades, of excellent weather and incredible production in every crop to work up to a safe surplus.

Telling It Like It Is

Now, we can see the warnings of world-famous scientists in better perspective:

Dr. Binay Sen, Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, warned, "If the rate of food production cannot be significantly increased, we must be prepared for the four horsemen of the apocalypse." Dr. Sen added, "The next thirty-five years . . . will be a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of an unprecedented magnitude."

Dr. Sen is intimately familiar with the problem and deals with it every day.

Another authority on the threat posed by a burgeoning population is Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich of Stanford University's Department of Biological Sciences. He predicts bluntly: "Sometime between 1970 and 1985 the United States and the rest of the world will undergo vast famines — hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death.

"That is, they will starve to death unless plague, thermonuclear war, or some other agent kills them first. Many will starve to death in spite of any crash programs we might embark on now. And we in the U. S. are not embarking on any crash program. Nor is any other nation. These are the harsh realities we face."


Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice-president of the State University of New York warned, "The food-population problem seems likely to reach such enormous




**Housewives
9 DAYS**




**Retailers
15 DAYS**




**Wholesalers
16 DAYS**



**Millers
3 MOS.**



**Grain Storage
8 MOS.**



**Cattle on Hoof
12 MOS.**

Ambassador College photos by Kilburn, Clayton, Gentry, Walter

LIMITS OF U.S. FOOD RESERVES in six basic areas.

proportions, even by 1975, that it will dwarf and overshadow all the problems and anxieties that now occupy our attention, such as the threat of nuclear war, communism, the space race . . ."

Professor John McMillan, president of the Australian Freedom from Hunger campaign, said that unless mankind "roused itself" the most terrible famine known to man could engulf the world within a short ten years!

"The relentless ticking of the overpopulation time bomb grows ominously louder with each passing day," wrote Irving S. Bengelsdorf of the *Los Angeles Times*.

Thomas M. Ware, head of the Freedom from Hunger Foundation in the United States: "The catastrophe is not something that may happen; on the contrary, it is a mathematical certainty that it will happen."

Dr. Earl L. Butz, Dean of Agriculture at Purdue University: "The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the

world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportions as to threaten the peace and stability of the Western world."

Asserted Dr. Robert H. White-Stevens, nutritionist, biochemist, Assistant to the Director of Research and Development, Agricultural Division, American Cyanamid Corporation, "The last third of the 20th century will prove to be of unparalleled gravity for civilization as it is now organized. The perils of the Dark Ages, the strife of the Hundred Years' War and the desolation of all the marauding armies of history combined will not match the devastation and loss of human life that will occur between now and the year 2000."

Dr. White-Stevens had more to say, "Famine can be expected to emerge as the paramount force in the world socio-political economy by 1975 and continue to a point now totally unpredictable where human society could fragment into total chaos on a global basis."

Humanity has a rendezvous with **FAMINE.**

Escapism

The world as a whole seeks escape by ignoring the problem, hiding its eyes

from reality, sweeping the whole crisis under a mental rug!

But what about you?

Warned Dr. Borgstrom, "The prevailing escapism is of such dimensions that it is bordering on insanity. We enjoy a leisurely existence in a world of illusion created by our words and fanciful concepts. When somebody reminds us of reality, we talk ourselves out of it — as do the insane." He continues, "If we continue as hitherto, we are heading for inevitable disaster" (*The Hungry Planet*, pp. 454-455).

Is it really sound-mindedness for nations to spend billions launching rockets toward the moon — but to spend trifling amounts on the most crucial, most urgent problems here on earth? Is it sane to waste billions on smoking, excess alcohol, excess drugs, excess cosmetics, excess leisure, and excess of nearly everything else . . . and ignore impending DISASTER?

Have you been hypnotized by glorious "space adventures"? Have you been lulled asleep by the siren song that "everything is all right"?

Or are you ready to face up to reality?

Now turn the page for a special interview —

"Most scientists agree that massive famines are inevitable..."



