

the
PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

Prime Minister
Trudeau

Quebec Premier
Lévesque

**WILL
QUEBEC
SECEDE?**

**BURGLARY—TO THWART A THIEF
TODAY'S YOUTH HAS CHANGED!
THE FLY THAT BLINDS**



the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

Vol. XLIII, No. 5

ISSN 0032-0420

May 1978

ARTICLES

Today's Youth Has Changed!	2
Why Is the Trinity Not Mentioned in Scripture?	4
Will Quebec Secede? Behind Canada's Unity Crisis	6
Burglary — To Thwart a Thief	10
Something to Remember Him By	16
Africa's Battle Against the Fly That Blinds	18
The Honeybee Knows All the Angles	22
Part I: David — A Man After God's Own Heart	24
Why Christians Keep Whitsunday (The Day of Pentecost)	28

FEATURES

Personal From Herbert W. Armstrong	1
Why Not?	31
Garner Ted Armstrong Speaks Out!	35
Questions and Answers	38
Letters: Orchids and Onions	45

ABOUT OUR COVER

The big issue in Canada today is the threatened secession of the predominantly French-speaking province of Quebec from the rest of Canada. While Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau (left) fights to hold his nation together, archrival René Lévesque and his separatist *Parti Québécois* continue to push for Quebec nationhood. What would be the effects of a Quebec pullout? Read the article beginning on page 6.

Cover illustration by Jack Davis

The Plain Truth is published monthly (except combined June-July and October-November issues) by Ambassador Publishing Company, Pasadena, California 91123. Copyright ©1978 Ambassador College. All rights reserved. Second-class postage paid at Pasadena, CA, and at additional mailing offices. PRINTED IN U.S.A.

United States: P. O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91123

Canada: P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2M2.

Mexico: Institución Ambassador, Apartado Postal 5-595. México 5, D.F.

Colombia: Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.

United Kingdom, Europe: P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., AL2 3TR England

Rhodesia: P. O. Box U.A.30, Union Ave., Salisbury

South Africa: P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa 2000

Ghana: P. O. Box 9617, Kotoka Int. Airport, Accra

Kenya and the rest of East and Central Africa: P. O. Box 47135, Nairobi, Kenya

Mauritius and other Indian Ocean Isles: P. O. Box 888, Port Louis, Mauritius

Nigeria: P. M. B. 1006, Ikeja, Lagos State, Nigeria

Australia, India, Sri Lanka, and Southeast Asia: G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia

New Zealand and Pacific Isles: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand

The Philippines: P. O. Box 2603, Manila 2801

West Indies: P. O. Box 6063, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Switzerland: Case Postale 10, 91, rue de la Servette, CH-1211, Geneva 7

Scandinavia: Box 2513 Solli, Oslo 2 Norway

BE SURE TO NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY of any change in your address. Please include your *old* mailing label and your new address.

The Plain Truth — SUPPORTED BY YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS

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

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn

Senior Editors: C. Wayne Cole, Jon Hill, Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith

Managing Editor: Brian W. Knowles

Assistant Managing Editors: Dexter H. Faulkner, John R. Schroeder

Associate Editors: Lawson C. Briggs, Robert A. Ginskey, D. Paul Graunke, George Ritter, Richard H. Sedliacik

Contributing Editors: David L. Antion, Elbert Atlas, Charles V. Dorothy, Lester L. Grabbe, Robert C. Smith, Les Stocker

Women's Consultant: Carole Ritter

Editorial Staff: Cheryl Graunke, Janet Halvorson, Linda Martens, Ronald B. Nelson, Janet Schroeder, Lesley Van Patten

Copy Editors: Ron Beideck, Peter Moore, Clayton Steep

Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lippross

News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg

News Research Staff: Janet Abbott, Jeff Calkins, Werner Jebens, Donald D. Schroeder, Keith Stump

Art Director: Greg S. Smith

Art Staff: Randall Cole, Ronald Grove, Gene Tikasingh
Photography: *Photo Services Director:* Warren Watson;
Staff: David Armstrong, Charles Buschmann, Ken Evans, Joyce Hedlund, Alfred Hennig

Photo Files: *Manager:* Alan Leiter; Kristy Woodbridge

Circulation Manager: E. J. Martin; *Assistant Circulation Manager:* Gordon Muir; *Subscriptions:* Boyd Leeson; *Newsstand Distribution:* Mark Armstrong

Business Manager: Raymond L. Wright

Director of Pastoral Administration: Ronald L. Dart

International Division: Leslie McCullough

International Editions: *Dutch Language:* Jesse Korver; *French:* Dibar K. Apartian; *German:* Gotthard Behnisch; *Great Britain:* Peter Butler; *Spanish:* Kenneth V. Ryland

Offices: *Auckland, New Zealand:* Robert Morton; *Bonn, West Germany:* Frank Schnee; *St. Albans, England:* Frank Brown; *Burleigh Heads, Australia:* Dean Wilson; *Geneva, Switzerland:* Bernard Andrist; *Johannesburg, South Africa:* Robert Fahey; *Manila, Philippines:* Colin Adair; *Utrecht, The Netherlands:* Roy McCarthy; *Vancouver, B.C., Canada:* C. Wayne Cole; *Oslo, Norway:* Stuart Powell; *Mexico City, Mexico:* Thomas Turk

Founder, President and Publisher: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Executive Vice-President and Co-Publisher: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Associate Publishers: Stanley R. Rader, Robert L. Kuhn



Personal from...

Education for Life!

Is a man truly educated unless he knows WHAT he IS? And unless he knows WHY he is, whether there is any purpose or meaning to life, and what that is? And unless he knows where he is going in the end? And unless he knows the true values from the false and the way to such desired conditions as peace, happiness, prosperity, and the enjoyable, pleasant, and interesting life?

Right now many high school seniors are facing the problem of whether to go on to college—and if so, which college.

If I were a young man or young woman facing that question, I'm very sure—knowing what I know now—that I would want to find out which college or university teaches these things. I'm sure I'd want to attend the school of higher learning which would teach me not merely how to earn a living—pardon me, I mean an existence—but the one which would teach me how to live!

Did you ever wonder why it is that nearly everybody wants to live a life that is pleasing, enjoyable, interesting—without boredom, aches, pains, suffering, or unpleasant environments or circumstances? Nearly everyone experiences a hunger for something that will really satisfy; yet, somehow, he never finds it except at brief intervals that never seem to last.

When this Work of God was only several years under way, in Oregon, and I was, most of the time, preaching in evangelistic campaigns about six nights a week, broadcasting every Sunday, editing and mimeographing *The Plain Truth*, and counseling with scores of people, I found the need of something relaxing—something to get my mind off these serious matters and this driving activity for a little while. Mrs. Armstrong and I found a total change, mentally, in attending occasional basketball games at the University of Oregon basketball pavilion, MacArthur Court. At that time the University of Oregon had a team of sophomores and one senior which looked like comers.

And sure enough, in their senior year these boys went on to win the first national championship—in late winter of 1939. That was the first year the NCAA had a national

play-off leading to a national championship.

Even today I can find an occasional change of pace by attending a game. There I can see thousands being thrilled by scintillating play. Are these basketball fans enjoying life? If you ask them, at the moment, the answer might be “*You bet!*” Are they bored? Not during the excitement of the game! Do they feel a sort of mental, emotional, or spiritual hunger? Not during the thrill of the game.

But after the game—then what? Why, after the game is over and the fans have gone home, do they experience a letdown—until the next game, or the next experience of some pleasure?

I got to wondering. After the game, *I* don't experience any letdown. *I* don't have to suffer the experience of emptiness, boredom, or this sort of soul hunger—whatever it is—until the next exciting entertainment. As a matter of fact, I find my life interesting, invigorating, stimulating, satisfying, and abundant *at all times!* It is tremendously exciting at times; it is never boring, never dull, never discontented!

Why? What's the difference?

I know what the difference is.


The answer is bound up in the questions I asked at the beginning of this *Personal* talk with my readers.

I have learned what man *is!*

I have learned that man was put on this earth for a purpose, and I have learned what that purpose is! I have learned how to fulfill it. I have learned what the *true* values are, and what are the false. And I have learned the secret of a full, abundant, interesting, enjoyable life! Not merely during a basketball game or some occasional entertainment! *All* the time!

I have learned the way to peace of mind, to invigorating, satisfying, always interesting living. I have learned why I am here, where I am going, and the way to get there. I'm on my way there now, and the journey is more interesting than I can tell you! There's never a letdown. There used to be—years ago—before I learned these answers. But not anymore!

Yes, if I were a young man (Continued on page 41)



TODAY'S YOUTH HAS CHANGED!

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Every decade sees a change in its youth. A decade ago we were alarmed by youth in revolt—campus riots, protest marches, resentment against the “Establishment,” the hippie movement, the advent of widespread use of drugs.

Much of the revolt is now gone. But what of today? What has this decade of the '70s brought us?

Today teenage suicides are at an all-time HIGH! So are violent teenage crime, drug abuse, alcoholism, pregnancy and vandalism!

As Abraham Lincoln Saw It

More than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln made a speech about this situation. It's as old as Cain and Abel, he said. He used the term “old foggy” to describe the teenager's conception of his parents and adult society. “The first old fogies,” he said, “were Adam and Eve.”

All of us past 21 have lived through that stage of life. I remember that, from age 18 to 20, I felt very sorry for my father. As a little

But how—and why? Why should we be concerned? What will the adults and leaders of tomorrow be like? Here is the truth almost nobody knows!

boy I was taught to call him “Papa,” and my mother “Mama.” But when I reached my teens, my father became “Dad.” I had to be like the other kids. Didn't you? By 18 I knew so much more than my father that, as I said, I felt sorry for him.

When I was 20, Dad moved to the West Coast (I was born and reared in Iowa), and my mother and younger brothers and sister soon followed him. I didn't see my father again for 12 years—until I was 32. And what a surprise it was to see him: He had “grown up” and learned so much in those 12 years that by then he knew more than I did!

But if the youth don't yet understand the adult generation, neither

do the adults—especially the psychologists, educators, and writers who write about the youth in books, magazines, and newspapers—understand our youth, or why they are as they are!

These adults are ignorant of the way God designed the human mind.

The Makeup of the Human Mind

Engraved in stone over one entrance to Ambassador Hall on the Ambassador College campus (the principal building in the Loma D. Armstrong Academic Center) are these words: “*The Word of God is the foundation of knowledge.*”

Years of diligent research and study of many sources have brought me proof that that statement is true. True and basic knowledge comes only by revelation. But today education and science reject revelation as even one possible source of knowledge. That is the reason for man's troubles in this world today.

To come to know WHY the experts cannot understand the real reasons behind the behavior of our youth

today—or any day in the past—you need to understand, first, just what the human mind is, and why and how it is so vastly superior in intellect to animal brain.

Despising and rejecting revelation as the only source of basic knowledge, this world's educated do not understand the real difference between human mind and animal brain.

This source of basic knowledge reveals that the first humans were created with, and all since have been born with, a spirit that is IN man. This spirit—not a “ghost,” but a spirit essence—is actually not the man, or any part of him—not an “immortal soul”—but something that is merely *in* each person.

It performs a most essential function.

For example, *man's* composition is revealed in Genesis 2:7: “And the Eternal God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath [air] of life; and man [made of material dust] became a living soul.”

The original word for “soul” here is the Hebrew *nephesh*, meaning “an air-breathing creature.” A literal translation of Moses' words in Genesis 1:20 might be: “And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving *nephesh* that hath life. . . .” Thus God called whales, all fish, and birds that fly in the air *nephesh*. They are not immortal souls. In verses 21 and 24, Genesis 1, animal life is called *nephesh*—only the King James translators here rendered *nephesh* as the word “creature.”

Genesis 2:7 says that what was made out of the dust—MATTER—became a SOUL. Therefore a soul is physical and material, not spiritual and immortal.

I have written on this subject many times, but I shall here try to present it, very briefly, in a different way than before.

This passage in Genesis 2:7 has no reference to the spirit in man whatsoever. But the soul described there does, of course, include the physical brain.

However, elsewhere in the Bible we find that there is something *non-*

physical that is IN man which performs the function of imparting intellect to the physical brain.

One man who earned his Ph.D. after doing brain research in at least three well-known universities came to the conclusion that what imparts intellect to the human brain is the presence of “a *nonphysical* component that is nonexistent in animal brain.” Needless to say, other scholars in brain research do not agree with him. But the human mind cannot be explained in any way that makes sense on the basis of the physical brain alone.

The human brain is slightly smaller than the brain of an elephant, a whale or a dolphin. It is slightly larger than a chimp brain. In physical quality it is only so slightly superior that the vast superiority in human intellectual output cannot remotely be accounted for.

The Spirit of Man

Most scientists and highly educated scholars not only reject biblical revelation as a source of knowledge, but they are utterly unable to comprehend spiritual knowledge or spiritual principles.

As we read in I Corinthians 2:9: “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man [his mind], the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.” Naturally, knowledge can enter the human mind only through the five channels of sight, hearing, taste, smell and feel. Spiritual things, spiritual principles, spiritual knowledge cannot be seen or heard, tasted, smelled or felt. Only physical and material knowledge can enter through those five channels.

So the quotation above from I Corinthians simply says that spiritual things, or the things of God, cannot enter the mind through the five natural channels. The passage continues: “But God hath revealed them unto us by HIS SPIRIT: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?” In other words, no man could have the knowledge possessed by

humans—knowledge millions of times greater than that possessed by mere animal brain—except for the presence of the *spirit of man* which is *in* him. The spirit of man is here contrasted to the Spirit of God. Therefore, because it is spirit and not matter—though *man* is wholly matter—I term it the *human spirit*.

This spirit is not a ghost, or conscious being. It is spirit essence. This spirit that is in every human is the factor that imparts the power of intellect to the human physical brain.

I can explain at least part of the process by which the power of intellect is imparted to the brain by this spirit. This spirit is like a computer. In our Data Processing Center on the Ambassador College campus we have some giant computers. A group of employees programs information into these computers, which contain millions of pieces of information—for example, names and addresses, among other information.

One interesting little trick we showed visitors to the Center was to ask the computer to supply whatever information had been programmed into it under my name. The demonstrator typed my name on the keyboard—and out of millions of facts, names, and pieces of information, the computer instantly sorted out my name and spewed out the information: It said, “Herbert W. Armstrong, age 37, going on 36.” Of course it got a laugh.

A Nonphysical Component

This human spirit cannot see, hear, smell, taste or feel. The physical brain sees through the eyes, hears through the ears, etc. And the brain can receive through these five channels only what is material and physical. But what the brain sees or hears—what knowledge it receives—is instantly programmed into the human spirit. In other words, the spirit in each human memorizes, and it provides instant recall for the brain. The human spirit imparts the power of intellect to the physical brain in two ways: 1) It gives the brain *instant recall* of whatever the brain calls for in the knowledge
(Continued on page 42)

Why Is the Trinity Not Mentioned In Scripture?

Does religion have to be a "mystery" in order to be understood? No one truly understands the so-called "mystery of the Trinity." Some nevertheless insist their followers accept the doctrine, though admitting it is a mystery incapable of being understood! But Jesus said: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." He said: "Thy word [the Bible] is truth." Can you really understand about God; about the family of God; about who and how many members make up the Godhead? God's Word says you can—and you must. Believe it or not, the Bible nowhere teaches the Trinity. Here's the proof.

by Garner Ted Armstrong

Why is the word "Trinity" not found anywhere in the Bible? Look it up for yourself—use any Bible dictionary or exhaustive concordance. The word "Trinity" just isn't there!

But then, neither is the word "Lent," nor the word "rapture," for that matter.

But why?

Why should it be that some of the major doctrines of a professing Christian world are shockingly absent from the Bible, the Word of God? Don't most religious organizations claim to find their doctrines in the Bible?

Probably you have either heard or sung many times the song called "Holy, Holy, Holy." Millions have. In it, the words "blessed Trinity" appear.

In the songbook. But not in the Bible!

But then, millions of Americans spend more time opening and closing a songbook in church services than they do a Bible—so it's little wonder the *impression* gained from habit and tradition sometimes outweighs solid biblical truth.

As shocking as it may seem to many, the doctrine of the Trinity is another of the pagan "mysteries" which is not found in the Bible!

Does a doctrine *have* to be obscure, murky, dark, mysterious, *impossible* to understand in a practical, day-to-day, commonsense manner? Not according to Christ! He promised His followers the *truth*! He plainly said the Father would *reveal* truth to real Christians!

Most of the really true concepts and doctrines of God's Christianity

are *not* out of sync with the real world of natural laws involving physics, chemistry and the way things work in this whole orderly universe. To our finite, limited, unseeing human minds, of course, miracles might be an exception to this general truism.

But the whole panorama of pagan doctrines seems to have this one common denominator: They are all patently illogical. And the Trinity is no exception! The Trinity is cloaked in a murky maze of mystery. Theologians find it exceedingly difficult to pin this doctrine down and get a firm grip on it. The layman is simply told not to bother his head about it—it is a "mystery," anyway.

"The mind of man cannot fully understand the mystery of the Trinity. He who would try to understand the mystery fully will lose his mind.

But he who would deny the Trinity will lose his soul" (Harold Lindsell and Charles J. Woodbridge, *A Handbook of Christian Truth*, pp. 51-52). So accept it or else, we are told in rather intimidating language; there is no use in trying to understand it.

Says *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*: "It is difficult in the second half of the 20th century to offer a clear, objective, and straightforward account of the revelation, doctrinal evolution, and the theological elaboration of the mystery of the Trinity. Trinitarian discussion, Roman Catholic as well as other, presents a somewhat unsteady silhouette" (vol. XIV, p. 295).

A Christian, who is firmly admonished by the apostle Paul to "prove all things" and to "search the scriptures daily," cannot afford to base his biblical understanding on an "unsteady silhouette." True Bible doctrine can be understood! It makes sane, logical sense when subjected to proofs and tests. Christ said: "You will know the *truth*, and the truth will make you free" (John 8:32, RSV).

To Whom Did Jesus Pray?

Can we apply a little plain old biblical "horse sense" to this time-honored doctrine of a three-person Godhead? Consider this completely unshakable biblical fact: Jesus Christ of Nazareth—your Savior and my Savior—was begotten *not* by a human father as all other human beings (except Adam and Eve), but by the Holy Spirit.

A great angelic being appeared to Joseph, Jesus' legal father, in a dream and said: "... Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is *conceived* in her is of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 1:20).

Perhaps the very same angel—in this case the archangel Gabriel (Luke 1:26)—was sent with a similar message to the virgin Mary. Notice carefully the wording of their conversation. "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, *thou shalt conceive* in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus" (verses 30-31).

Mary's reply was just exactly

what you would expect of a woman in that situation. "Then said Mary unto the angel, *How shall this be*, seeing I know *not* a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The *Holy Spirit* shall come upon thee, and *the power of the Highest* [this is the real biblical definition of the Holy Spirit; it is a force or power] *shall overshadow thee*: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. . . . For with God nothing shall be impossible" (verses 34-35, 37).

So if we want to believe the Bible, we are forced to admit that Jesus Christ was conceived through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

Yet Jesus calls *God* His Father—not the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ said to Mary Magdalene in the book of John: "... Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my Father*, and your Father; *and to my God*, and your God" (John 20:17).

Can you begin to see how utterly illogical the concept of the Trinity is? *If* the Holy Spirit were a person, "he" would be Jesus' father—not God the Father. Yet Christ dogmatically stated, as you have just read, that *God* is His Father.

Consider further. *If* the Holy Spirit were a person, Jesus Christ prayed to the wrong "father." Since Jesus was conceived of the Holy Spirit, *if* the Holy Spirit were a person, Jesus' father would be the Holy Spirit. But throughout the four Gospel accounts, we find Christ praying directly to His Father—God Almighty! Just one example: "These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee. . . . And this is life eternal, that they might know thee *the only true God* [still talking to the Father], and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John 17:1, 3).

A Simple Lesson in Grammar

Somebody is going to ask: "What about the fact that John uses the personal pronoun 'he' when referring to the Holy Spirit or Comforter in the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of his Gospel?"

In the Greek language, as in Spanish, Italian, French, etc., every

noun has what is called gender; that is, it is either masculine, feminine or neuter.

Even such an inanimate object as a glass—being utterly devoid of any real life—has masculine gender in Spanish. *El vaso* is the Spanish equivalent of the two words "the glass" in English. The "el" article and the -o ending to the word *vaso* give the word "glass" masculine gender in Spanish. Yet by no stretch of the imagination could a glass be considered a male person in the human sense. That would be utterly ridiculous!

Likewise in the Greek language, the gender of a word has nothing whatever to do with whether it is really masculine or feminine in the sexual sense at all. Gender in language is really nothing more than a convenient grammatical tool. In the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of John, the English pronoun "he" is definitely used in connection with the word "Comforter"—but *not* for theological or spiritual reasons.

Grammatically, all pronouns in Greek must agree in gender with the word they refer to—or in other words, with the term that the pronoun replaces. The Greek word *parakletos* ("comforter" in English) has masculine gender; hence the translators' use of the personal pronoun "he." ("It" would have been a far better rendering into the English language.)

I John 5:7

But so deliberate has been the deceptive attempt to foist the false doctrine of the Trinity upon the world that a monk copyist in the fourth century A.D. inserted totally and completely spurious words into the Bible in order to "prove" this major doctrine of pagan antiquity.

Turn in your own Bible (King James Version) to I John 5:7-8: "For there are three that bear record *in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.*"

But did you know that not one of the italicized words is in any of the accepted New Testament Greek
(Continued on page 40)

The friendly neighbor Americans take for granted is facing her most serious challenge ever as a nation. At stake is the economic well-being and military security of not only Canada but of all North America.

Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau may soon be facing the sternest test of his ten years in office. He is expected to call for general elections later this year, and his popularity, recent polls reveal, has been slipping. His chief opponent, Progressive Conservative leader Joe Clark from Alberta, is, on the other hand, gaining somewhat after a slow start. The 39-year-old Mr. Clark has projected a positive image in recent parliamentary sessions, which are now televised.

Mr. Trudeau's Liberal Party is losing favor mainly because of Canada's faltering economy. The Canadian dollar has now slipped to U.S. \$.89 (its lowest level since the early years of the Great Depression) from a high of U.S. \$1.03 a year and a half ago. Unemployment hovers at a stubborn 8.5 percent, inflation at 9.5 percent.

Real Issue—Separatism


Yet despite the country's economic doldrums, the contest could be decided on the overriding issue of separatism (the threatened independence of the predominantly French-speaking province of Quebec). Trudeau, an avowed federalist, is the political archrival of Quebec Premier René Lévesque, the leader of the separatist *Parti Québécois* which was stunningly swept into power on November 15, 1976. Until now, Trudeau, who is three-quarters French Canadian, has enjoyed widespread support even from

English-speaking Canadians as the best man to hold Canada together. But there is a discernible countervailing mood too: that the fate of the country can't be left to two Quebeckers, with Canada's predominant British stock left standing in the background.

However the national elections turn out, the life-and-death showdown over Canada's future may not be far off.

Which cause will prevail—Canadian unity or Quebec nationhood? And if Quebec pulls out, what is likely to be its future along with that of the rest of Canada? What about the massive network of trade and investments between Canada and the United States? How would an independent Quebec, occupying a strategic chunk of North America, affect continental defense arrangements?

These are all mighty big questions and we may not have long to find out the answers. Premier Lévesque has promised to hold a referendum



Michael Evans—Contact

in Quebec over the issue of independence before the next provincial election in 1980. If Quebec's voters give him the mandate he is looking for—by voting for the P.Q. program of political sovereignty coupled with economic association with the rest of Canada—Lévesque has promised to negotiate with federal authorities in Ottawa for Quebec's hopefully peaceful exit.

Mr. Trudeau has vowed, on the other hand, never to be the one to negotiate Canada's division.

How Much Reform?

The separatism issue is a major factor in Canada's gloomy economic picture. Money, which is a political coward, is leaving the country, especially from Quebec. Foreign investors are holding off on large commitments.

To be sure, not all of Canada's economic and political problems can be pinned to the Quebec impasse. The booming mineral-rich provinces of Western Canada and the economically stagnant Maritimes along the Atlantic seaboard are both dissatisfied with the concentration of political power in the hands of the central government in Ottawa. These areas have also long complained of what they consider discriminatory tariffs and freight rates designed to favor the industrial heartland of Ontario and Quebec.

Western premiers have repeatedly called for a restructuring of Canada's Senate and Supreme Court to better reflect the country's current demographic balance, which has shifted westward.

Yet Canada's regional differences, while sharp, do not appear to be unbridgeable. In a meeting last year, for example, the premiers of Canada's four western provinces, while outlining their grievances with the current federal system, nevertheless stressed that "the values, benefits and potentials of confederation far outweigh the current disadvantages."

In other words, they pledged to work within the system. At the same time, they "firmly rejected" the independent aims of the current Quebec government.

Thus the unity crisis in Canada is, in its final analysis, primarily one of conflicting nationalisms and currently revolves around two different perceptions of the future role in North America to be played by Canada's French-speaking population, most of whom are concentrated in *La Belle Province* of Quebec. Furthermore, the two current standard-bearers of the struggle—Trudeau and Lévesque—are both *Québécois*.

Two Mutually Exclusive Viewpoints


During the ten years he has been in office, Mr. Trudeau has vigorously pursued a policy of bilingualism and multiculturalism in order to open up to French-speaking Canadians (so-called "francophones") throughout the nation greater opportunities for advancement.

"I've been fighting separatism since my teens," says Trudeau. "I'm a federalist because I'm convinced that it is in the greatest interest of Quebecers—particularly the 4.8 million who speak French as their mother tongue—to be part of a large, stable, prosperous, advanced, developed and just country. They have a much greater chance of preserving their language, their culture and their economy in Canada than they do in a small French state surrounded by vast, powerful English-speaking North America. A separate Quebec would turn inward on itself."

The prime minister admits that his program has not always been well-received by the predominately English-speaking majority of 17 million, many of whom have resented the extension of bilingual signs (even bilingual labels on canned goods) into areas of exclusive or predominant anglophone culture.

French and English now have equal status throughout all areas of the federal government. A French Canadian can be served by the federal government in his native tongue—*theoretically*, at least—regardless of where he happens to live. (Over one million French-speaking Canadians live outside Quebec, primarily in Ontario, New Brunswick and Manitoba.)

Michael Evans—Contact




Quebec's René Lévesque

WILL QUEBEC SÈCEDE?

BEHIND CANADA'S UNITY CRISIS

by Gene H. Hogberg



SUNSET OVER Quebec City, one of North America's most attractive urban settings, is pictured in top photo. Will the city on the St. Lawrence someday become a national capital? Canadian bilingual sign, left, carries a message in itself: an impasse is near over the Quebec government's determination to secede from the Canadian confederation. Canadian bulk carrier, below, passes through a lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Opened in 1959, the seaway has been a great boon to the Great Lakes basin, the world's largest agricultural and industrial complex. Much of the seaway courses through the Quebec heartland.



On the economic side, Quebec is steadily catching up with Ontario in per capita income. Francophones are beginning at last to move into top management positions in Quebec-headquartered firms, though they are still considerably outnumbered in Montreal's executive suites.

Partly because of aggressive federal prodding, French culture in Quebec has flourished. The French-language service on the CBC, Radio Canada, has had a major role in leading Quebec's "Quiet Revolution" of the 1960s and '70s. Montreal produces more live television in French than the national network in France; and it is original television for the most part, whereas Canada's English-language networks are surfeited with American programming.

The arts—theater, ballet, opera, concerts—are all vigorous. More French-language books are published and bought in Quebec than in France. French Canadians far surpass Frenchmen in their overall standard of living.

All of this, stress Canadian federal authorities, has taken place within confederation. Quebec's nationalists, they claim, are still living in the past, fighting the old battles, kindling the fires of 1759 (when British forces ended the rule of New France on Quebec's Plains of Abraham).

"Our goal is a bilingual, multicultural country," stresses federal cabinet official Barney Danson.* "We're [still] a long way from Cartier's dream of a bilingual Canada coast to coast, but I do think it's ironic that separation should threaten us just as the first dim outline is taking shape."

*Canada is no longer one nation composed of two founding races, the British and the French. Since World War II, four million newcomers from approximately 100 nations and colonies have settled in Canada. These "new Canadians" now comprise about 30 percent of Canada's 23 million population. The great majority speak English as their main adopted Canadian tongue. Reflecting this development, Canada, in 1971, was officially declared a "multicultural society within a bilingual framework."

Preparing the New Quebec

It is precisely this goal of a bilingual, multicultural society that the *Parti Québécois* is determined to prevent—at least insofar as Quebec is concerned. In fact, it is probably the very progress of Trudeau's bilingual, multicultural policies which makes the P.Q. determined to act now, before Quebecers become "too satisfied" with Canada and turn their backs on the "Quebec nation" the province's nationalists espouse.

To the P.Q., bilingualism and multiculturalism run counter to the very spirit of the confederation and constitute the first step toward a "melting-pot" Canada, similar to the United States, where one language, English, prevails over all.

To the P.Q., Canada itself is an anomaly—a "myth" and "essentially artificial," in the words of Quebec's Minister of Cultural Affairs and Communications, Louis O'Neill. He believes that bilingualism can never bridge the gap in a country composed of "two nations and two cultures."


When I interviewed Mr. O'Neill in his office in Quebec City last fall, it was obvious from the beginning of our conversation that he and his colleagues view independence for the province as only the final and logical step in the long evolution of the Quebec "nation."

Bill 101

Since its assumption of power, the *Parti Québécois* has been busy preparing the province for the future it seeks.

The most controversial piece of legislation has been Bill 101, the so-called "Charter of the French Language." In introducing the bill to Quebec's National Assembly, its author, Quebec Cultural Development Minister Dr. Camille Laurin, proclaimed that the law announced to the world the "official birth" of a French Quebec.

Bill 101 firmly establishes French as the province's only official language. This is in direct opposition to the federal bilingual policy. Under its terms, all business with the provincial government must be con-



ducted in French. All professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, must, in the near future, display "appropriate" fluency in order to practice in Quebec. Corporations employing more than 50 people will be monitored by a government board to ensure that French becomes the "language of work."

In education, Bill 101 severely restricts the use of English in the schools. The bill's education requirements are specifically directed at the "new Canadian" immigrants, such as Greeks and Italians, who up until now had overwhelmingly elected to send their children to English schools. But the bill also effectively shuts out the long-term transfer of English-speaking personnel from the rest of Canada to the large Quebec head offices, since the children of such transfers would have to attend French schools. Thus Bill 101 is accelerating the move of big corporations to Toronto.

A Solution or a Bigger Problem?

Bill 101 attempts to rectify a fact of economic life in Quebec that many French speakers have long resented: namely, that to succeed in business in the province, one must learn the language of the "colonial power."

The minority anglophones—now about one million—have dominated Quebec's economic affairs due in no

small part to the fact that up until the 1960s French-Canadian education did not prepare its young people for the world of big business. But if the majority of the "privileged" anglophones leave—and many are already doing so—they will also take with them their capital and expertise, and this could result in a mountain of unemployed francophones. (One study reveals that if the ten largest head offices still left in Montreal were to move out, some 11,000 jobs would go with them, accounting for an annual payroll of \$400 million.)

Public opinion polls indicate that the majority of French Canadians in Quebec have yet to be sold on the *independiste* approach and its slogans of *maître chez nous* (masters in our own house) and *Quebec pour les Québécois* (Quebec for Quebecers)—slogans which appear consistent with the mood of decolonialization which has swept the world since the early 1950s. Especially dubious are members of the older generation.

In Quebec I talked with one very successful and prominent French-Canadian businessman. He believed that the P.Q. was telling only the
(Continued on page 32)

T

he average citizen of the United States can expect to have his home burglarized twice in his lifetime. This estimate is based on current crime statistics from across the United States. And the statistics continue to spiral upward, even where other crimes have peaked and declined. While murder and some other serious felonies have become less frequent, break-and-entry larceny—police jargon for burglary—continues to rise. It is the single most frequent crime against citizens over 65 years of age, who can least afford to have their possessions stolen.

The average burglary costs the homeowner about \$400. This doesn't seem terribly threatening—it's only a number. But if a burglar breaks into your home or apartment, he'll probably haul off anything valuable and portable: TV sets, radios, cameras, binoculars, stereos, kitchen appliances and guns. Don't think you're safe because you keep all your money in a bank and don't own any jewelry. Moreover, while the average burglar is nonviolent, a felon who breaks into your home may be a pervert or a homicidal maniac. Or he may enter without any violent intent but panic and commit murder or brutal assault in trying to escape. Lastly, even those people who don't think they're preoccupied with material possessions often suffer tremendous shock and depression when their homes are broken into, rifled and plundered.

The Bible, of course, contains many injunctions against theft, in both the Old and the New Testaments. Yet even in biblical times theft was rampant, as it has been ever since. Much of the excitement about the discovery of the tomb of Pharaoh Tutankhamen came about because his was the first royal Egyptian tomb that had not been plundered in ancient times—despite all the precautions of law and



BURGLARY- TO THWART A THIEF


by James Edward Keogh and John Koster

superstition, including the famous Pharaoh's Curse on anyone who disturbed a royal grave. Islamic law demands that the hand of a thief be cut off—as is still done in the strictest Moslem countries—yet theft goes on. At the time of the American Revolution, English law listed 200 separate offenses that merited the death penalty, most of them related to some sort of theft, and yet pickpockets fleeced their victims in the shadows of the gallows where other pickpockets were hanged. While burglaries fluctuate in times and cultures, few nations have ever been crime-free. Some sociologists argue that rampant crime indicates a weakening of respect for law that presages the downfall of a nation. Others cite—perhaps too often—what they consider the mitigating psychological factors that lead people to become thieves.

Basically, in America at least, people become thieves because it's an easy way to make a lucrative living. Professional thieves, while comparatively rare, realize that they run no more risk of being apprehended than they do of being killed or seriously injured in an automobile accident. And just as most people drive, even though they know it's dangerous, the thief steals, even though he knows it's dangerous—at least mildly so.

Amateurs and Juveniles

Few burglaries against the average homeowner, however, are carried out by professional thieves. Recent statistics show that the average burglar is not only an amateur, but a very young amateur. Half of all burglaries are committed by juveniles—boys, or sometimes girls, under 18 years of age. Many of these youngsters are under 16, which means that in some places the courts are basically powerless. Broadly speaking, the juvenile justice system is based on the era of small towns and pious Victorian parents who took their children out to the woodshed for such offenses as smoking or filching apples and pears. The courts are not prepared to deal with undisciplined children from broken homes, or offspring of parents who may ignore or even encourage criminal behavior.



You should ensure that your front door is well-lighted, so that a person standing at the front door is easily seen from the road.

Added to this army of legally invulnerable juvenile offenders, there looms a second group of burglars even more menacing: America's estimated 400,000 heroin addicts, all of whom need far more money than they can ever hope to earn at legitimate work. Some criminologists think that half of all the burglaries in the United States are committed by drug addicts. While juveniles are bold through ignorance, junkies are brash through desperation. One burglar/addict who supplied information for the authors' book *Bur-*

glarproof: A Complete Guide to Home Security described stealing portable TV sets "while the people were still watching them." He would prowl through housing developments on hot summer evenings, look for homes with screendoors or with doors open, charge into the living quarters, seize the TV set and run off into the night before the victims had a chance to react.

Not every thief is this brave—or this crazy. But many addicts are so desperate to maintain their habits, which cost them \$100 and up per day, that they will take risks that would seem heroic if undertaken in a better cause than slow self-destruction through drugs.

Speaking generally, the rare professional thief, while much more highly skilled, is far less dangerous to life and limb than the amateur, who is probably either a juvenile or a drug addict, or possibly both. The professional usually limits his crimes to targets of known worth—warehouses, art museums, and the haunts of the very rich—while the amateur usually steals from inner-city dwellers or suburban homeowners.

Make House Unattractive Target

The key to dealing with the common amateur thief is to understand that he is not highly skilled or highly motivated to break into your house or apartment in particular. If you can make your house unattractive to him psychologically, he may not approach it at all. And if you can stop him at the front or back door for one to two minutes—that's just 60 to 120 seconds—he may very well give up right there and head elsewhere.