Kilburn — Ambassador College

Dr. James Bonner, above left, noted biologist of California Institute of Technology, has studied for more than 15 years the threat of world population explosion. He is an authority on the interplay between modern industry, population, food, and the outdoors. In this personal TV interview with Garner Ted Armstrong, Dr. Bonner speaks plainly about this explosive problem.

QUESTION: Dr. Bonner, from your studies, how would you define the "population explosion"?

ANSWER: Population explosion means that the population increases rapidly. A side effect that plagues us in getting to work in the morning is the population explosion of automobiles. But generally when we talk about "the population explosion," we mean the exceedingly rapid increase in the number of human beings on our planet.

Today there are about three and a half billion people on our world. They are increasing at a rate of more than two percent per year, an increase of some seventy million people per year. This rate of increase of human beings is greater than the rate at which many countries find it possible to provide means of support for people — food, housing, all of the necessities of life that people must have.

Indeed, in many parts of the world people are getting poorer each year instead of richer, because people are increasing more rapidly than the means to support them.

QUESTION: Is population outstripping our ability to produce food?

ANSWER: Oh, it is indeed. I think that most people in our country don't appreciate the gravity of the food situation in the world at large. In most of the world there's much less than one acre of cultivated land per person, in contrast to the two acres per person available in our country. People in our country don't realize the gravity of the food problem in such places as India, Pakistan, much of Latin America, most of Africa, where today more than one half of all people go to bed hungry each night.

And still population numbers are increasing more rapidly than food supplies in all of these areas.

QUESTION: In the event of a bad year, a poor monsoon or floods, what happens — do people just starve to death?

ANSWER: The last time there was a monsoon failure, the United States made massive shipments of food to India. Indeed we used up our vast reserves of grain in feeding and tiding the Indians over this failure of the monsoon.

But you ask, what happens the next time there's a monsoon failure. That's the sort of thing that leads people who study the world's food and population problem to the conclusion that when such inevitable monsoon failures do occur — they will someday happen simultaneously in several areas. And the U.S. won't be able to supply the required food to all of those areas simultaneously.

When that time occurs, we must expect massive famines in the underdeveloped countries — and there will be literally nothing that we here in the United States can do about it.

QUESTION: This puts the United States in the position of Atlas, with all the world's problems on our

shoulders. If famine were to strike two or three different countries at the same time, what do we do? The political overtones are a little frightening.

ANSWER: It would indeed be a very embarrassing time for the United States. Should we send food to all hungry areas and let them starve more slowly, or shall we choose nations which we will preserve from famine, allowing other nations to starve?

When the time of massive famines comes, as now seems inevitable, let's decide ahead of time which policy we will adhere to, on which criteria we will select whom we will help.

QUESTION: Specialists have agreed that it is inevitable that famines will strike the human race periodically. This doesn't take into account sudden unexpected catastrophes. It could happen next spring—or next fall. It could happen to parts of the world that would directly affect us.

ANSWER: It would, as in Latin America.

QUESTION: What is the likelihood of a massive famine resulting as it were from accident, just by the caprice of nature?

ANSWER: The probability that famine will take place someplace in the world each year is very high. There's a famine going on in Biafra right now. Small pockets of famine are occurring in Southeast Asia and in Latin American countries, as you know. The probability that each year there'll be a bigger-than-average-famine someplace is still quite high.

It would be my guess that we'll see middle-size famines in Africa, India, and Latin America in the near future, and maybe a few years afterwards, middle-size famines in two of these areas at once. And, as the Pad-dock brothers wrote in *Famine 1975!*, I agree that by 1975, most probably, we'll have very large-scale famines — famines that we won't be able to alleviate!

QUESTION: What would you call a large-scale famine?

ANSWER: I don't want to be too gruesome about the scale. A famine affecting tens of millions of people would be a small-scale famine. A middle-size famine would involve a hundred million people. A large-scale famine would involve many hundreds of millions. The world will probably see such famines before we gain the technical ability to grow the food to support the number of people who are left, and before we gain the ability to convince people not to multiply so rapidly.

QUESTION: Then this is an inevitable, virtually an insoluble problem — and tens of millions will — not maybe, but will — die?