Making your house psychologically unattractive to the burglar doesn't mean having an ugly or repulsive house; it means making the house look like the sort of place where he's more apt to get caught than to get rich quick.

One of the best ways to do this is landscaping to prevent break and entry. Your shrubbery should be kept pruned, summer as well as winter, to offer anybody cruising by on the nearest road, especially the police, a clear view of the front door, and, if at all possible, of the back or


side door too. If the thief knows he can be seen clearly and will be under suspicion while he's trying to get your door open, he'll feel a lot less confident. For this same reason, you should ensure that your front door is well-lighted, so that a person standing at the front door is easily seen from the road. You can do this by installing overhead lights—far enough off the ground so the thief can't reach up and unscrew the light bulb—or by keeping porch lights bright enough to illuminate the front door.

The door itself should be as strong as possible, preferably made of solid wood, not built up of thin veneer panels. Iron doors, in fact, are a good idea in urban areas. Glass doors, or doors with a lot of glass panels in them, may appeal to the eye, but they're useless as security devices. A desperate thief, like the one who stole TVs while people were watching them, would put his fist right through a glass door, perhaps taking time to wrap his jacket around it first.

Deadbolt Lock

The lock on the door is perhaps the most important feature of all: Insist on a deadbolt lock, and accept no substitutes. The alternative to the deadbolt lock is the slipbolt lock. Physically, you can identify a deadbolt lock by the square edges on the bolt, the part of the lock that goes into the door frame and secures the door. If the bolt has a slanted tip facing outside, it's a slipbolt lock. If the bolt has a slanted tip facing inside, it's a reverse slipbolt lock, which is a little bit better, but still not good enough.

The reason that the deadbolt lock is so important can be simply explained: A slipbolt lock can usually be opened simply by sliding a strip of semirigid plastic, such as a credit card, against the bolt and pushing and jiggling until the bolt slides back into the lock and the door opens, leaving your house "easy pickings" for the burglar. This sort of ultrasimple lock-picking isn't possible with a deadbolt lock. The deadbolt lock, in fact, requires a key both to open and to shut and lock it. Some deadbolt locks have a special switch that can be used for a quick



The lock on the door is perhaps the most important feature of all: Insist on a deadbolt lock, and accept no substitutes.

exit, from the inside only, in case of fire.

Besides a deadbolt lock, your door should also have a latch chain and/or a peephole. The latch chain is used to open the door partially, while holding it shut against anyone you don't recognize or want to admit. Even the strongest chain is only as strong as the wood it's screwed and bolted into, which is why the peephole is a better idea—you don't have to unlock your door to see who's outside. If your house doesn't now have a peephole, some hard-

ware stores or security-equipment dealers sell miniature telescopes made with special lenses, the two parts of which can be inserted into either side of a 1/4-inch hole in your door and screwed together. The fish-eye lenses in these mini-scopes allow you to see who's knocking.

For total security, it's not a bad idea to buy a latch chain for your main door if you habitually use another back or side door to leave the house. The thief, if he picks your main lock, may be thwarted by the unexpected chain, or may fear kicking it in because of the noise involved.

Open or unlocked windows also tempt the break-and-entry larcenist. Stoplocks are available which limit window openings to ventilation spaces too small to allow entry. Sliding glass windows and doors—traditionally easy marks for burglars—can be fitted with simple broomsticks cut to size and placed in the sliding jamb.

Burglar Alarms

For the homeowner who lives in a high-crime area, or the person who has a lot of property to protect, some form of electronic burglar alarm is a must. The subject seems more complicated than it really is, because burglar alarms basically do for you what you would do for yourself if you were home: spot the prowler and alert the neighborhood or the police. Briefly, the simplest alarm systems are those in which a mild electrical current forms a complete circuit. When the circuit is interrupted—by someone making an illegal entry—the sensor (in this case, the broken electrical circuit) touches off an alarm. This may be a siren, a bell, or even a silent alarm which lights up an indicator in a police station. The noise itself will probably frighten the burglar into beating a hasty retreat.

The typical homeowner will probably want a simple electrical sensor like this on each ground-floor window, and one that covers the door, if he lives in an extremely vulnerable neighborhood or has a lot of valuables to protect. Those who have more specialized possessions may need more specialized alarms. Step-

on or step-off sensors, which trigger alarms when a thief walks across a carpet or lifts a valuable object like a painting or statue, are used by many collectors. Motion detectors or electric-eye devices are used to protect limited areas—corridors leading to master bedrooms or dens in which treasured possessions are stored.

Dog—Homeowner's Best Friend

One of the best burglar alarms, however, is not electric or electronic. Ever since the days of the wandering herdsmen, the dog has been man's constant companion, and, because of his sharp hearing and sense of smell, has helped protect homes from marauders by detecting their approach and giving a warning.

Dogs still serve this purpose today, and most thieves would rather pass up a home where they can see a dog inside, or hear one barking and running around to investigate a noise outside. The average homeowner doesn't need a specially trained guard dog. A mongrel you ransom from the city pound may prove more than a match for the amateur thief. Whatever you do, don't buy a trained attack dog unless you yourself know a great deal about animals; they can be a menace to your friends and family and even to yourself out of all proportion to their value in home security.

Avoid Handguns

Another security device that most homeowners should leave alone is the handgun. Statistics show that the ordinary citizen is five times more likely to kill a member of his family—or himself—than he is to kill a burglar. Those aren't good odds. It's a lot worse to bear the shock and horror of accidentally shooting a loved one than it is to put up with the aggravation of a burglar. Nor is it strictly legal to shoot a prowler. Many a homeowner has been taken to court and suffered financial loss, even prison, for shooting a felon.

Checklist of Precautions

To explain some of the simplest precautions against break and entry, let's assume that you're leaving home for the store, or to briefly visit



Protect your home with a siren or bell alarm.

The noise itself will probably frighten the burglar into beating a hasty retreat.

a friend. Here's a checklist of things to do:

1) If you're going out after dark, or won't be back until after nightfall, leave at least two lights on. Make one of them the bathroom light—people use their bathrooms at unpredictable times, and a bathroom light will convince most potential burglars that someone is at home and awake.

2) Turn on either the radio or the TV to normal volume and leave it on in your absence. If a prowler approaches, he will hear this noise

and either think it's conversation taking place inside, or that somebody is listening to the radio or TV. Habitual association of noise or music with someone at home is so instinctive that few thieves will bother to investigate further.

3) If you have a dog and it's housebroken, give it the run of the house so it can approach the scene of any forcible entry and make its presence known.

4) If you have a garage, and taking the car leaves it vacant, close the garage door so the thief can't see whether or not there is a car inside. A vacant driveway and empty garage advertises the fact that no one is home.

This checklist and a good set of locks should make your house at least reasonably safe. For longer trips, there are added precautions:

5) Stop mail and newspaper deliveries, and milk if you get it from a milkman. Or, better yet, make arrangements with a trusted neighbor to pick up your mail, newspapers, and any leaflets left at your door. An overstuffed mailbox or a half-dozen newspapers lying on the sidewalk advertises the fact that you're not home.

6) Buy a couple of light timers—they cost about \$6 each—and program two of your lights to turn on at dusk and off around 11 p.m.

7) If you're going to be away more than a week, ask a friend or neighbor you trust to have someone mow your lawn, rake your leaves, or shovel any snow that may fall. These chores, if left undone, can indicate to a burglar that you aren't home.

Apartment dwellers should adapt the same precautions to their own circumstances. Proper use of lights is especially important in apartment houses, where a blacked-out apartment can stand out like a knocked-out tooth. The apartment dweller picking an apartment with security in mind can also do himself a favor by considering which floor he moves into: The safest are those above the third floor from the ground, or below the top few floors. Some thieves come up from the street, while others work from the rooftops down—but relatively few thieves choose to clamber around on the

sides of buildings, exposed to view, while looking for likely targets. Generally, thieves prefer to stay as close to exits as possible, in case they are interrupted and have to run for it.

Keep Valuables Elsewhere


Assuming that a thief may get into your living space, there are several ways in which you can minimize your potential losses: One of the best is to keep your most precious valuables elsewhere. Jewels, furs, and large amounts of money are safer in a bank's insured safety deposit vault than they are in your home. Those possessions too bulky to be kept in a vault, but not used on a daily basis, should be kept in the room farthest from the street and the front door—the attic, if you have one, or the basement, if it isn't subject to frequent flooding. Store them in an unattractive container—an old steamer trunk, or even a sturdy cardboard box.

The small amount of cash you keep for shopping and immediate needs can be concealed in any number of ways—but avoid the obvious. Hiding money in a desk or behind a picture frame is a cliché—everybody does it. One of the best caches for small amounts of money is the refrigerator. Paint the inside of a mayonnaise or mustard bottle white or yellow, respectively, and use it as an adult piggy bank for “cold cash.”

One thing you should *never* hide around the house, however, is the key. Many people think it's frightfully clever to leave the front-door key hidden someplace near the door in case they lock themselves out; atop the lintel (the beam over the door frame) or in the mailbox are favorite spots. Some people actually hide the key in the mailbox or under the doormat, which is almost criminal in itself. The thief knows all these favorite places, and if the key is left in any of them, you needn't even bother locking the door when you leave. The places you leave the key are the first places the burglar will look for it.

If a Burglar Enters

Even assuming you take all the precautions—but more especially if you



Most thieves would rather pass up a home where they can see a dog inside, or hear one barking. A dog can be the best of burglar alarms.

don't bother taking any of them—it's quite probable that one day you'll come home and find the door ajar and hear someone inside your house.

What do you do?

First, don't panic. Panic never helped anyone. *Don't try to enter the house or apartment*, no matter how big and strong you think you are, or how outraged you may feel. The burglar may hear you coming and panic himself—in which case you could be faced with a battle to the death inside your own front door.

This is a losing proposition. You really don't want to kill another human being, not even a thief. If you do, you could also be liable for criminal prosecution. An even more distasteful thought: The thief might kill you. So *don't* barge in.

Instead, back off quietly, make your way to the nearest safe telephone, and call the police. If you can't remember the number, dial the operator. Tell her there's a burglary in progress, and give your address. Wait until the police get there and have them check out the house to make sure it's safe, and also to look for whatever evidence they want. In many towns, the examination of the scene of burglary is pretty elementary, but some departments actually do dust for fingerprints and check files and records, especially if they already have a suspect in mind. Be on the lookout yourself for anything that could provide evidence: tracks in the dirt outside the house, smudges that could contain fingerprints, and anything the thief may have dropped and left behind.

If you do bump into a thief—freeze, then back away. Don't abuse him verbally or try to psychologize him. But at the same time, try to look him over and remember his size, height, weight, color of hair and eyes, or any visible marks or scars, as well as what he's wearing.

Don't get between the thief and the door. Let him make his way out unimpeded. He may very well drop whatever of yours he's picked up to steal, as a sort of trade-off in return for free access to the street; but even if he doesn't, don't try to attack him. Let him leave, lock or secure the door behind him, and then call the police immediately.

For a Safer Neighborhood

Just because you shouldn't play policeman doesn't mean you should ignore all responsibility for your neighborhood. Here's a checklist of some things you can do to make your neighborhood safer.

1) Call police and report any strange persons loitering in the vicinity without any apparent reason for being there.

(Continued on page 34)

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER HIM BY

We like to remember the accomplishments of our fellow human beings. We set up philanthropies and foundations named after great individuals in the hope that what they've done won't fade like the proverbial blade of grass. But there's one unique memorial that honors someone who's still alive—and participating in this living memorial can change your life!

by Elbert Atlas

Human beings have traditionally honored men and women who make significant contributions to the human family. We remember George Washington's birthday, name airports after John F. Kennedy, build memorials to Abraham Lincoln, and put Queen Elizabeth's picture on currency.

But there is an individual who's done far more for mankind than any of the great or famous people we commonly recognize; someone who's a greater inventor, artist, humanitarian and philanthropist than any of the human beings we normally honor. And yet most of the time we fail to properly appreciate and remember all that he's contributed to the human race.

Just who is this powerful and talented individual who's given us so much? By now you've probably guessed: He's the Creator and Maker of this universe—the one who's done more for mankind than all the Nobel prizewinners and great men who have ever lived; the one who took the time and trouble to make us and everything around us!

We like to remember men, but God wants to be remembered, too—not for reasons of ego, but for a very different reason. And God has set up His own memorial to that end.

People usually don't get to decide what kind of memorial they'll have after they're dead. But God is alive, and He's decided what His memorial is to be. It's not just a few words carved in stone or written on parchment somewhere, but a living, dynamic reminder of what He has

done in the past, what He's doing now, and what He's going to do in the future.

This memorial to God is the Sabbath day. It's a memorial to Him, but also a generous gift to humanity. Mark 2:27 tells us: "The sabbath was made for man."

His Past Gifts

In Genesis, the first chapter, God reveals Himself as the Creator and Giver of all good things: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." There's an awful lot contained in that short statement—mankind is only now beginning to scratch the surface of the complex and wonderful world God put together. Think about it. Everything you see around you, from the gigantic and ancient sequoia to the smallest and short-lived gnat, was designed, given life and brought into balance with the rest of the incredibly complex environment by the great Creator God. God's fantastic *magnum opus* includes the stars, the sun, and this floating greenhouse we call the earth that goes hurtling through space in orbit around the sun. It includes our weather patterns, our oceans, and all the teeming life forms that inhabit this planet.

Now if a person or a company had done what God did—developed a fly, or a bird, or a tree, for example—how much publicity do you think they'd want to receive? But God humbly summarizes these mind-bending accomplishments in just a few paragraphs in the book of Genesis. And after that brief sum-

mary, He inspired these words to be written: "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made" (Gen. 2:2-3).

Now why did God insert a day of rest into this seven-day cycle of creation? He could have rested on the first day, or the fifth. He could have ended the cycle at six days. But God inserted an extra day in which He did nothing in the way of creating.

So why the Sabbath? What is it for? Just this: The seventh day is an integral part of the same process of creation. It symbolizes the fact that God is *still creating*—the crowning part of His creation is still incomplete. And the Sabbath day is a memorial to that creation process.

As a reminder and memorial of creation, it shows us that God is still the Creator and the Life-giver, and that His process of creation for us is not finished. The Sabbath reminds us that it is God's intention to give us physical life now as human beings and life eternal later on as spirit beings. So the Sabbath is a reminder of a life-producing sequence that is as yet incomplete.

In the account of Adam and Eve, God said of the epitome of His creation, humanity: "Let us create man in our image, after our likeness—let's make him like us."

Well, people are certainly not like God now. We might have the general form and shape of God, and we

might to a limited degree have some of His attributes and qualities, but we don't have the character or power of God. When we compare ourselves to Him, we are quite limited. But our potential for growth in this direction is limitless. (For more on this, send for the free booklet *Why Were You Born?*)

The Billionaire

In the Bible God reveals Himself over and over again as a multibillionaire trying to give something good away to humanity. God tried to bring the nation of ancient Israel into a land flowing with milk and honey, the "glory of all lands."

But the people then, and people nowadays, stand back and try to second-guess this multibillionaire, saying, "Hmm... I wonder what He's after." He wants to give us everything—ultimately: the good life He has, including a purpose in life, palatial surroundings, a sense of achievement and contribution, and joy, forever and ever.

It's amazing, isn't it, that God is having such a hard time giving all these good things away? Human beings seem to always say, "Aw, forget that. I want to live my life my own way."

If you met a rich man, one of the first questions you might ask him is, "How did you make your money?" Then, "Have you got any tips for me?" These are natural questions, and they're questions God answered for ancient Israel. He showed them how wealth could be acquired. He gave them a system—told them how it was done—didn't hold anything back. Then He said, "Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them" (Ezek. 20:12). God is the source of instruction in how to live; the source of all good things!

But ancient Israel wanted to do it "their way." And God told them over and over again through the mouth of His prophets, "Remember that I am the Lord your God," and "Walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and hallow my sabbaths. . . ." But Israel didn't do

these things. They failed to keep His Sabbath and gradually lost contact with Him. Similarly, those who today fail to keep the Sabbath have lost the connecting link between man and God. And when man forgets the Sabbath, he's in trouble.

So every time Israel forgot God, they got in trouble. They polluted His Sabbath, ignored His laws, and began to follow the practices of the pagan peoples around them—even going so far as to practice infant sacrifice. God's warning came to pass: "I swore . . . that I would scatter them among the nations and disperse them through the countries, because they had not executed my ordinances, but had rejected my statutes . . ." (Ezek. 20:23, 24).

The book of Lamentations is a pitiful account of how far Israel fell when they forgot who God was. The Bible says that all scripture is inspired by God for our instruction. So what does the book of Lamentations teach you and me today? It shows how far a nation can sink into depravity—even cannibalism—once they forget their Maker.

God has done everything He could to give us an historical account of what happened to multiple millions of people over thousands of years of history who forgot this one overriding point: God is God, the Creator, the Source of life, the only Giver of good things, the only one in the whole universe who can give us eternal life.


And God wants us, for our benefit, never to forget that. That's why He gave us the Sabbath. That's what it's all about. Such a memorial is worth remembering. □

RECOMMENDED READING

Does the Bible establish Sunday as the "Lord's day"? Was the Sabbath given for the Jewish people only—while Christians are commanded to keep Sunday as the Lord's day? Does it make any difference which day we observe—or whether we observe one at all?

These questions and more are answered in the booklet *Which Day Is the Christian Sabbath?* To receive your free copy by return mail, simply write to the address of our office nearest you (see inside front cover).

Heaven




or Hell?

Where do you think you're going? Heaven, hell, or maybe only six feet under? As a child you may have been taught about life after death, but what does the *Bible* have to say on this all-important subject?

For a complete explanation send for these three booklets:

- Do You Have an Immortal Soul?
- Is There a Real Hell Fire?
- What Is the Reward of the Saved?

To receive your free copies, use the envelope inside this magazine or write to our office nearest you. (See the inside front cover for addresses.)




Africa's Battle Against

THE FLY THAT BLINDS

by Brian Knowles

Onchocerciasis—commonly known as “river blindness”—is a disease that afflicts some one million people in West Africa. It is estimated that 70,000 have been totally blinded and another 30,000 have severely impaired vision as a result of the disease. The culprit? A small black fly about half the size of the North American housefly.






In 1973 government representatives from seven African nations met in Accra, Ghana, to approve battle plans against the dreaded blackfly (*Simulium damnosum*) that is plaguing West Africa. The World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, and other United Nations agencies had drafted a twenty-year plan for controlling river blindness. The plan will cost some 120 million dollars.

Pledges of help came from the governments of Belgium, Canada, France, Japan, Kuwait, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the

have been carried to some parts of the world as a result of slave trading.

The fly-borne parasite that causes river blindness was actually discovered in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Yet it was only after World War II that serious efforts to understand the dreaded affliction got underway. The French government took the lead in the investigation. Later the World Health Organization became involved, along with various regional ministries of health.

It was discovered that the black-



WHO Photo

United States and West Germany. It was to be an all-out war against the "scourge of the rivers."

River blindness is not new to Africa, nor is it limited to that continent. The World Health Organization estimates that some twenty million persons suffer from onchocerciasis around the world. Though its most serious incidence is in the savannah region of West Africa, it has also been found in Yemen and in parts of Central and South America. It is believed to

fly, commonly found in the Volta River region of West Africa, feeds on human blood. The fly needs the blood to aid in the production of eggs. While sucking blood from its human victims, the fly often deposits tiny, parasitic worms (*Onchocerca volvulus*) under the skin. These worms are infectious and breed rapidly throughout the human body. Clusters of worms group together and form unsightly, itching bulges in the skin called cysts. The younger worms travel throughout the body,

United Nations—Ray Whittin

producing offspring known as *microfilariae*.

In areas of heavy fly concentration where the human population is scarce, a victim can receive up to 13,000 bites in a single day! The result is a continuous buildup of breeding worms within the host body. In time every square millimeter of skin may be infested with hundreds of larvae.

The results of constant worm infestation are devastating to the victim. As infection deepens, nodules appear all over the body. Skin tissue, especially on the legs, turns white and red. In addition, the skin tends to thicken, crack and age prematurely. Painful itching develops, and in some cases becomes so intense that hapless victims of the parasite have committed suicide to end their misery.

The final and perhaps worst result of the parasitic invasion is blindness. This is slow to develop and sometimes takes a number of years. Blindness is caused by the death of worm embryos in the cornea of the eye. When this occurs, a tiny opaque spot appears which, after a period of time, may completely blot out the entire cornea.

The ravaging effects of river blindness were described by writer John Williams: "In one half-abandoned village, we saw an old woman, squatting on her haunches, pounding millet with a wooden pestle. She was blind; milky whiteness, interlaced with red rivulets, flooded the entire eye; the colored parts were gone. In the brilliant light we could see that she was a very old woman, crouching and shuffling, the skin horribly thickened and wrinkled. In places the pigmentation was worn away, leaving splotches of raw baby pink. Our interpreter discovered she was not yet forty" (*Geographical Magazine*, November 1974, p. 78).

River blindness has taken a terrible toll in the affected nations, especially in Mali, Upper Volta, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Ivory Coast, and Niger. Village after village has been abandoned along the Volta River. Thousands have moved inland to more arid areas to escape the scourge of the blackfly. This has drastically affected the economic de-

velopment of already poor countries. According to Williams: "Onchocerciasis is the biggest factor retarding growth in West Africa" (*ibid.*, p. 78). Many experts have concurred with this judgment.

The governments of the affected nations are determined to defeat the blackfly, and it is certainly in their best interest to do so. Slow, but encouraging progress is being made. But no one expects to wipe out the fly completely. "Control" is the watchword.

Kenya's Experience

Some 28 years ago, DDT was used with complete success to rid the Koder Valley in Kenya of the blackfly. River blindness completely disappeared. But conditions for eradication were ideal: The blackfly of Kenya was a local variety with an extremely limited flight range, and the Koder Valley was isolated from other infected areas, making reinfection highly unlikely. In contrast, the project zone of West Africa is considerably larger, covering some 231,600 square miles (600,000 square kilometers), making reinfection much more difficult to prevent. And the blackfly of the Volta, unlike the Kenyan variety, has a range of over 100 miles.

At present an American product, Abate, is being used with some success. Abate has such low toxicity that it can be safely added to human water supplies to combat yellow fever. It is harmless to fish and freshwater organisms, yet is lethal to blackfly larvae. Systematic spraying of Abate on blackfly breeding areas commenced in late 1974.

The final result may take up to two decades, however. A successful blackfly control program carried out over a wide area must continue for longer than 20 years—that is, longer than the worm's life-span within the human host. The reason for this is that the blackfly picks up the parasitic worms from those it bites and transfers them to its next victims. If the human victims of the blackfly contained no parasites, the bite of the blackfly would be relatively harmless.

Drug Treatments

Humans who are hosts to the parasites have been treated with two

drugs with some success. The first, suramine, is injected intravenously. It kills the worms, but leaves the embryos alive. The drug can produce serious side effects and must be administered only under strictest medical supervision.

A second drug, diethylcarbamazine, kills the embryos but has no effect on the worms. It too can have serious side effects. Diethylcarbamazine is taken orally and must be swallowed regularly, for a lifetime, if the patient remains in an affected area. If the individual moves from an affected area, treatments must continue up to fifteen years, since the worms can live that long in the host body.

Surgery to remove the worm-containing cysts has been performed with some success in Central America, but it is of little value in Africa. Younger worms are often "free-floating" within the body and are beyond any surgical procedure. Only the more obvious concentrations can be removed. These usually contain older, more localized worms.


Administering comprehensive drug therapy over large areas where river blindness is endemic is a difficult problem at best. Better solutions will have to be found. The greatest hope appears to lie in simply eliminating the blackfly from the region. But this will take some two decades to accomplish. There are no short-term solutions to the problem.

In the meantime, WHO is supporting a research program aimed at developing more effective drugs for the treatment of infected populations. If current programs succeed, and new and effective drugs are developed, the fly that blinds could be defeated. This in turn would facilitate the agricultural development of the affected nations. Long-abandoned villages would again be populated and river-based agricultural activities could resume. A massive burden would be lifted from presently overtaxed farm areas, and, some believe, the progress of the encroaching Sahara Desert could be measurably slowed.

Only time will tell whether man will win the battle against the dreaded blackfly. Present programs do appear to be producing positive results. □

Are you lonely? Tired of wrestling with marital or financial problems? Wish you had somebody to talk to? Maybe we can help. The Worldwide Church of God has a counselor in your area who's willing and able to lend an ear. He can patiently, discreetly and confidentially provide a sounding board when you need it most. He can give you encouragement, answer your questions about the Bible, and let you know when and where the Worldwide Church of God meets near you. (Now *there's* a place you'll find hundreds of friendly people willing to reach out—people just like you who share the hopes and dreams you share—people who could end up being the best friends you've ever had.) So whether you need confidential counseling or would just like to know where you could meet some happy, sharing people, pick up your phone and call now. There's no cost or obligation—we're here to serve you.

**Maybe
We
Can
Help**



CALL (1)-800-423-4444* TOLL FREE

Or write us at the address nearest you (see inside front cover). *Residents of California, Alaska and Hawaii may dial 213-577-5225 collect.



by George Ritter

Let's assume you have just been given the task of putting together a six-million-dollar version of a bionic bee. You're not going to make some kind of superbee, just an ordinary worker version like in any run-of-the-mill beehive.

Obviously you'd need all the anatomical accoutrements like the head, thorax, abdomen, legs, antennae and the like. But let's say you've already got the existing plans for all of these. What you're really interested in is the internal circuitry and black boxes that will be needed

for the bee's navigational and guidance system.

For starters, here's a list of equipment you'll need:

- Internal clock
- Polarized-light sensor
- Sun-angle-azimuth computer
- Instrument for measuring true vertical
- Dead-reckoning equipment
- Wind-speed and direction indicator
- Trigonometric calculator and tables
- Air- and ground-speed indicators


Perhaps you think this is a bit extravagant for your ordinary bionic bee. But before you jump to conclusions, consider some of the normal everyday navigational problems which must be solved.

A bee can literally follow its proboscis to nearby flowers, but its pint-sized power of smell obviously has limitations. In order to pinpoint distant nectar and pollen finds something more is needed.

First of all, bees have to know in which direction to fly for those proverbial beelines. Here the basic guidance problem is relatively

Illustration by Don Weller

THE HONEYBEE KNOWS ALL THE ANGLES



simple. All the bee has to do is navigate by keeping a fixed angle in relation to the sun. Even on cloudy days they can do this because of their ability to perceive the angular direction of the sun's polarized light.

But there's more here than meets the bee's eye. The sun is a moving point of reference. So the little six-legged pathfinder has to continually "compute" its movement as it proceeds in a given sun-oriented direction.

Bees not only have to work out the solutions to such problems, they have to communicate them to other

bees as well. Imagine a scout bee returning to the hive having just discovered a distant trove of flowery nectar and pollen. How does she tell her fellow workers where the flowers are located? By doing a fancy dance step in front of her sister bees! Distance to the find is indicated by the pattern and frequency of the dance. The further the source, the slower the speed of the dance.

The real genius behind the bee's well-patterned footwork comes in the way she communicates directional information. Let's say the

scout knows that the desired target is at an angle of 30 degrees from the sun. She simply rotates the axis for her dance pattern 30 degrees from the true vertical!

Even more remarkable is the fact that, during the dance, the bee will adjust the angle to compensate for the sun's movement through the sky. And this process all takes place within a darkened beehive!

Now how did the lowly honeybee make such a great intellectual leap? Who taught it to mentally equate deviation from the vertical

(Continued on page 41)

A MAN AFTER
by Jon Hill
DAVID
PART
1
GOD'S OWN HEART

Sinner and saint. Poet and warrior. Lustful and repentant. King and shepherd boy. Humble and willful. Humorous and tearful. Faithful and rebellious. Hunter and preserver. Builder and destroyer. Wise, eloquent, organized—foolish, babbling, disoriented. Joyful, morose. Biblical author, friend of God, future king of Israel forever!

David is all these and much more. Few men have held such an outstanding place in the historical record. If there is another who is more quoted than the sweet psalmist of Israel, perhaps it is the like-hearted man Jesus, who is the God who cherished David.

How can a man of so many contradictions be a “man after [God’s] own heart”? (Acts 13:22.) Because “men judge by outward appearance, but I look at a man’s thoughts and intentions” (1 Sam. 16:7, *The Living Bible*, used throughout article).

Whence came this ancestor of our Lord who became the most outstanding king of Judah-Israel, and who is promised that kingship forever in the resurrection? A man whose great-grandmother was Ruth, a woman of Moab. A man who was almost overlooked by Samuel because he was the inconsequential, not-yet-grown eighth son of Jessie. When Saul became king, David was a mere youth herding sheep in the field. But since God even keeps track of sparrows, David rose from the hopeless eighth-son position in a relatively obscure family in Israel to become king—forever!

Outside of Bethlehem, in the hills of Judea, David entertained himself as best he could while he watched his father’s flock. Little did he realize then that he was learning vital lessons not only to be used in later life, but lessons which men throughout all succeeding history could draw from. Plucking on an instrument which was probably the crude forerunner of the guitar, he committed to memory the first notes of anthems to be played

in God’s Temple—a Temple not yet dreamed of, much less built.

Small deeds of boyhood heroism executed in the protection of his father’s flock presaged major battles fought to build a kingdom. Clever ruses he employed to outwit beasts of prey and bandits alike served him well throughout forty years or more of palace intrigue, in dealings with wily enemies within and without, assassins nurtured in the bosom of his own family!

A sense of compassion and tenderness grew in him as he noticed how completely dependent his father’s sheep were on his guidance and care. A desire to commit to memory the lessons learned led him to put together small poems—later to be expanded into one of the most cherished portions of the Word of God, the Psalms!

Complete Trust in God

A deep love of God’s natural creation built into him a strong sense of organization and design, a desire to be creative as was his Creator. From these beginnings came the design of the Temple of God, left to David’s son Solomon to build, and so, unfortunately called “Solomon’s Temple.” But it was David who designed the Temple and established standards of measurements and weights. David organized the courses of Levitical priests who would serve in the Temple, and made the plans for hundreds of singers to give their praise to God with his words and his music. He even, believe it or not, was responsible for the basic financing and selection of mate-

rials to build this most expensive structure ever erected by mankind!

With time on his hands while tending the flocks, and with solitude and peace in the Judean hills, David read and reread the first five books of what we call the Bible (the only ones that were "Scripture" at the time, along with Joshua and a portion of the book of Judges, and possibly Job). He took endless hours to meditate, examine and absorb the laws of God. "O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day," he wrote.

As much as the flock of sheep trusted in him, he realized that, of and by himself, he was as helpless as his flock in the world of his day. Perhaps the most vital lesson he learned from this was complete trust in God, whatever might befall; trust as a child with his parent, as a sheep with the shepherd. The kind of trust Jesus later gave as a qualification for the Kingdom of God: "I tell you as seriously as I know how that anyone who refuses to come to God as a little child will never be allowed into his Kingdom" (Mark 10:15). The kind of trust that finally came to fruition in that most beautiful psalm we all remember, the twenty-third!

Tears and laughter, bravery and fear, humility and pride, anger and compassion, gentleness and ferocity. David was a fighter and a poet, one who could pluck a harp as adeptly as he could wield a sword, a very human person who made small and great mistakes, who accomplished small and great monuments of word and deed, a boy and man, acquainted with sin personally and very personally understanding repentance as the most powerful contact man has with God. David is a comfort to all of us, a character covering the broadest spectrum of human shame and human accomplishment.

A Little History



David: murderer, plotter, adulterer.

David: repenter, saint, author of Scripture, king forever. And most important of all: "A man after God's own heart"!

Let's get to know this man better. Let's wear his shoes, get inside his head, inside his heart, learn the lessons he learned, and somehow perhaps become a person after God's own heart in so doing!

Let's go slowly and savor the entire experience. Hopefully we will dig just deep enough to prime further study and understanding. Hopefully we will improve our concept of humanity, our contact with God, our comprehension of the world around us, within us, and the world tomorrow—God's Kingdom to come. Hopefully we will gain a great friend and come to love David as God does—and in so doing come to love God Himself and our fellowman as David did, and as Jesus commands in His "new" commandment! Hopefully we will develop "the heart of God"!

Let's start with the world into which David was born, understand the time in which he lived: the political turmoil, the primitive conditions, the brotherly bickering among the twelve tribes of God's nation Israel, the misunderstanding of how God directs and deals with human beings and how He dealt with that misunderstanding.

Israel had escaped Egypt in the famous Exodus four centuries before David. Israel (all twelve tribes) had escaped the thralldom of Egypt to become a nation under Moses, but because of a rebellious attitude on the part of the Israelites, they wandered for forty years in the wilderness of Sinai. Moses died and Joshua took over. The "conquest" of the promised land proceeded slowly and imperfectly. The separate tribes lost cohesion as a nation, fell to bickering among themselves, accepted the local inhabitants and their gods and lost their identity as a nation.

"Give Us a King"



Hundreds of years passed. One tribe after another was offered an opportunity to cement together the nation, but each Judge (as the book of Judges tells) only brought a temporary surcease in his local area from the domination of strong political enemies left free in the land after the original "conquest."

When David was born, Israel was still not a reality. Warring tribes struggled to maintain their identity. Surrounding small nations maintained their stranglehold on different tribes of the twelve (thirteen, counting Levi) that made up "Israel." More powerful centers to the south (Egypt) and to the north (Syria) dominated what was in between. Life for the unorganized tribes of Israel was touch and go. Unity was unheard of. Judah was the most powerful tribe of the twelve.

The only cohesive factor among them was Samuel, who saved the light of the truth from going out in Israel as a child serving in the Tabernacle. His influence, as the last of a long line of Judges in Israel, was the most binding of all. Yet, the people of Israel complained. They looked around them at the more successful nations who had unity, kings, a form of national government; and they complained to Samuel.

Samuel was distraught. He felt he had failed somehow. He felt rejected by his fellow Israelites. "'Give us a king like all the other nations have,' they pleaded. Samuel was terribly upset and went to the Lord for advice. 'Do as they say,' the Lord replied, 'for I am the one they are rejecting, not you—they don't want me to be their king any longer. Ever since I brought them from Egypt they have continually forsaken me and followed other gods. And now they are giving you the same treatment. Do as they ask, but warn them about what it will be like to have a king!'" (I Sam. 8:5-9.)

Samuel told the people: "If you insist on having a king, he will conscript your sons and make them run before his chariots; some will be made to lead his troops into battle, while others will be slave laborers; they will be forced to plow in the royal fields, and harvest his crops without pay; and make his weapons and chariot equipment. He will take your daughters from you and force them to cook and bake and make perfumes for him. He will take away the best of your fields and vineyards and olive groves and give them to his friends. He will take a tenth of your harvest and distribute it to his favorites. He will demand your slaves and the finest of your youth and will use your animals for his personal

gain. He will demand a tenth of your flocks, and you shall be his slaves. You will shed bitter tears because of this king you are demanding, but the Lord will not help you.'

"But the people refused to listen to Samuel's warning.

"'Even so, we still want a king,' they said, 'for we want to be like the nations around us. He will govern us and lead us to battle.'

"So Samuel told the Lord what the people had said, and the Lord replied again, 'Then do as they say and give them a king'" (verses 11-22).

The people had spoken. Their choice was a king, "like the other nations have." God, and Samuel, acquiesced. The king was chosen according to the people's desire. His name was Saul—which being interpreted means "choice."

The tribe was Benjamin. The family was Kish. Rich, influential, having a long history of excellence in Israel. Saul was most handsome. Saul was "head and shoulders" taller than anyone else in the land. A perfect leader, just like the kings of other nations around!

The fact that he was egotistical, self-serving, a bit doltish and given to mental fits didn't sway the desire of Israel—they wanted a king.

Saul's beginning was not bad. He showed at least an outward humility. Though he was from a rich and influential family, he said to Samuel: "Pardon me, sir. I'm from the tribe of Benjamin, the smallest in Israel, and my family is the least important of all the families of the tribe! You must have the wrong man!" (I Sam. 9:21.)