ANSWER: Yes. Those who study the matter agree that famines are inevitable, and they agree that such massive famines will reduce the population of the more crowded areas of the earth's surface to a level at which that area can support itself with food. Such famines will encourage populations to learn how to limit their numbers. Finally, as populations are stabilized, the slow growth of agricultural productivity will be able to increase the amount of food per person per year in places like India, where today people are getting less food per person per year.

QUESTION: What about birth control and government-sponsored programs, such as in India?

ANSWER: Those are problems that face all our developing nations. Of course, we do have the technical means to prevent conception, but problems remain. We have to make people want to limit their family size. This is not easy.

Let's take a typical Indian farmer, for example. He has been taught for thousands of years that if anybody's going to support him in his old age, he has to have surviving children. Until this generation, in order to have a surviving child, one had to have eight or ten children.

This is an attitude that has to be gotten rid of, but it persists, nonetheless. The result is that the population

increases rapidly. There is very good evidence that in large segments of the population of developing nations there would be no acceptance of birth control. It has to be sold.

QUESTION: What about the United States? Do we have a population problem too?

ANSWER: Very definitely. Of course, the U. S. population isn't growing as rapidly as that of the underdeveloped areas. But still it's growing at an appreciable rate — about 1 percent per year. Many of the problems of the cities, schools, and traffic are associated with population growth.

Here is a frightening statistic. I have calculated that at the present rate of U. S. population growth, with the increasing pattern of leisure and of people taking vacation trips, that in 1984 — if everyone decides to take his vacation on the same day in August and goes to a national park or monument — each one of us will have only about one square foot of land to stand on!

QUESTION: Back to the global picture, and the threat of impending famines — do you foresee FOOD WARS erupting because of massive starvation?

ANSWER: Oh, indeed I do foresee food wars. In a time of national catastrophe, people naturally blame the government. I think we'll see a lot of overthrow of governments and we'll see Communist parties rising to power here and there. The Communists will say, "The reason we're having a famine is because our government isn't organized correctly. Communists can do it correctly." They will just say it. They won't be telling the truth, but people will believe it because at least it would be a change.

So we will see many governments overthrown because of the coming massive famines. We will see new governments arising, many of which will not be friendly toward us, nor us toward them. We will have to learn to disregard the formal political alignment of our developing countries and view them instead as countries populated by people in need.



ADVANCE NEWS REPORTS *Come alive* TODAY!

THE Soviet Union pulled off a space spectacular in mid-October.

The real meaning behind the unprecedented mission went virtually unnoticed.

Briefly, the story is this. On three successive days, Soyuz 6, 7, and 8 were launched into earth orbit. Never before had three spaceships and seven men been in orbit at the same time.

According to Soviet reports, Soyuz 7 and 8 attempted a space docking — nothing new. This part of the “cosmic troika” mission, it now appears, was not successful.

The crew of Soyuz 6, however, did accomplish a special welding experiment to test the fusing of metals under conditions of deep vacuum and weightlessness.

A Soviet scientist reported the space welding experiment pushed forward the day when permanent earth-orbiting space stations could be built. The unidentified scientist, interviewed by the Soviet defense ministry newspaper *Red Star*, said space stations would first have to be built on earth. They would then be taken apart, rocketed into space in pieces and reassembled by spacemen in orbit.

America Caught Flatfooted

It is obvious that the Soviets have placed first priority on the conquest of “inner space” rather than outer space.

It now appears that the United States has been caught flatfooted. Or, as some have stated it, caught with its foot on the moon.

The U.S. lags far behind in the development of a manned space station. The Director of America's first space station effort says the project is moving

“as fast as humanly possible” toward its initial launch. But this will not be until 1972.

The U. S. program of course, will be civilian-directed, and for scientific reasons.

Military Importance

Almost overlooked by the average American or Briton is this fact: Unlike the U. S., the Soviet space program is run by the military. Military goals are fixed uppermost in mind. Civilian and scientific goals are strictly secondary.

An orbiting space station such as the Soviets are talking about can be used as a stepping stone to the moon. But it can also be employed as a military space platform for a variety of offensive tactics.