The People's Choice



Modest. But perhaps more so, shy. Because when Saul's coronation time came he hid himself from the festivities, and it took the Lord Himself to find him! (I Sam. 10:22.) He was coronated. All the people shouted, "Long live the king." Israel dispersed. Saul went home. A crisis occurred.

The Ammonites attacked an Israeli city and threatened to put out the right eyes of all the inhabitants as part of the terms of surrender. Israel was not yet a nation. Separated tribes were encircled on every side by the Ammonites, Moabites, Philistines, Phoenicians, Syrians, and Egyptians.

Saul, not too impressed with his duties as king, was found plowing his own fields when the news of the anticipated atrocity arrived. To his credit, his response was immediate and correct. He organized the people, went to the aid of Jabesh (the threatened Israeli city), and crushed the Ammonite attack. When some would also have added his critics to the list of dead, Saul's reply was wise: "'No one will be executed today; for today the Lord has rescued Israel!'

"Then Samuel said to the people, 'Come, let us all go to Gilgal and reconfirm Saul as our king.'

"So they went to Gilgal and in a solemn ceremony before the Lord they crowned him king. Then they offered peace offerings to the Lord, and Saul and all Israel were very happy" (I Sam. 11:13-15). At this moment of triumph, Samuel again warned the people about

their choice of a king: "'All right, here is the king you have chosen. Look him over. You have asked for him, and the Lord has answered your request. Now if you will fear and worship the Lord and listen to his commandments and not rebel against the Lord, and if both you and your king follow the Lord your God, then all will be well. But if you rebel against the Lord's commandments and refuse to listen to him, then his hand will be as heavy upon you as it was upon your ancestors'" (I Sam. 12:13-15).

The King Is a Fool



Saul reigned one year, with one triumph against the Ammonites at Jabesh. Coronated twice, more accepted because of his actions as king, he now began to take hold and fulfill the warnings of Samuel. In the second year of his reign he conscripted three thousand special troops (the people paid). Stationing them at strategic points, he sent the rest of the volunteer army home.

Jonathan, Saul's son, took a contingent of the special troops and attacked the Philistines at Geba, completely destroying the enemy garrison. Everyone was thrilled—except the Philistines! They mounted an offensive in response that required a larger war than Saul had counted on. The situation could be summed up in one word: terrifying! The Philistines had enlisted an army of three thousand chariots, six thousand horsemen, and innumerable foot soldiers. (Israel was divided geographically—a maritime plain on which chariots excelled; foothills where the odds were more even; and rugged mountains where the Israelis of Saul's and David's day maintained their tenuous hold.)

Saul called Israel to battle. (This is what the people had wanted!) They came. They saw. They fled!


Saul had summoned Samuel to dedicate the troops. Samuel promised he'd be there in seven days. Samuel didn't show up. Saul panicked. Deciding he had better do something, Saul performed the sacrifices himself to preserve what troops remained. Just as he finished, Samuel arrived.

"'You fool!' Samuel exclaimed. 'You have disobeyed the commandment of the Lord your God. [Saul must not have read the Bible of his day as did David.] He was planning to make you and your descendants kings of Israel forever, but now your dynasty must end; for the Lord wants a man who will obey him. And he has discovered the man he wants and has already appointed him as king over his people; for you have not obeyed the Lord's commandment'" (I Sam. 13:13-14).

Morbid, woebegone, fearful, disheartened—Saul counted the soldiers that remained: six hundred! Saul did not pray, did not repent, did not turn to God in his time of trouble. He counted his soldiers and regrouped.

The whole scene was ridiculous. Twenty-five thousand (at the smallest count) Philistines with chariots (the fore-runners of tanks) and horsemen against six hundred Israelis, and among those six hundred—two swords (Saul's and his son Jonathan's)! The Philistines had held in thrall the Israelis on their border for generations. There were no blacksmiths in

(Continued on page 39)



WATCH GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Should we legalize laetrile? Keep the Canal? Is the energy crisis real or political? What are the chances for a permanent Mideast peace? Each week Garner Ted Armstrong speaks out on the pressing problems of today's troubled world. His program is a must for people who care about the direction in which this world is heading. It's for people who are more than curious—

who want to know what the future really holds for themselves and their loved ones. This exciting half-hour program will offer you real solutions to today's perplexing problems. You need to watch the Garner Ted Armstrong program. Call the number below for time and channel in your area.

CALL (1)-800-423-4444* TOLL FREE

Or write us at the address nearest you (see inside front cover). *Residents of California, Alaska and Hawaii may dial 213-577-5225 collect.

WHY CHRISTIANS KEEP WHITSUNDAY (THE DAY OF PENTECOST)

by Lawson C. Briggs

Whitsunday," says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, is "one of the three major festivals of the Christian Church" (article "Whitsunday," 1973 edition).

But you will never find it by that name in the Bible. Instead, you will read of Christians observing "Pentecost," a term derived from the Greek language. And in the Old Testament, where Hebrew was the original language, you will find it variously called the "feast of first fruits," "feast of harvest," and "feast of weeks."

All of these terms refer to the same festival—originally taught by Moses to Israel, and observed by the people of God ever since. Each name is descriptive of some phase of its observance, and each of these terms is connected with a different aspect of the meaning of this deeply meaningful day.

Whitsunday

"Whitsunday," postbiblical and English, is of course a late term and biblically nonsignificant. It has reference to the practice of the newly baptized wearing special gleaming white garments on this day, which they felt for the first time worthy to wear. (See Revelation 19:8 for the spiritual symbolism of this.) The tradition of Whitsunday does illustrate the great importance (it is emphasized in the Bible) of the indwelling work of the Holy Spirit of God for the Church. For the Holy Spirit's function is to reproduce the spotless works and character of God in man. The Spirit was first made generally available to humanity on the day of Pentecost, A.D. 31.

Let's explore the biblical basis for Pentecost observance.

Pentecost

"Pentecost" is a Greek term meaning "fiftieth." It has nothing to do with supposed or alleged modern charismatic manifestations. It does not signify a style or degree of Christianity. It does, however, refer to the way by which the date of the festival must be set, and links it to preceding episodes in the plan of salvation represented by the Passover and the Days of Unleavened Bread.

Pentecost, continues the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, is "celebrated on the Sunday that marks the 50th day after Easter, to commemorate the descent of the Holy Spirit on the disciples following Jesus' passion, resurrection and ascension (Acts 2). . . ." One correction needs to be made to this statement: The fifty days should be counted not from Easter, but from the first Sunday following the Passover (Lev. 23:15). On that Sunday certain Old Testament rituals were performed which prefigured the first day of the restored life of the resurrected Jesus Christ. Symbolically represented were His presenting Himself before God the Father and His acceptance there as the very first to be fully reborn from the dead (Col. 1:18), "raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (I Cor. 15:20).

Following that, on the fiftieth day, comes the time which, among other things, prefigures the Christian's future first glorious day in a similar state. But before we come to a discussion of today's Christians as

firstfruits, notice some additional meanings in the names of this day.

The Feast of Weeks

Deuteronomy 16:9-10, 16 gives an alternate method of counting the 50 days: Simply count forward seven weeks, and the next day, the first day of the week, is "the feast of weeks," the same day as the "festival of the fiftieth."

The Feast of Harvest

Exodus 34:22 links the concept of the feast of weeks to the harvest of early spring: "And you shall observe the feast of weeks, the first fruits of wheat harvest. . . ." The same theme occurs in Exodus 23:16: "You shall keep the feast of harvest, of the first fruits of your labor, of what you sow in the field." In Numbers 28:26 this festival is again equated with the harvest: ". . . the day of the first fruits . . . your feast of weeks, you shall have a holy convocation."

This late spring festival, then, is linked to the idea of the year's early harvest. Since later harvest periods extend on into the autumn of the long Palestinian growing season, the early harvest is only a part of the ultimate increase to be garnered. This has spiritual meaning.

But what has this material harvest in Palestine to do with Christianity?

The Day of the Firstfruits

Most know that the Christian Church began with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, on that "feast of weeks" shortly after the ascension of Christ from this earth. But what is not commonly understood is the har-

vest/firstfruits connection to that event.

The ancient Levitical priests made a special "wave offering" of firstfruits of the barley harvest, the first grain crop to ripen in the spring. This symbolically pictured the resurrected Christ's ascension to heaven. But still in the category of firstfruits was the other special "wave offering" 50 days later, at Pentecost, this time probably of wheat, which ripens next after barley (Lev. 23:16-17). That offering of firstfruits represented the Church; unlike the offering representing Christ, the loaves that were offered contained leaven, the symbol of sin, for not one individual Christian is perfect.

Does the New Testament say Christians are firstfruits? "Of his [God's] own will he brought us forth by the word of truth that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures" (James 1:18). And Revelation 14:4 speaks of 144,000 who are firstfruits. So this is the Bible's own interpretation of the meaning of at least one aspect of Pentecost.

Pentecost—the day of firstfruits—is indicative of the fact that God is not calling everybody to salvation today. The entire Christian era, from the resurrection and ascension of Christ to His return and inauguration of the millennial Kingdom of God, is only a firstfruits phase of God's plan. To fully explain that—and to explain how the harvests of the year are involved in the meaning of additional biblical holy days—would require another article—or several. For a full explanation, request our booklet *Pagan Holidays—or God's Holy Days—Which?* and the article "Is This the Only Day of Salvation?"

It's true. Today is the day of salvation—the only one—for those whom God is calling *now* as firstfruits, a tiny fraction of the majority of humanity ultimately to be called.

A Day of Christian Promise

It took the coming of New Testament times and Christianity to fully reveal the depth of the spiritual meaning of Pentecost. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (ar-

Christians Kept Pentecost

Tertullian was a prolific writer and one of the most famous of the church fathers. He flourished in Roman North Africa during the years just before A.D. 200, to about 222. In the fashion of his day, he denounced the wrongheadedness, as he saw it, of the way the Jews observed the holy days and Sabbaths. But did he believe such days were all abolished? Not at all. He himself kept at least some of them, while insisting on a new Christian manner of observance more suited to their meanings.

"If [since] there is a new creation in Christ [the New Testament Christian], our solemnities [manner of observing the festivals] will be bound to be new [different from the Jewish manner, and filled with

new meaning]; else, if the apostle [Paul, in Galatians 4:10, for example] has erased *all* devotion absolutely 'of seasons, and days, and months and years,' why do we celebrate the Passover by an *annual* rotation in the *first month*? [Tertullian's meaning is that Paul did *not* do away completely with festivals and holy days, but only pointed to a more proper mode of observance; otherwise Christians in Tertullian's day, and Tertullian himself, would not have kept on celebrating the New Testament Passover or Lord's Supper once each year.] Why in the *fifty days* ensuing [to and including Pentecost] do we spend all our time in exultation?" ("On Fasting," ch. 14, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, IV, p. 112).

Date of Pentecost

The Worldwide Church of God will observe Pentecost this year on Sunday, June 11, in accordance with the lunisolar holy day calendar. We do not consider correct the Whitsunday date which is derived by counting the fifty days, not from the "morrow after the Sabbath" following Passover, but from Easter, a day neither taught nor mentioned in the Bible. (The mention of "Easter" in the King James Version [Acts 12:4] is a mistranslation of the Greek word *Pascha*, meaning "Passover.") Influenced by anti-Semitism, in order "that none should hereafter follow the blindness of the Jews" (Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, i, 9, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. II), the Constantine-dom-

inated Council of Nicea, A.D. 325, decreed that Easter Sunday should completely replace the Passover and be tied directly to the solar year, specifically to the spring equinox. Centuries of confusion followed. Not only have Christians disagreed with the Jews, they have continually disagreed with one another. With Passover (and Easter) no longer necessarily falling in the first month nor Pentecost in the third, the British and Celtic Christians for centuries frequently kept a different day than the Romans; while the French, Spaniards, Egyptians, etc. sometimes disagreed with both and with each other. Up to modern times the Eastern (Orthodox) Church's calendar has continued to differ from the calendar of the West.

ticle "Pentecost") remarks: "It [Pentecost] marked the beginning of the offering of first fruits. The NT [New Testament] uses the term to refer to the established Jewish feast. But since the gift of the Holy Spirit to the church occurred on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1), Christians reinterpreted the meaning of it in terms of the then event."

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (article "Pentecost") more fully explains: "The Jewish feast was primarily a thanksgiving for the firstfruits of the wheat harvest, but the rabbis associated it with remembrance of the Law given by God for the Hebrews to Moses on Mt. Sinai. The church's transformation of the Jewish feast to a Christian festival was thus related to the belief that the gift of the Holy Spirit to the followers of Jesus was the firstfruits of a new dispensation that fulfilled and succeeded the old dispensation of the Law."

The New Testament Pentecost fulfilled, and advanced, God's purpose that involved the law.

So now we are ready to examine the question: Exactly what is the relationship between the Old Testament Pentecost and the New? From at least the later centuries before Christ, the Jews tended more and more to look back on the original Old Testament Pentecost as the feast related to Israel's experience at the foot of Mt. Sinai, just as they looked back on the original Passover (commemorated today in the Christian's annual reenactment of the Lord's Supper) as the memorial of divine protection and deliverance from Egypt. At Sinai, God spoke the Ten Commandments. And at Sinai, on the following day, the people of Israel bound themselves to a covenant with God to obey those Ten Commandments in addition to other regulations and ordinances given them by God through Moses.

Pentecost and the Law

Where, you may ask, does the Bible tell us this covenant was solemnized on Pentecost? The answer is in the use of the simple reference "in the third month" (Ex. 19:1; also see II

**"Pentecost" is a Greek
term meaning
"fiftieth." It has
nothing to do with
supposed or alleged
modern charismatic
manifestations.**

Chron. 15:10-15, where a reaffirmation of that covenant was made by Judah in the days of King Asa).

Understand that the date for Pentecost is unlike that of any other of God's feast days. Pentecost alone must be counted each year; it does not always fall on the same day of the month. Probably for that reason no date is given in the original account for the first Pentecost. But Pentecost does always occur in, and is the one biblically and spiritually significant day in, "the third month."

According to a Jewish tradition and belief dating from at least the time of the composition of the pre-Christian *Book of Jubilees*, the Old Covenant was indeed made on the feast of weeks. After the Roman destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, the feast of weeks became preeminently a feast of the law even for the Pharisees. The Samaritans likewise have always placed God's actual revelation and giving of the law on the Sabbath preceding the Sunday Pentecost.

The Covenant Day

But is the connection of the law to the day of Pentecost antithetical to this festival's Christian connection? Not at all.

The significance of the day of Pentecost is that it is the day of covenants. We have seen that this is a biblical concept illustrated in Asa's reaffirmation of the Old Covenant. The writer of the *Book of Jubilees* went even further, judging Pentecost and covenants so obviously related that he assigned also God's covenants with Noah (Gen. 9), two with Abraham mentioned in Genesis 15 and 17, and Jacob's cov-

enant with Laban (Gen. 31:44), to this day.

At Sinai, when Moses had written down all of God's instructions, built an altar, made other preparations for the actual ceremony, and read again to Israel the requirements of God, Israel, as the wife, promised to obey God the Husband, in a marriage covenant: "All the words which the Lord has spoken we will do," they said (Ex. 24:3).

So the day God and Israel finalized a covenant at Sinai became, so to speak, God's wedding day—and the anniversary is still so important to God that He chose that very day to inaugurate a New Covenant, confirming His continued love and concern for humanity.

It was because of Israel's lack of the Holy Spirit that the original marriage came to grief. Therefore Christ later came to reconcile God and man, and then sent the Holy Spirit from heaven to beget Christians to God-life, and to empower them so they would be able to keep a covenant with God. With this covenant function in mind, it should be fully apparent how law, grace and divine love are united for Christians in the meaning of this day of Pentecost.

When Christ by sending the Holy Spirit had confirmed the covenant on this day, three thousand people then entered a new covenant with their God, solemnizing it by the ceremony of baptism (Acts 2:41). They, like all of us who today are baptized into the New Covenant, were agreeing with the words of the Israel of old: "All that the Lord commands, we will do." And whatever the actual day on which we are baptized, Pentecost is the spiritual commemoration—the birthday—for us all, for it is the birthday of the Church.

It is the day of our espousal, or betrothal to Christ (a very binding kind of engagement). "I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband," wrote Paul (II Cor. 11:2).

Who knows, perhaps some future Pentecost will also be our wedding day—at the marriage of the Lamb (Rev. 19:7-9; Matt. 25:1-13), when Christ takes His Church as His bride. □

WHY NOT IGNORE THE FACTS?

The sky is falling! The sky is falling!" said Chicken Little. What with hydrocarbons, aerosols and plummeting Cosmos satellites, little did we realize how accurate the little "turkey" would prove to be. But, obviously, this prattle of dire global problems must be ignored. After all, this old world has been around for millennia while prophets of doom have been predicting its imminent end.

And more minor problems are best ignored as well. Maybe the problems will go away if we ignore them. Here is an exercise in how to ignore the problems.

Ignore the problem in Southeast Asia. There is no such thing as the domino effect. Ignore the fact that South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia have been taken over by Communist governments. Ignore the fact that incursions are being made into Thailand, Indonesia,

Weather upsets? Drought? Flooding? Severe winters? Those are all cyclical. They come and go. Not to worry.

India and some other countries we don't even know the names of, much less where they are located.

Africa is no problem. Cuban troops in Angola and Ethiopia—along with Soviet pilots flying sophisticated modern jet fighters—are only there to staff hospitals, help with the general welfare, build roads. Really, what has the Horn of Africa got to do with us?

Concentrate on South Africa where real wrongs are being committed. What does Capetown mean to you when the rights of certain groups are being abridged? Ignore Uganda and Idi Amin—or any similar African situation. Ignore the fact that more blacks have died at his hand in just a few years than during the entire fiasco of over two centuries of colonialism.

Italy and France may vote a majority of communists into their governments? Ignore that fact. Italy (which in the memory of some of us was Fascist not too long ago) and France have always been in the Western camp.

The sky is falling? Ridiculous! Take with a grain of SALT that bit of news. We will reach an accord, a détente. The fact that the Soviets have hunter-killer satellites capable of destroying our military communications system established in space should be ignored!

The sky is falling? Take with a grain of SALT that bit of news.