Leading American military strategists have constantly urged more attention be paid to military use of inner space — the area 100 to 600 miles above the earth.

As early as 1965, when the Soviets first accomplished a “space walk,” Air Force planners envisioned the possible emergence of a “Buck Rogers” age of elaborate command posts in space, men in reconnaissance vehicles, in satellite interceptors — even in “nuclear dreadnoughts” able to fire down on earth targets. A defense-oriented, Air Force-sponsored Manned Orbital Laboratory program was proposed — then scrapped.

Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, who was chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council said, regarding Soviet space accomplishments in 1965: “We would be foolish if we did not understand the military implications.”

Leading strategists say warnings such as this were forgotten in the rush to

place American astronauts on the moon. They believe the most likely way the nuclear stalemate between the United States and Russia will be broken will be via space-based weapons.

And the Soviets — if they are able to fabricate a space-station within the next year — will have a substantial head start on the military conquest of “inner space.”

Who will win the space race, which has taken on a radical new dimension? Write for our free booklet, *Who Will Rule Space?* It gives the surprising outcome in advance.

* * * * *

New Government in Bonn

For the first time in the modern West German state, the Christian Democrats — the party of the late Konrad Adenauer — are out of power.

In the driver's seat now is a coalition composed of the Social Democrats (SPD) and the tiny Free Democratic Party (FDP). The new Chancellor, replacing Kurt Kiesinger, is the SPD's Willy Brandt.

The switch in power was a surprise to many Western observers of West German parliamentary elections.

Almost lost in the initial elation over the surprising defeat of the Nazi-type NPD was this sobering factor — the incoming government may be weak.

Outgoing Chancellor Kiesinger called the SPD-FDP partnership “unnatural and weak.”

The combined SPD-FDP majority in the Bundestag totals a mere 12 seats. The Christian Democrats, along with their Bavarian affiliates, the Christian Socialists, have already promised to give Brandt's shaky coalition a rough time. One top CDU official said shortly after



Ambassador College Photo

Willy Brandt at press conference Sept. 28, 1969, date of West German Parliamentary election. Brandt is the first Social Democratic Chancellor in the 20-year history of the Federal Republic.

the election that the prospect of a West Germany without his party at the helm was leading to "widespread feeling of discontent and insecurity" in the country. The statement was undoubtedly premature, but it at least signaled the beginning of sharp political infighting in the Bundestag.

There are indications that the opposition CDU/CSU may even move toward the right to attract deserting supporters of the defeated National Democrats. Outgoing Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss of the CSU said: "The role of the opposition is to check on the Government, criticize it and, if it fails, to overthrow it."

Some political analysts are likening West Germany's political future to the uncertain days of the ill-fated Weimar Republic, when a succession of weak governments ruled Germany between the first and second World Wars. The Socialists had two frustrating tenures of office then, the last one shortly before the assumption of power by Adolf Hitler.

* * * * *

Israeli Official Visits Vatican

On October 6, Pope Paul received Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban and offered his help in seeking an end to the Middle East conflict.

It was the first substantive Vatican au-

dience granted to a member of the Israeli Government since the creation of the Jewish state in 1948. The Vatican announced that the Pontiff and the Foreign Minister reviewed the Middle East crisis, the safeguarding of the Christian and Moslem Holy Places, the fate of refugees, and the "sacred and unique character of Jerusalem."

The Pope expressed his desire to see the achievement of a "just and lasting peace" in the Middle East and respect for the religious and civil rights of everybody in the region. The Pontiff further offered his "willing and cordial cooperation" in seeking an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In August, the Pope set a precedent for such an offer when he attempted to mediate in the Nigeria-Biafra dispute while on a religious pilgrimage to Africa. That attempt failed.

Significantly, the meeting between the Pope and Mr. Eban came four years after the Second Vatican Council formally exonerated the Jews from the guilt of deicide — the murder of Jesus Christ.

In a talk to Rome's Jewish community and to newsmen after the papal audience, Eban stressed what he called the "historical significance" of the meeting after the "centuries-old tragic dialogue" between Catholics and Jews.