We'll promise not to make any space weapons, and they will promise to destroy all those they have already made.

The Panama Canal? Who needs it? We really never had sovereignty over that piece of real estate in the first place. In an age of supertankers and ICBM missiles, the Canal is obsolete and archaic in any case. Ignore the facts. Who should really own the Canal anyway? The Panamanians? The Colombians? The Spaniards? Sasquatch?

Population explosion? Just a myth. Ignore the fact that the world will have more than seven billion souls before the year 2000.

Famine? On a worldwide scale? It will never happen! Ignore the fact that today more people die every day of starvation than at any time in recorded history.

Pollution bringing us to the brink of catastrophe? No way! Whole river systems are being cleaned up; new environmental laws are in effect. Ignore the fact that one-third of all sea life has been destroyed in your lifetime—and forget that one-third of the food for mankind comes from the sea.

Weather upsets? Drought? Flooding? Severe winters? Those are all cyclical. They come and go. Not to worry—ignore the facts.

Nuclear proliferation? The possibility that mankind might yet destroy his own and all other species from off this planet? Ignore the fact that for the first time in history it is entirely possible. It hasn't happened yet!

Why not ignore the facts—it's more comfortable that way! □

CANADA

(Continued from page 9)

“good side” of separation—the side that appeals to the emotions, to swelling national pride. The P.Q., he believed, hasn't told the people that Quebec, despite its vast mineral wealth, is not yet in the position of being its own master. “Who's going to pay the bills?” he asked.

This worldly-wise gentleman related to me that when he started in business he first had to learn how small he was and “how much I needed others.” This is the message he believed his own countrymen needed at this crossroads in their history.

Association or Violence?

The bottom line of Canada's unity crisis is this: Is it possible to break up a national marriage of 111 years, which has produced a highly advanced interdependent economy, without paying an enormous alimony cost in the form of social hostility and economic disruption?

In actuality, the *Parti Québécois* proposes that Quebec gain political independence and at the same time retain economic association with the rest of Canada in a sort of common market arrangement. The official term for it is “sovereign association.” Opponents, however, say this is nothing but a “having-your-cake-and-eating-it-too” policy designed to get independence without paying the full price.

The rest of Canada appears not to be buying the program, at least for now. As Peter Newman, the editor of *Maclean's* magazine puts it: “Any hope of economic association is entirely impractical and the policy itself has been rejected by every important political leader in English Canada.”

Former federal Deputy Finance Minister Simon Reisman adds bluntly: “The so-called economic union is a phony. Most of Quebec's secondary industry depends heavily on the highly protected Canadian market. Other Canadians are prepared to accept this cost only to the extent that they can believe it is part of the cement that binds a nation together.”

Quebec officials counter that their market is so vital to Ontario industry that Canada would have no choice but to accept an economic association.

A young journalist in Victoria, B.C., a former resident of Montreal, told me that he is convinced that in the aftermath of a separation “there would be one of the biggest boycotts you've ever seen” throughout Canada against Quebec products.

It must also be realized that few nations in history have allowed themselves to be split apart amicably. There is a great possibility that separation would not be received by English-speaking Canadians in their customarily reserved manner. Many Canadians may become “bloody upset,” as Canada's leading book publisher, Jack McClelland, told me, when they finally wake up to the fact that separation stares them in the face.

In January, Trudeau warned Lévesque that he would not hesitate to send in the Canadian military to prevent an “illegal” breakaway by the Quebec government—without clearly defining the word “illegal.” The prime minister already has established a precedent, having dispatched the army to Montreal in 1970 to quell a sudden outbreak of political violence and kidnappings.

Some Quebec authorities believe, in the event Canada turns thumbs down on the common market scheme, the resource-rich province can easily strengthen its already formidable trade links with the United States, which has \$5 billion invested in the province. But it is difficult to see the U.S. showing favoritism to Quebec at the very time Washington needs Ottawa's (and Western Canada's) favor on oil and gas pipeline arrangements in the West.

How to Divide Canada?

Even if Canada's breakup were accomplished without violence, however—and the P.Q. is dedicated to a democratic, peaceful solution—negotiations on how to divide up the “family estate” could be long, arduous and acrimonious, in the manner of a bitterly contested divorce.

The list of issues is a long one. Who, for example, would get control of federally owned properties in

Quebec, such as port facilities? Also involved is the status and future of Canadian-owned corporations in Quebec; the dividing up of the assets and routes of the Canadian National Railroad and Air Canada; the right of land and air passage across Quebec to the impoverished Maritime provinces left dangling on Quebec's right flank; the dividing up of the responsibility of operating the Canadian portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway (most of which runs through Quebec and to which Quebec would certainly stake a sovereign claim).

Ottawa would certainly remind Quebec that two-thirds of its territory was acquired by a grant from the federal government after federation and was therefore subject to “recall.”

It should be obvious that it is much easier to break up a country than to build a new one! But *Parti Québécois* leaders are convinced that their program of *souveraineté association* will work (they often refer to the amicable split between Sweden and Norway in 1905) and that it is worth the risks involved. “You have to go through breaking some eggs before the omelet appears,” says Lévesque.

The U.N. and “UDI”

Lévesque clearly hopes for a carefully orchestrated “clean break” once he has a successful referendum in hand. But if Ottawa should choose not to negotiate, some in the P.Q. hierarchy are said to be willing to take another course: an appeal to the United Nations for support of the cause of Quebec's “liberation.”

Of course, the Communist/Third World-dominated U.N. could be counted on to give thunderous applause to such a rite of national self-determination. The Soviets, especially, would eagerly support any rupture of the unique Canadian-American relationship.

The reaction of France at this time is uncertain. While Paris officially respects Canadian sovereignty over Quebec, President Giscard d'Estaing rolled out the red carpet for the visiting Lévesque several months ago, according him honors usually befitting a head of state. And, of course, eleven years ago

France intruded into the Canadian/Quebec squabble in a most overt manner when President Charles de Gaulle shouted *Vive Quebec libre* (Long live a free Quebec) from the balcony of Montreal's City Hall.

Some in Canada, such as noted author Richard Rohmer, believe that if world support could be assured, the P.Q. might even dare to proclaim a "UDI"—Unilateral Declaration of Independence—the day after a successful referendum, and boldly confront Ottawa with a *fait accompli*.

Separation Inevitable Unless . . .

In Toronto I had the opportunity to speak with Peter Newman, the distinguished editor of Canada's leading newsmagazine, *Maclean's*. Mr. Newman was very sober and direct about the crisis immediately ahead for his country. He especially viewed the steady exit of the anglophones out of Montreal as an "error of monumental proportions," noting that a leading P.Q. minister contemptuously referred to it as "nothing less than a form of surrender . . . as if part of the battlefield is conceded to us before we have even tried to occupy it."

Time is on the side of the P.Q., admitted Newman. When the next provincial election is held in 1980, 42 percent of the electorate will be between 18 and 27 years old, and this group, said Newman, "is almost entirely separatist. And this is what Lévesque really means when he preaches that independence is inevitable."

For this reason, the editor stressed, Lévesque will keep holding referendums until he finally wins one, assuming the P.Q. retains power in Quebec. Newman referred to a slogan coined by someone else: "If at first you don't secede, try, try, again."

Mr. Newman also stressed how much of the problem lies with English-speaking Canadians. He gave me a copy of a speech he had recently delivered at York University in Toronto. In it he said that "the new government of Quebec is tough and single-minded, determined to have its way whatever the costs, to split up this country, to de-

stroy the great Canadian experiment."

Newman continued: "What we need, and need desperately, is a cultural co-revolution in English Canada which would excite us about ourselves. . . . Only in Quebec has there grown a spirit of self-determination. As a result, Quebec now has a national purpose. The rest of Canada seems to have none."

Newman's bureau chief in Ottawa added, in a recent edition of *Maclean's*: "There is, in English Canada, too little sense of urgency and a stupefying ignorance of the historical grievance that fuels the march of the *Parti Québécois*."

There should be no doubt of the hurdles that English Canada and the federalist cause in particular must surmount. The P.Q. has the initiative. It will call the referendum when it wishes, will dictate the wording of the referendum and establish all the ground rules upon which it will be debated and held. The P.Q.'s efficient party organization will clearly have the advantage in "propaganda," a term it uses itself.

Dramatic Impact on U.S.

Any partition of Canada would have an immense impact on the United States. The U.S. and Canada are so economically interwoven that the economic fortunes of one automatically affects the other.

U.S.-Canada trade amounted to a staggering \$60 billion in 1977—a volume far exceeding, for example, U.S. trade with Japan. Canada sells over two-thirds of all her exports to the U.S. and receives nearly 70 percent of her imports from the same partner. One-fifth of all American exports are shipped north.

The economies of the two North American giants are virtually one and the same. A U.S. citizen driving through Ontario, the industrial heartland of Canada, sees dozens of familiar names on factory after factory, except for the two-word appendix they have in common: General Electric *of Canada*; Control Data *of Canada*; Columbia Records *of Canada*, to name only a few.

On the human plane, there are 78 million border crossings a year between Canada and the United

States. Over eight million Canadian citizens reside at any given time in the U.S.

A major article in the October 1977 *Foreign Affairs* reports: "The United States would instantly feel the shock waves of Canada's partition if it ever happened. . . . After Quebec's departure, what would then be left of the Canadian union, its economic strength, its enormous market, its American-owned industries and its military cooperation? . . ."

"A sovereign Quebec nation," continues this analysis, "must divide Canada not on the perimeter but in the middle, astride the international artery of the St. Lawrence. The four Atlantic provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would be separated from Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia by a constitutional and economic dam on the river that carries their goods and those of the American interior as well. Canada, in short, would split into a kind of East and West Pakistan, its single anatomy fractured beyond repair."

Strategic Region

In Toronto, I had the privilege of speaking with a popular Canadian Broadcasting Corporation commentator, Mr. John Fisher, popularly known as "Mr. Canada." I found him to be gravely concerned over the likely rupture of his much beloved land.

He believed that in the aftermath of Quebec's independence, and negative reaction on the part of the rest of Canada, the economy of Quebec would take a dramatic plunge; that there would be widespread social disruption; that Quebec's newly independent government would be forced to resort to stern methods to get control of the accelerating crisis. As a result, Quebec might then be vulnerable to "international meddlers" who would be eager to take advantage of the situation.

In his office on Toronto's Bay Street, Mr. Fisher and I looked at a map of the U.S.-Canadian border. He pointed out something unique about Quebec. Among Canada's provinces, Quebec alone is con-

nected by land to four U.S. states, the key one being New York.

If an independent Quebec chose not to belong to NATO or NORAD (the joint North American Air Defense network), there would be a gaping hole in the continental defense structure. (The P.Q. has vacillated quite a bit about future defense commitments.)

The effectiveness of the Pinetree Line and DEW (Distant Early Warning) Line networks against Soviet ICBMs would be gravely impaired. The Canadian navy would also be seriously hampered in performing its main task—keeping the sea-lanes open to Europe.

Moreover, a recalcitrant Quebec may choose not to honor existing U.S.-Canadian treaties regarding the St. Lawrence Seaway—or may elect to hold the seaway passage as a bargaining chip to secure its sovereign association aims.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway navigational system serves an agricultural and industrial region unparalleled in the world. The opening of the seaway in 1959, producing North America's "fourth seacoast," has been a great boon to the continent's heartland. If the seaway were to be bottled up, Canada's grain exports to the world would be halted, as well as shipments of much of the iron ore (from Quebec and Labrador) needed for U.S. and Canadian steel mills.

On Soviet Attack Route

Quebec, which is larger than France and Spain combined, is one of the most strategically important pieces of territory in North America. Nicholas Stethem, a Canadian defense expert, reveals just how critical it is—and how dangerous an independent state on its soil would be if it chose neutrality (perhaps as a consequence of Soviet/Third World support). In the Winter 1977-78 issue of *Foreign Policy*, article "Canada's Crisis, The Dangers," Stethem writes: "An independent Quebec implies a fundamental change in one of the post-World War II military constants of the West, a strong and unified North America. Perhaps the separatists believe that the stationing of one-third of Canada's air defense interceptor force . . . in Ba-

gotville, Quebec, and of another third at Chatham, New Brunswick, just south of the Quebec border, was a function of coincidence, or of regional politics played by the federal government.

"The fact is that these forces are based there because the primary manned-bomber route from the Soviet Union to the most heavily populated and industrialized areas of Canada and the United States runs from the Kola Peninsula over the Arctic and then south, straight down the middle of Quebec from Ungava to the St. Lawrence. That is also why American units of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) are stationed in a direct line further south.

"If the intermediate range supersonic 'Backfire' bomber, the latest addition to Soviet arsenals, follows this route, armed with standoff or cruise missiles, and refuels in flight, it can attack the eastern seaboard of the United States. The weapons themselves would be released at a point smack in the middle of Quebec."

Much at Stake

It is time that everyone in the United States, in Canada—and certainly in Quebec—woke up and realized what really is at stake if the coming showdown in the Canadian unity crisis is not resolved peaceably: nothing short of the very survival of freedom in North America.

As I left the office of Quebec cabinet official Louis O'Neill at the conclusion of our discussion last autumn, my host paused in the doorway and called back to me: "Please tell your American audience that they have many friends here in Quebec. Tell them also that we are not making a tragedy, we are creating a nation."

Mr. O'Neill was no doubt sincere in his appraisal. But only time will tell whether or not he is correct. □

This article is the result of a month-long trip the author recently took in Canada, where he interviewed prominent Canadian political, business and military leaders.

BURGLARY

(Continued from page 15)

2) Report any strange noises—especially the sound of breaking glass or doors being kicked in anywhere on the block or in the apartment building, which may mean a burglary in progress.

3) Don't tolerate large, noisy groups of teenagers hanging around aimlessly. Instead, join in some civic group active in helping young people find something constructive to do with their time. Bored kids may not necessarily become vicious kids, but some may burglarize homes for the sheer thrill of it, particularly if they feel ignored or unwanted in their own community.

The fight against burglary is everybody's business. Make it yours now, before the crime comes to you. □

(Editor's note: Ambassador College publishes a booklet entitled "Crime Can Be Stopped—Here's How!" This booklet gives many precautions and commonsense rules to protect yourself from criminals. To obtain your free copy, simply write to the address of our office nearest you.)

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

James Edward Keogh is a professional security consultant who has lectured in police science at the John Jay School of Criminal Justice in New York City and at the International Association of Police Chiefs seminars. He also devised, at a cost of \$500, a municipal antiburglary campaign for his hometown of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey, which was credited with saving the town \$66,000 in crime losses. He has appeared on TV and radio to talk about prevention of burglary and the technology of the war on crime.

John Koster is the author of The Road to Wounded Knee (Bantam Books, 1974), which won the Sigma Delta Chi Award for Distinguished Public Service. Koster is a veteran police and municipal reporter and has written numerous articles on youth crime, drugs and serious felonies for his newspaper, The Record, which covers northern New Jersey.



Garner Ted Armstrong

**SPEAKS
OUT!**

The Fashionable Ignorance

If you had to admit to friends that you knew absolutely nothing about politics, nothing about the economy, nothing about health or diet, nothing about world affairs or anything else that people are apt to discuss, it would probably prove somewhat embarrassing to you. But it isn't a bit embarrassing for most people to openly confess their complete ignorance of the Bible.

In fact, it's almost a badge of respectability to say, "Me? I'm no Bible scholar" or "I've never really looked into the Bible."

Have you ever noticed, as I have, that when you stay in a motel or hotel while traveling, there is invariably a copy of the Bible in the upper drawer of a dresser or bedside stand? If you will experiment by paging through that book you will, in nine cases out of ten, find absolutely no signs of use at all. It will be one of the most carefully preserved items in the room. The bed, the couch, the chair, the dresser, everything else may be beat up. The towels may have holes in them, the plumbing may be in disrepair—but that Gideon Bible looks absolutely brand-spanking new, with the possible exception of rings on its cover from coffee cups or beer cans.

This is not to say, of course, that people don't occasionally sit around and talk about the Bible. But so often their conversation revolves around what they've *heard* about the Bible, what they've *read* about the Bible, or what others have *said* about the Bible, rather than about what they have found from reading the Bible themselves.

Moreover, many have totally rejected

the Bible on the basis of what they *think* it says, never having looked into it for themselves to ascertain whether, in fact, it really says what they've been told it says. Many scientists, for example, have rejected the Bible because they have heard that it claims the earth is only 6,000 years old. (It makes no such claim. Write for our free booklet *Answers from Genesis* for details.)

Others, seeing the sad state of the world today, have rejected the Bible—or belief in God altogether—because they think the Scriptures claim God is trying desperately to save the world *now*, and obviously is failing miserably in the process. The Bible, however, reveals a totally different master plan for humankind. (Request our free article "Is This the Only Day of Salvation?")

Still others find it hard to reconcile the concept of a loving, compassionate, merciful God with the specter of the eternal torment of millions in an ever burning hell. But one can search the Bible from cover to cover without turning up any mention of such a place. (Write for our free booklet *Is There a Real Hellfire?*)

A major part of this problem of biblical illiteracy is that people think they must leave the Bible's understanding or interpretation to the religious professionals, meaning those people who wear the frocks and collars that identify them as members of the priesthood or the clergy. In other words, if you want to sell a house, you go to a realtor. If you want to buy stocks, you go to a broker. And if you want to find out about heaven, hell, the meaning of life,


or how you ought to live, you simply go to a priest, minister, or rabbi.

The trouble with this is that some of these Bible "specialists" are not as professional as you might think. Many will merely learn certain portions of the Bible, certain favorite texts they like to quote and preach from each week. As a result, many of these clergymen become like some of the guides I've heard about in the Amazon region of Brazil. As long as they stick to the trails and streams they are familiar with, they are safe. But if they wander out into a huge rain forest—such as the tractless Mato Grosso of Brazil that seems to stretch endlessly in all directions—they quickly become hopelessly lost.

Biblical illiteracy can be as prevalent among the clergy as among laymen. Surveys have shown that some clergymen cannot even correctly name the books of the Bible, much less tell you what's in them! And other surveys have revealed that many clergymen believe in the Bible to a far lesser degree than do their parishioners—but they seldom pass this fact on to their congregations.

It can be an interesting and illuminating experiment to personally read through the Bible to see what it does say and what it does not say. Write for our two free booklets *How to Study the Bible* and *Read the Book* to learn how to get the most out of your study. And be sure to enroll in our twelve-lesson Bible Correspondence Course, also sent free and without any obligation.

Why not get started *now* in your personal study of the Bible to see for yourself what it really says. You may be in for a few surprises! □



*"At
Ambassador
College I'm
not just a number.
I'm an individual
with personal
goals surrounded
by people who
are helping me
achieve them."*



Juanita Lujan is sold on Ambassador College. She is happy about what's been happening in her life as a student. Since she came to college from Socorro, New Mexico, Juanita has found that she has a natural flair for visual design. She credits Ambassador College with helping her to discover her talent. But more than that, Juanita is grateful for the opportunities she has had to develop the self-confidence and character necessary to be successful—as an interior designer, and as a woman in today's complex society. Ambassador College is in the business of educating and encouraging young people who want to *grow*, professionally, socially and spiritually. Juanita Lujan is one of those people. . . . What about you? For information about admissions, call toll-free (800) 423-4444 [except in California, Alaska and Hawaii, call (213) 577-5000], or write: Admissions Office, 300 W. Green St., Pasadena, CA 91123.

Ambassador College admits students of any race, color, national, and ethnic origin.

In accordance with Title IX of the Higher Educational Amendments of 1972, as applicable and not therefrom exempted, Ambassador College does not discriminate on the basis of sex in educational programs, activities, or employment.

Ambassador College

Q&A

Q u e s t i o n s

a n d

A n s w e r s

Q "According to Exodus 24:9-11, God was seen by human eyes. Therefore any words in the Bible claiming otherwise are without foundation. Right?"

R. E.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan

A No doubt the words you have in mind "claiming otherwise" are such New Testament statements as John 5:37: "And the Father who sent me has himself borne witness to me. His voice you have never heard, his form you have never seen. . . ." To understand this passage, notice that the Person who had never been seen was God the *Father*. This verse does not say that the *second* Person of the God family may not have manifested Himself physically on many occasions. The Bible, in fact, records many of His appearances.

"God" in the Old Testament refers almost invariably to the second Person, the *Logos* (Greek for "Spokesman") of the Godhead, who spoke to and otherwise dealt with mankind. The personal nature of the Father was then generally unknown. This is why Jesus spoke of revealing Him: "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and . . . no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him" (Matt. 11:27; also see Luke 10:22). Also, John wrote that "no one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known" (John 1:18).

By contrast, this One who became the Son was fairly well known to several individuals mentioned in the Old Testament. He walked and talked with Adam, Enoch (Gen. 5:22), Noah, Abra-

ham (Genesis 17 and 18 are especially plain), Isaac (Gen. 26:24), Jacob (Gen. 32:24-30), Moses, Joshua (Josh. 1:1, 5; 5:13-14), and a whole series of prophets. He is often called (interchangeably) "God," "the Lord" (Hebrew *YHVH*, the "Eternal" or "Self-Existent"), and "the angel [messenger] of the Lord." So when not only Moses and Aaron, but all the chief elders of Israel saw "the God of Israel [standing on] . . . a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness" (Ex. 24:10), they saw the executive, spokesman God, but they did not see God the Father. And what they saw, of course, was only a physical manifestation, since God is spirit and as such is inaccessible to the human senses. For more on this subject, write for the free reprint article "Who—What—Was Jesus Before His Human Birth?"

Q "Joshua was commanded to march around the city of Jericho for six days and on the seventh day to march around seven times. Since one of these days was obviously a Sabbath, why did God command them to break the Sabbath by working—going to war—on that day?"

Robert B.,
Portland, Oregon

A If God commands one to "work" on the Sabbath, it is certainly not "breaking the Sabbath." God commanded the priests and the Levites to work on the Sabbath in the Temple, offering up the evening and morning sacrifices and teaching the people. No one would argue that a direct command from God would temporarily

supersede the overall principles codified in the Ten Commandments.

Q "It has been said that the nuclear family as we know it in America—a small and mobile unit, cut off from the larger family and community—is an unhealthy substitute for the more traditional extended family. For one thing, it requires people to satisfy too many of their most basic life needs within an excessively limited sphere. In other words, in the nuclear family, it is said, the marriage suffers an inordinate pressure to provide more support than it possibly can. How does this view square with, 'Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh' (Gen. 2:24)?"

Kent H.,
Corpus Christi, Texas

A "Leaving one's father and mother" does not necessarily mean picking up stakes and moving across the country. One could just as well fulfill this admonition by moving into the house next door. Although an "extended family" (consisting of mother, father, children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) might occupy one large household, it is much more common to find such a group living in the same general geographical area or small town. In such a situation, the need for distance and privacy must be balanced with the need for closeness and emotional support such a network of relatives provides. It is of course not wrong for a family to take in an elderly father or mother who needs a home and perhaps care in his or her old age. Nevertheless, in some instances such a close association

between two (or three) generations may cause a great deal of friction and tension in the family. The point made in Genesis is that ideally a husband is to independently establish a new household when he marries.

Q "What place did Jesus mean by promising 'in my Father's house are many mansions'? Was he referring to a golden age in heaven?"

Anonymous

A Many have misunderstood John 14:2-3: "In my Father's house are many rooms [KJV, mansions]; if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? . . . I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also."

The phrase "my father's house" does not refer to heaven, but rather to the same "house" spoken of by Jesus when He drove the moneychangers and their animals out of the Temple. At this time He quoted from Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11: "It is written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer'; but you make it a den of robbers" (Matt. 21:13.)

In the account of the Temple tax (Matt. 17:24-27), Jesus, by identifying Himself as the "son" of the Temple's owner (RSV), in effect called the Temple His "Father's house."

By speaking of the Temple having many "rooms" (the numerous side chambers which were built along the side walls of the Temple and along the inside of the walls of the Temple court), Jesus illustrated the concept that there would be places for many assistants in the government of the Kingdom of God on earth, when Jerusalem and its Temple would be the millennial capital. "I will come [back to earth] again and will take you to myself, that where I am [headquartered in the Temple itself, on earth] you may be also." For more on the subject of heaven, write for the free booklet *What Is the Reward of the Saved?*

DAVID

(Continued from page 26)

Israel. No means of sharpening even the farming tools they purchased from the Philistines, except, at great expense, they were sharpened by the Philistines! And it was the Philistines they were supposed to fight!

Hopeless! Saul was sick!

The Philistines held the lowlands unhindered. They held even the mountain passes. Israel was bottled up in the barren hills like a rabbit in a hole, dependent on Philistines to even harvest their meager crops.

Rejected by God, if not by the people, after his first year as king, Saul brooded.

Saul's Sane Son

P rince Jonathan, who had greater faith in God, was more of a man than his father. With his one sword and with one faithful companion armed with a dull ax (or perhaps a sickle, ox goad, club or stick, and maybe a rock or two), Jonathan attacked a Philistine garrison at a strategic pass. "Let's go across to those heathen," Jonathan had said to his bodyguard. "Perhaps the Lord will do a miracle for us. For it makes no difference to him how many enemy troops there are!" (I Sam. 14:6).

Jonathan, with one ill-armed companion, attacked an entire mountain-pass garrison of Philistines. Among the Philistines were conscripted Hebrews, bearing arms against their brethren. When Jonathan and his unnamed companion had killed more than twenty Philistines, the enemy began to falter. God added His miracle by producing an earthquake and causing the Philistines to fight each other, and the Hebrews among the Philistines turned on their masters.

Two men triggered the rout of an entire Philistine army!

Saul, observing this from afar, rushed with his six hundred men to join the chase.

Victory!

"I will be avenged," Saul said. And he proclaimed a fast that day for all, despite the fact that his troops were exhausted.

But Jonathan had not heard his father's decree; he ate some honey he found in a tree. Saul called all the army together, and when it was found that Jonathan had eaten honey, he stubbornly stuck firm by his edict of death for any who would eat that day, despite the fact that Jonathan was his son and the hero of the day!

Unwisely, in haste, rashly, presumptuously, Saul signed his own son's death warrant.

But his troops would not hear of it! "Jonathan, who saved Israel today, shall die? Far from it! We vow by the life of God that not one hair on his head will be touched, for he has been used of God to do a mighty miracle today." So the people rescued Jonathan [from the people's choice, Saul]" (I Sam. 14:45).

The people didn't agree with Saul's decision. Yet he was king still, and Jonathan's victory had lifted the morale of his troops. "And now, since he was securely in the saddle as king of Israel [thanks to Jonathan], Saul sent the Israeli army out in every direction against Moab, Ammon, Edom, the kings of Zobah, and the Philistines. And wherever he turned, he was successful. He did great deeds and conquered the Amalekites and saved Israel from all those who had been their conquerors" (verses 47-48).

Need for a New King

Y et despite Saul's successes, his character flaws showed. He had already been rejected by God to found a dynasty to be the kings of Israel forever. And he was yet to commit a final blunder on a commission from God which would deny him the throne itself.

Next issue we'll see what that mistake was, and how David—a man after God's own heart—came to be chosen as his successor. □

(To Be Continued)

Trinity

(Continued from page 5)

manuscripts? Did you know this spurious section was not found in the text of any Greek manuscripts until *after* the invention of printing? Comparison with many of the more modern translations and simple research will prove my point. Verses 7 and 8 should actually read as follows: "There are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree." This is how the passage is rendered in the Revised Standard Version, perhaps the best overall of modern Bible translations.

The editors of both liberal and conservative Bible commentaries (ancient and modern) agree as to the very dubious origin of I John 5:7 (as it now stands in the King James or Authorized Version). Notice a couple of quotes from two commentaries of more recent vintage. Says the conservatively oriented *New Bible Commentary Revised*: "... The words are clearly a gloss and are rightly excluded by RSV [Revised Standard Version] even from its margin" (p. 1269). *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, universally recognized as a standard liberal work, is even more incisive with its comments: "The famous interpolation after 'three witnesses' is not printed even in RSV, and rightly. . . . No respectable Greek MS [manuscript] contains it. Appearing first in a late 4th century Latin text, it entered the Vulgate and finally the NT [New Testament] of Erasmus [and eventually the King James]" (p. 1038).

The translators of the Revised Version of 1881 immediately spotted the difficulties with I John 5:7. The passage occurs in *only* two modern Greek manuscripts, in one or two ancient versions of little value and, of course, in many late copies of the Latin Vulgate. This is the extent of the textual support for this dubious verse.

The fact could not be ignored that not a single Greek manuscript or church-lesson book before the fifteenth century had any trace of I John 5:7. Also it is omitted in nearly every ancient version of any

critical value—including the very best copies of the Latin Vulgate itself. Finally no Greek father even quotes it in any discussion concerning the Trinity doctrine itself.

Consequently the passage was omitted and it does *not* appear in the Revised Version of 1881—the first scholarly revision of the King James Version of any consequence.

F. F. Bruce, a respected British scholar, has this to say about I John 5:7: "... A footnote rightly points out that the passage is 'not in any of the early Greek mss, or any of the early translations, or in the best mss of the Vulgate itself' and suggests that it is probably a gloss that has crept into the text" (*The English Bible*, p. 217).

Clearly I John 5:7 is a spurious addition that is in no way, manner, shape or form a part of the New Testament canon.

Matthew 28:19

Another grossly misunderstood text (often cited to "prove" there is indeed a Trinity) is Matthew 28:19: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

To imply that this verse means that all three (the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit) are persons is just not being honest with the Scriptures. Clearly the first two (God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ) are two separate individual spirit personalities in the Godhead, but that fact does *not* automatically make the Holy Spirit also a person.

Think about it a moment! People give names to many things that are simply not persons. Everything—whether person, place or thing—*has a name!*

But why did Jesus command the apostles to baptize converts into these three names? And why must they be baptized (see Acts 2:38) into these names in order to receive the Holy Spirit? God the Father *grants* human beings *real repentance* (Rom. 2:4; Acts 11:18; II Tim. 2:25). We become His sons (literally!)—*the sons of God* (bearing His name)—when we receive the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:9, 14, 16-17). Is that so hard to understand? Human beings often bear the names of their forebears,

e.g., Johnson, Robertson, Jackson, meaning originally the sons of John, Robert and Jack.

"God" is the family name in English of the divine Kingdom of spirit beings. The Father's name is "God" in English. Jesus Christ—who was crucified so our past sins may be forgiven—is also called *God* in John 1:1, Hebrews 1:8 and other New Testament texts. The Holy Spirit—which comes forth from the very person of God—is the begetting agent by which we receive the earnest of our salvation (II Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14; Rom. 8:16).

Many religionists do not understand the part that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit each play in the salvation process. The Trinity is the result, in part, of such fundamental misunderstandings.

But here is another one of those "famous" biblical opposites. Instead of teaching the pagan doctrine of the Trinity, Matthew 28:19 really tells us that God is a growing family or Kingdom into which we may enter upon repentance, baptism, the receipt of the Holy Spirit and patient endurance to the end of our natural lives and/or Christ's coming—whichever comes first.

A closed Trinity, triad, or triumvirate of three persons is as far from God's mind and His plan and purpose for human beings as the east is from the west. The false doctrine of the Trinity can only blind gullible human beings to the transcendent purpose of human life: to be born as literal spirit beings (sons of God) into the great God family!

God is *not* a limited Trinity! He is the divine Head of a growing family or Kingdom into which we may, through the grace of God, freely enter! The apostle Peter wrote that *if* you have the fruits of God's Holy Spirit (II Peter 1:5-9), "*an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*" (verse 11). □

RECOMMENDED READING

Was humanity created for a great purpose and, if so, why is humankind so totally unaware of it? To find out, write for our free booklet titled *Why Were You Born?*

THE HONEYBEE

(Continued from page 23)

with relative bearings to the sun? How did such a tiny creature learn to equate sun angles and distances with dance-step routines? How does a bee "learn" to quantify concepts like distance, time, and direction? Where did the internal time clock come from? If one bee came up with this mind-boggling scheme all by herself, how did she get the rest of the hive to understand her language?

If that weren't enough, consider some of the other complex navigational problems bees have to solve once they learn the location of a flower find. Often natural obstructions require the bee to fly a dogleg course to reach its desired target. Again picture a scout returning from a flowery find having made a large in-flight detour (in order to avoid objects like houses, trees, or hills). She then communicates the direction based on, of all things, the straight-line course to target! Now that's quite an achievement, considering the bee never flew in that direction either leaving or returning to the hive! Yet somehow she makes the correct "trigonometric calculations" for her fellow workers. They, too, successfully fly the dogleg, figuring out all the distances and angles along the way.

During actual flight, bees have to reckon distance flown over the ground versus movement through the air. This becomes critical when one is trying to fly a proverbial beeline, but is being buffeted by a crosswind. Somehow, just like an experienced navigator, the bee has to compensate for the crosswind drift.

Again, all the aeronautical equipment necessary for these complicated calculations is built right into the bee's tiny anatomy. Its multifaceted eye can measure speed over the ground by making direct visual checks. Relative wind movement is detected by means of sensitive hairs located on the eye. The bee's tiny brain then compares the two measurements and comes up with a corrected "course to station."

Bees will even "ground" themselves under adverse weather condi-

tions. If a stiff headwind is blowing, they could easily end up flying backwards trying to track down a particular group of flowers. They avoid this rather awkward aerial exigency by using their own mini-weather-advisory system. Before takeoff, bees will measure wind speed with their antennae to determine if it is safe to proceed.

Bees also have to work out a daily "flight plan" based on the amount of light available and the season of the year. For most efficient operations, first takeoff should occur early in the morning to allow for the maximum "time on station" gathering nectar and pollen. But a premature departure will mean insufficient light to work by. Bees get around this problem by using their eyes to gauge optimum departure time, much like a photographer would employ his light meter.

In the evening, flight timing becomes much more complicated. If the bee leaves for her last trip when the light is at the same intensity as it was for her first morning departure, she's likely to come home groping in the dark. Part of the remaining light will be consumed in getting to and from the target. So the bee correctly calculates that the last flight in the evening can only take place with the light intensity slightly brighter than it was in the morning. As one author put it, this is "an astonishing instinctive calculation of things to come, considering the smallness of a bee's brain" (Vitus B. Droscher, *The Magic of the Senses*, p. 48).

Perhaps it's not so astounding when you consider who designed all the miniaturized circuitry in the first place. By comparison, consider for a moment the remarkable strides man has made in the field of micro-miniaturization in the last few years. Most of it took the combined efforts of highly intelligent, trained and experienced individuals. In spite of that, man has yet to come even remotely close to matching the levels of design found in the small brain of the honeybee.

Can anything, then, but a highly skilled and creative Being account for the bee's remarkable behavior? By any logical standards the answer to this question should be obvious. □

Personal from...

(Continued from page 1)

graduating from high school, I'd look for the college or university that would teach me what I am, why, and what the true values are. I'd want to learn something more than merely a profession for earning an income.

But I am no longer a lad of eighteen. And I not only know these answers, but I know also that there is only one place on earth where a student may learn these answers that are worth more than all the money in the world. But, for that matter, when you learn these answers and apply them, you don't have to worry about money—for the very application of these principles brings economic security.

The only college or university on earth that teaches these most important areas of knowledge is Ambassador College at Pasadena, California.

People remark that they never have seen such a happy atmosphere as the Ambassador College campus.

"Why, all your students seem to really enjoy life," they say. "They seem alive, alert, full of spark and interest—and happy!"

"You're right," I reply. "They do—and they are!"

When I started writing the first paragraph of this *Personal* talk, what I had in mind was to tell you what man is. I intended to show you that science doesn't really know. What we call education in the usual sense, as disseminated at colleges and universities, doesn't know.

Space does not now allow me to get into this discussion of what man is, so I'm afraid I cannot get that explanation into this present talk. It would take ten to twenty typed pages to explain it, anyway. So it probably would be better to write it as a full article later on.

The true answer, I think, is not only thrilling and exciting, but it is also important!

By the way, if you are facing this question about whether to attend college—or which college—I suggest you write to the Ambassador College Admissions Office, 300 West Green Street, Pasadena, California 91123. □

TODAY'S YOUTH

(Continued from page 3)

stored in this memory—or this human computer; 2) it somehow supplies the brain whatever energy is needed to cause it to *think*—that is, to put these pieces of information stored in this spirit together in the process we call thinking or reasoning and drawing conclusions.