He said that he and the Pope greeted each other with "shalom" and told Jewish leaders in the Rome synagogue: "The discussion gave me fully to understand that the Pope wishes to express a sense of deep respect for the historical heritage and spiritual legacy of the Jewish people whose continuity is now assured by the state of Israel."

He said he hoped this respect could become "a point of departure" for more contacts with the Vatican, which he called a "central factor in international politics."

Israel is the only Middle East nation that does not have formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican although the Israelis have long sought such relations. The Vatican has never taken any initiative toward it and the issue apparently did not come up in the talks with Eban.

Quakes Jolt South Africa, Northern California

South Africa's worst earthquake in 37 years rocked a 1000-mile stretch of coastline from Cape Town to Durban on September 29. The earth tremor wrought havoc and destruction, nearly leveling three towns, killing at least eleven persons and leaving scores of victims homeless and injured.

The worst-hit areas were the country towns of Tulbagh, Wolseley and Ceres, about 75 miles from Cape Town.

"We thought the earth was going to burst open under our feet," said one man in Tulbagh. Authorities estimate that even if funds are available it will take at least four years to restore Tulbagh. Total damage of the quake is now estimated to run into seventeen million South African rands [\$23,800,000 American].

The strongest Northern California earthquakes in 12 years jolted the city of Santa Rosa in early October, causing widespread damage. Scores of persons were treated for glass cuts, bruises and other injuries, none however, major. Santa Rosa hospitals treated eight for heart attacks. There were no deaths. Property damage from the series of three tremors may rise to as much as \$5 million or \$10 million.

Ninety percent of the earthquakes in the United States occur in California — thousands every year. But only one in 10,000 does serious damage. The state is laced with hundreds of fault lines. Every community in California is within striking range of one or more important faults.

Each year around the world there are an average of 12 large, seriously damaging quakes. Such "killer" quakes often snuff out the lives of thousands of people and destroy multiple millions of dollars worth of property.

Leading seismologists continue to warn of increasingly greater and more damaging earthquakes, largely because of population growth, the crowding into cities, and careless construction on or near fault lines.

Few know the real causes of earthquakes, or why even more severe earthquakes are imminent. No one knows when the next one will strike.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The PLAIN TRUTH
P. O. Box 111
Pasadena, California 91109

Printed in U.S.A.

★ THE MODERN ROMANS

Part IV. Despite awesome military power, America is confused about its goals. Witness the recent "Vietnam Moratorium." Britain's sun has set. What has led to the declining power and prestige of the two English-speaking powers? This fourth in a series explains. See page 3.

★ THE ALARMING DECLINE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT FLEET

Why is the U. S. merchant fleet deteriorating at such an alarming rate? Why — while the USSR is fast becoming the world's No. 1 sea power? Where is this ominous trend leading? What does it portend for America's future — and for your personal way of life? See page 9.

★ WHAT'S BEHIND THE FUROR OVER SEX EDUCATION?

Millions are concerned about the latest trend in U. S. education — sex education beginning in kindergarten. Outraged, indignant parents protest. Others approve. What is all the uproar about? See page 19.

★ EVOLUTION GETS THE HORSE LAUGH!

Did giant draft horses and sleek Thoroughbreds evolve from rabbit-sized ancestors? Neat diagrams in science textbooks say yes. But research the details and you find a horse of a different color! Increasingly, scientists are questioning what has been the greatest array of "evidence" ever assembled in favor of evolution. See page 23.

★ "FOOD GLUT" — OR FAMINE?

News of a supposed "Worldwide Food Glut" has made headlines. Some think the danger of a population explosion is past! Others say the population bomb is still relentlessly ticking away. Is the world on the way to self-sufficiency? The answer is in this article. See page 30.

★ THANKSGIVING DAY... WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO YOU?

To many Americans Thanksgiving Day means sumptuous turkey dinners, family reunions and football games. Most seem to forget that the very name of this traditional holiday means to give thanks. But give thanks to whom? For what? And why? See page 39.

580319-0001-6 3 P119
MR-MRS TED A EFIMOV
5114 W 125 ST
PALOS PARK IL 60464