Animals see, hear, smell, etc. But what they see, hear, smell is not stored in such a “computer,” and there is no instant recall of knowledge stored there years ago, and no spirit to cause the physical brain to function in the process of thinking and reasoning, and acquiring knowledge.

Animals do not have this spirit, and are not capable of the functions of the human brain, which has the additional presence of a NONPHYSICAL component—this human spirit.

Why do we humans have this spirit? Because we were made in the image and likeness—form and shape—of God. And we were made to have a relationship with God. Animals were not so made. God is a spirit—is wholly composed of SPIRIT. Man is physical MATTER, but made to have a relationship with a spiritual God! That is why God the Creator made man the way He did!

Now we are ready for the last half of this same verse 11 in I Corinthians 2: “... even so the things of God [godly knowledge, spiritual knowledge and comprehension] knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”

What tremendous meaning is here! *Yet almost no one understands it!* Just as an animal cannot have the knowledge or intellect of a man—nor could a man without this spirit which is in him—so, in like manner, no man can have spiritual comprehension, know the things of God, have spiritual knowledge, without also having another spirit—the HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD.

Pattern of Duality

How interesting that God does things in a manner of duality—in twos, or pairs. He created Adam, a

man. But alone, this man was incomplete. He needed a woman to form the one unit of a family. Not many know it, but God is a family into which we may be born.

There was the first Adam, and then the second Adam—Jesus Christ. There are in the Bible the two Testaments—the Old and the New. To form a new human being through the process of reproduction, the principle of duality enters again: A female egg cell, or ovum, must be entered by and joined with a male sperm cell. The two make one.

What the Human Spirit Lacks

Now understand this wonderful knowledge. The spirit in man is not complete by itself; it was made to NEED *another* spirit—the Holy Spirit of God. They join to make ONE begotten child of God, just as the male sperm cell and the female egg cell—the two cells—join to make one begotten human—begotten, but not yet developed or ready to be born as one human being.

In the incident of the “forbidden fruit” in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve were freely offered this second and most needed Spirit. Of the two symbolic trees, the tree of life was a symbol of God’s Holy Spirit. To have taken the fruit of *that* tree would have been to receive God’s Holy Spirit, which would join with their human spirits, impregnating them as begotten (not yet born) children of God.

But our first parents took to themselves, and FOR the human family which sprang from them, the knowledge of what is good and what is evil, thus rejecting the government of God based on His spiritual law. That law is a WAY OF LIFE—the way of good, the way of love, outgoing, not self-centered.

They cut themselves and the human family which was reproduced from them off from God. Since that was man’s choice, God gave him his choice, and sentenced the human family to 6,000 years of being cut off from contact with Him. Man would thus have to go on living with the *one spirit alone* and would be capable of knowing only

that which is physical and material—with a mind that could not comprehend spiritual knowledge or the things of God!

So, to finish the awesome revelation of truth in I Corinthians 2: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (verse 14).

But if the things of God are “foolishness” to the highly educated natural man, listen to how his vast fund of misknowledge appears to God. God says, “For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God” (I Cor. 3:19).

He did, however, reserve to Himself the decision to intervene in this God-rejecting world in certain instances where it served His purpose. Apparently He intervened and imparted certain knowledge through personal contact to Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob (Israel), Joseph, Moses, and the prophets of Israel. God intervened in forming the nations of Israel and Judah. He intervened in sending Christ with the announcement of the good news of the coming Kingdom of God. The government of the Kingdom of God will be established at the seven-thousandth year and will rule all nations for 1,000 years with WORLD PEACE, happiness, and spiritual salvation offered to all. God also intervened in raising up His Church, in the Bible called “the little flock,” persecuted by the churches of this world. (And Satan is called “the god of this world,” though he has DECEIVED all nations until none, it seems, realizes that fact.)

I will come later to an explanation of the change that will take place in the world’s youth at the beginning of that seventh thousand years. Right now I’m concerned with *today’s* youth. But what I first wanted to make clear is the state of the human mind. And today’s youth, as a whole (save for the few converted who have God’s Spirit *as well*), have only that one human spirit.

Let me add here, however, that

we are within a FEW YEARS of the END of the 6,000-year sentence cutting humanity as a whole off from God. This is the very living generation that shall live through the ending of this unhappy and evil world, and the beginning of the happy, peaceful world tomorrow. We are the living generation that shall live to see that happy day!

There Really Is a Devil

I know it is not fashionable in today's knowledge (which is FOOLISHNESS to God) to say that there exists a devil named Satan.

Very, very few people today (theologians especially) really understand the Bible. It is like a jigsaw puzzle. It does not start with Genesis 1, verse 1, and carry its revealed truth through its pages in straight time sequence. In fact Genesis 1:1 does not record the real earliest beginning at all. John 1:1 in the New Testament does. Biblical revelation is found "here a little, there a little." This is explained in Isaiah 28:9-10: "Whom shall he [God] teach knowledge? And whom shall he make to understand doctrine?... For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." This passage goes on to explain that this was done for a world that cut itself off from God, "that they might go, and fall backward." But for those willing to believe what God says, who have His Holy Spirit and who really hunger and thirst for understanding, God will reveal His truth to them by helping them put the "jigsaw puzzle" together properly—and then the wonderful, beautiful, glorious picture will come clear in the only explanation of things that makes sense!

The Bible reveals what almost nobody knows: Before the creation of man, this earth was inhabited by angels. God set over them His government. On an earthly throne, with the whole earth his jurisdiction, God placed the superarchangel, the cherub Lucifer. This Lucifer was of the highest rank of being it is possible for God to create—actually only God is superior in power. Lucifer led his angels—apparently a

third of all created angels—into rebellion against the government of God.

God's government is based on the way of life I call "GIVE"—or the better biblical term, "LOVE." It is outgoing love toward God—a return of His love which He gives to us with His Holy Spirit. It is giving to God obedience, reverence, utter trust and worship. It is outgoing concern for the welfare of one's fellowman—the way of giving, serving, cooperating, helping, sharing.

But Lucifer turned to the way I call "GET." He turned to vanity, lust and greed, to jealousy and envy, to competition and strife, to violence and war, to rebellion against God and God's way of life.

The government of God was no longer in effect on earth. Lucifer's name was changed to Satan, meaning "adversary," "enemy." The angels became demons—their minds perverted, warped, twisted, as is Satan's. Nevertheless, all angels are SPIRIT beings, composed of spirit, and therefore immortal. Satan appeared before the first woman, Eve, to deceive her. He has deceived all humanity ever since (Rev. 12:9), except those few throughout the ages God has called.

Prince of the Power of the Air

Jesus Christ overcame Satan; He obeyed completely and proved He would never deviate from God's laws and God's way of life, as Lucifer did.

However, Jesus Christ did not come 1900 years ago to then take over the rulership of the earth or to engage in a "soul-saving crusade" to save the world spiritually. God had sentenced humanity to 6,000 years of being cut off from Him. God up until now has called only a FEW, for special purposes. Christ came as a Messenger sent from God. The message—His gospel—was to announce the coming Kingdom of God, which is the family of God ruling in the government of God.

So, this mighty and powerful, tricky, deceptive and subtle Satan has continued to rule the earth up until now.

You read of him in the book of

Job; you read much of him in the New Testament. In Ephesians 2:2 he is called the "prince of the power of the AIR." I could not have understood that until I began broadcasting over the air. When I was a young man, there were no radio stations transmitting sound through the air. Television did not get started really reaching the public until after World War II.

When God wanted to have King Cyrus of Persia issue a proclamation for certain Jews to go back to Jerusalem to build the second temple, He did not communicate with this gentile king as He did with His own prophets, or as with Moses, face to face. It is recorded in Ezra 1:1 that *God stirred up the spirit* in Cyrus, thus communicating with him through his human spirit. That is the method by which Satan deceives the whole world.

Our youth of today were not born with what we call "human nature." Human nature is described as vanity, lust and greed, jealousy and envy, competition, an attitude of strife, war, violence, and rebellion against authority. This is precisely what Satan turned to, and turned his angels to. And just as God communicated through the air to King Cyrus, through Cyrus' human spirit, so Satan, the prince of the power of the air, broadcasts. And every human spirit is tuned to Satan's wavelength!

He does NOT broadcast in sounds—your ears do not hear it—nor in pictures, as in television. He does not broadcast in words. He subtly broadcasts in ATTITUDES, moods, impulses.

Heredity and Environment

Our youth of today were born as the lovely, sweet little infants their parents thought them to be—with none of this "human nature." Their parents did have this so-called human nature, but they *acquired it* from Satan's broadcasting, and acquired characteristics are NOT transmitted by heredity. Besides, these attitudes we call human nature are really spiritual in nature—not physical or material.

But, as the baby grows into a little

child and his mind begins to develop, his human spirit begins to receive Satan's messages of the "get" way of life. And by the time he is a teenager, growing toward adulthood, he may have received a great deal of this satanic attitude.

Humans become what they do because of two factors—heredity and environment. Some inherit a better mind than others. By environment, I mean ALL external influences: teaching from parents, schools, and other people, especially peers, from books and entertainments—and, of course, from these impulses and attitudes that Satan keeps subtly injecting into one's mind in a manner he does not realize.

The flight steward on my plane who accompanies me on my trips is a young man who formerly taught in one of our Imperial schools (grade and high schools formerly run on the Ambassador College grounds). He said to me the other day: "We could always tell which of our children came from homes where their parents spent a good deal of time with them, and which from homes of parental neglect."

Parental teaching, love, and training can very greatly counteract Satan's broadcast influence. Other factors of environmental influence may help counteract it also.

One Spirit, and Cut Off From God

Now consider WHY today's teenagers are like they are. Some are "good" by this world's standards, some are bad, and some are very bad.

Having only the human spirit creates loneliness and a craving for something that will satisfy. This void can only be filled by God's Holy Spirit—which, as we read in Romans 8, "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (verse 16). So today's youth (and adults as well) seek to satisfy that "soul hunger"—in physical pleasures and interests.

Not only are most children shamefully neglected by their parents today, but they have no contact with God.

I think these things explain the

splendid *U.S. News & World Report* article on "America's Youth" with the subhead, "Angry, Bored, or Just Confused?"

Yes, I think they are all of those things, and I think I have here explained why.

But the good news is that the 6,000 years is just about over; Christ, who conquered Satan and qualified to restore the government of God once again to earth, is very soon coming.

Satan's broadcasting, by the way, can be resisted. He has no power of duress. He can put the thought or temptation or the attitude there, but we humans, if only taught so, can RESIST it with the power of the Holy Spirit, and there is much teaching in the New Testament that we should, can, and must resist it.

I am proclaiming around the world the good news that Christ is very soon coming; Satan will be put away, and the ENVIRONMENT of teens will be entirely changed. The lesson has been written in 6,000 years of humanity rejecting God.

The Conclusion

We are right now emerging rapidly into the final supreme WORLD CRISIS that will end this present evil world and bring on the supernatural intervention of the Almighty Creator God to prevent humanity from using its now existing weapons of mass destruction to erase all life from earth. This age will climax in the coming of Jesus Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords, setting up the Kingdom of God that shall rule and bring PEACE to all nations.

Meanwhile today's youth, fast growing toward adulthood, will not improve, but conditions will worsen (II Tim. 3:1-4). Few people know—but Satan knows—that he now has but a short time (Rev. 12:12) and this stirs him to great wrath (same verse). He will surcharge the air over the earth with his "get" attitude with greater intensity than ever.

But, as I said, Satan has no power of duress. He can do no more than God allows. Those parents who read

this article can devote more time to their growing children. Teach them the way of give—of LOVE. With proper teaching and help, at least they can improve, overcome, turn to more profitable interests, and RESIST these impulses to evil with which Satan is surcharging the air with increasing power and wrath!

But very soon now, the supreme crisis will come. God will shake the whole world with frightening signs in the heavens; Christ will come and Satan will be put away (Rev. 20:1-3), and the saints whom Christ has called and prepared will rule under Christ in love and with power over all the earth for the next thousand years.

And what of the world's youth, then?

They will be totally freed from being on the receiving end of Satan's broadcast. They will live in an environment where truth and love and peace are being taught everywhere. The whole world will be relieved of this unseen, unrealized evil pressure from this evil prince of the power of the air. Instead God's law of love and peace will go out to all the world from Jerusalem. The Holy Spirit of God will flow out from Jerusalem, even as Satan's broadcasts of evil attitudes go out over the earth today. Listen to the SURE word of God: "And it shall be in that day, that living waters [the Holy Spirit] shall go out from Jerusalem. . . . And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one" (Zech. 14:8-9).

It will be a NEW and totally different world. Our youth, then, shall be filled with ambition to live the "give" way, and will be preparing themselves for great accomplishments and spreading joy and happiness all over the earth.

We could have a veritable utopia here on earth.

We shall have—and all this will come in our very present living generation. THAT IS YOUR SURE HOPE! The living Christ has committed to me His great commission—to announce, proclaim, and spread this good news over all the earth. □

orchids

L E T & T E R S

onions

Conservative Kudos

In your article "Why America Is in Global Retreat" (January *Plain Truth*) you've said what conservative America believes. If ever an article made me "fightin' mad" and want to stand up and do something, it was yours on America's irritating premeditated apathy and moral collapse. I cannot believe the populace at large agrees with such "leadership," if that's what it can be called. I feel that if anything is ever to cause the mass of quiescent citizenry to make demands upon their elected representatives, it will have to be through articles like yours. Keep 'em coming.

Richard Davids,
Vista, California

I want to congratulate you on your very fine article in the February *Plain Truth*, "America's National Goal—Appeasement." It has always been my contention that we should adhere to the principles given us by the men who founded this country; men like Washington, Adams, Jefferson and Monroe. These men believed that our sphere of influence should be in this hemisphere alone. I am all for sharing our medical and scientific knowledge and even our food with the rest of the world, but as for going to war outside this hemisphere I am strictly an isolationist. We should stand by Nationalist China, but not to the extent that it would lead us to war, and we should make no other commitments along that line. We cannot police the entire world. The best we can do is set a good example, so that other nations will look to us and say, "That is for me."

A. H. Thieme,
Reno, Nevada

Helped by Articles

I just finished reading the articles on depression and "turning the other cheek" in the January *Plain Truth*. I am just starting to recover from a nervous breakdown, and you'll never know how much these articles have helped me. I

thought I had to passively take the bad treatment I was receiving. I was turning into a monster because of pent-up anger and I just couldn't cope any more. God has answered my prayers through these articles. Thank you!

Mrs. N. S.,
Neillsville, Wisconsin

Articles for Children?

Please address an occasional article to children. It's hard to be a kid nowadays, but it could be less complicated if we were shown why biblical principles are preferable to worldly principles.

Gregory Sheroian,
Toledo, Ohio

• *Thanks for your suggestion, Gregory. We wonder, how many others would like to see articles written directly to children and young people?*

God and Evolution

Regarding "The Potter Wasp's Unusual Hanging Act" in the January 1978 issue, may I ask exactly how (by what procedure) did God create the potter wasp and its "unusual" behavior? If you have no answer, why would you object to the perfectly logical answer that God created the potter wasp by means of His "laws of evolution"? Ignorance of how these laws operate should encourage us to seek the method. It should not encourage us to explain away these laws with nonanswers or red herrings as your author did.

Jack Ryan,
El Paso, Texas

• *We do have an answer. God created the potter wasp the same way He created the rest of the fantastically complex animal kingdom. See Genesis 1 for details.*

I consider myself a fairly well educated man. I believe very strongly in Darwinian evolution, but I also want to believe in an all-powerful, loving God. The immensity of the heavens, the tetrahedral nature of carbon, the laws of gravity and energy, the function of the kidney, the Mendelian laws of genetics

are all so beautiful. But this perfect order and incredible logic didn't just happen. Someone had to put these laws in motion. Someone had to start the "game of life."

I believe that life—simple unicellular life—spontaneously arose. This does not alter my belief in God. It is not hard for me to conceptualize God creating the laws of the universe eons ago, which through time led to the evolution of man. As a scientist, I believe in the cold, hard facts of science, but I believe and marvel at the Creator who established the laws. For me, at least, the role of scientist does not conflict with my belief in God, but rather enriches and reinforces it.

Stephen E. Miller,
New Orleans, Louisiana

Wants More Drug Booklets

I have just read a copy of the booklet *The Dilemma of Drugs*. In a word: excellent. I am anxious to share this fine work with my students. I realize the book can neither be bought or sold, and I don't know your policy concerning bulk orders. But on behalf of my students, may I beg your kind indulgence and ask you to send approximately 50 copies of this booklet. I assure you my students will be required to read these chapters carefully and they will be notified that this fine work comes courtesy of your organization.

Lawrence Walsh,
Belmont, North Carolina

Changed Life

As a direct result of reading your magazine and other literature, I can say that my entire life has changed. I have become noticeably more Christian in almost every aspect of my life. I have a very long way to go, but I sincerely never thought I would get even this far. The precepts you teach are magnetic to me. Your church has brought me closer to Christianity than the one I was reared in.

James S. Mortellaro,
New York, New York

CAN LAETRILE CURE CANCER?

Opponents say it's worthless, but those who've tried it give glowing testimonials. This year 380,000 Americans will die of cancer, and for all the billions we've spent on research we're still a long way from a cure. Conventional cancer treatments are often painful and only partially effective. But is laetrile any better? Does it really help or is it only a useless placebo? Or is the controversy over laetrile only part of the

larger drugs-versus-nutrition dispute? For an in-depth survey of this life-or-death subject, send for the booklet *Laetrile—Cancer Cure or Quackery?* It's free of charge—just use the envelope inside this magazine or send the coupon below to our office nearest you. (See inside the front cover for addresses.)



LITERATURE REQUEST / CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please check:

- Please send the following literature: _____
- Change of address: _____
- New subscriber: _____
Print new address below

Name _____

Address _____

City/State _____ Zip _____

Clip and mail with address label at right to:

The Plain Truth
Pasadena, CA
91123

741203-0303-5 31 P058

ROBERT S KUHNE
2845 WALTERS AVE
NORTHBROOK IL 60062